

MARIPOSA COUNTY

Fire · 209-966-4330



RESOLUTION - ACTION REQUESTED 2021-80

MEETING:February 16, 2021TO:The Board of SupervisorsFROM:Mike Van Loben Sels, Acting Fire ChiefRE:Mariposa County Community Widlfire Protection Plan Adoption

RECOMMENDATION AND JUSTIFICATION:

Adopt the Mariposa County Community Wildfire Protection Plan (February 2021 Update).

The Mariposa County Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP) functions as the County's principal document to prepare for wildfires to minimize negative impacts and increase desired ecological outcomes. The plan is intended to serve as the County's primary reference for strategic wildfire planning and guide future wildfire prevention and mitigation activities.

Staff recommends receiving the CWPP (February 2021) presentation: including a power point presentation regarding the plan and update process overview; and adoption of the plan.

(See attached)

BACKGROUND AND HISTORY OF BOARD ACTIONS:

The Board has approved multiple actions in support of the CWPP update including: Formation of the Mariposa County Fire Advisory Committee (Key Role to Update and assist in CWPP Plan management)

Budget augmentation of CWPP Update grant funds (FireSafe Council Administered Grant)

Approval of CPAW grant (predecessor activity to assist in CWPP update)

Various past actions for ongoing support of Fire Prevention and Protection activities Countywide.

ALTERNATIVES AND CONSEQUENCES OF NEGATIVE ACTION:

Negative action would result in the CWPP not being functional for implementation and thereby potentially precluding participation in various important activities for fire prevention and protection including potential grant funding opportunities. ATTACHMENTS: Staff Memorandum (PDF) Mariposa County CWPP FEB 2021 FINAL (PDF) PRESENTATION FINAL CWPP (PDF)

RESULT: ADOPTED [UNANIMOUS]

MOVER:Rosemarie Smallcombe, District I SupervisorSECONDER:Wayne Forsythe, District IV SupervisorAYES:Smallcombe, Sweeney, Long, Forsythe, Menetrey

RES. <u>2021-80</u>

Mariposa County Community Wildfire Protection Plan

FEBRUARY 2021

Signature Page

Mike van Loben Sels ZOFFOSIGN 6B3E6D14AD

Mike van Loben Sels Unit Chief CAL FIRE, Madera-Mariposa-Merced Unit Mariposa County Fire Department

02/17/2021

Date

Marshall Long

Marshall Long Chairperson Mariposa County Board of Supervisors 02/18/2021

Date

Steven J. Engefer zorrosign 6836601405

Steve Engfer Chairperson Mariposa County Fire Advisory Committee 02/18/2021

Date

Approved as to Legal Form: Steven W. Dahlem ZOFFOSign 6B3E6D14A3 Steven W. Dahlem, County Counsel













Acknowledgments

The following **organizations and agencies provided invaluable time, input, and feedback** to ensure the contents of the Mariposa County Community Wildfire Protection Plan update, and its associated outreach activities, were accurate and met the needs of the planning process:

- Mariposa County Fire Safe Council Barbara Cone, Executive Director
- Mariposa County Planning Department Steve Engfer, Senior Planner
- Mariposa County Fire Department John Morgan, Battalion Chief
- Mariposa County Resource Conservation District Melinda Barrett, Program Manager
- Mariposa County Fire Advisory Committee
- Mariposa County GIS Ben Ogren
- CAL FIRE MMU GIS Jim Pearce

Funding for this project was provided by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection as part of the California Climate Investments Program. Funding was also provided by Mariposa County, California.

This plan update was led by a consulting team, consisting of Wildfire Planning International LLC, Wildland Professional Solutions, Inc., and Anchor Point Group LLC. Internal review was provided by Atlas Planning Solutions.

Photo credits are listed below:

Cover, Executive Summary – Chief Bernie Quinn (CAL FIRE, retired)

Introduction, Local Environment, Cohesive Strategy Approach, Action Plan and Implementation, Appendices – Molly Mowery (Wildfire Planning International)

All other image credits are listed next to figures.

Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
INTRODUCTION	4
Minimum Plan Requirements	4
Mariposa County CWPP Goals	5
PART 1: UNDERSTANDING THE LOCAL ENVIRONMENT	7
Area Description	7
Demographic Information	7
Local Economy	
Land Management and Ownership	9
Land Use and Development	9
Critical Infrastructure and Communications	9
Infrastructure	9
Communications	10
Public Safety Power Shutoffs	10
Historic and Cultural Resources	10
Natural Environment and Ecosystem	11
Yosemite-Mariposa Watershed	11
Threatened and Endangered Species	11
Fire Environment	11
Topography	15
Climate (Weather)	15
Vegetation (Fuels)	15
Influence on Other Natural Hazards	17
Relevant Plans	18
PART 2: RISK ASSESSMENT	
Understanding the Wildfire Risk Triangle	22
Parcel-Level (Structure Ignition Zone) Susceptibility Assessments	23
Updated Risk Assessment Approach	23
Assessment Methodology	25
Defining the Wildland-Urban Interface	26
Integrating a SIZ Assessment Program	28
Using the Wildfire Risk Assessment Results for Decision Making	

PART 3: TAKING A COHESIVE STRATEGY APPROACH	
Resilient Landscapes	
Restoration and Maintenance Strategies	
Increasing Resiliency of Landscapes	32
Fire-Adapted Communities	33
Property Scale	34
Neighborhood / Subdivision Scale	35
County Scale	36
Increasing Community Fire-Adaptation	36
Response and Suppression Capabilities	37
Interagency Cooperation	39
Community Limitations	39
Increasing Community Fire Response	
PART 4: ACTION PLAN AND IMPLEMENTATION	
Action Plan	42
Tracking and Monitoring	46
Plan Updates	47
Crosswalk with Other County Plans	47
APPENDICES	
APPENDIX A. KEY TERMS DEFINED	50
APPENDIX B. PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT AND COLLABORATION	52
Overview	52
Public Survey Summary	52
Public Workshop Outcomes	56
Public Comments	57
APPENDIX C. RISK ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY	58
APPENDIX D. LOCAL WUI COMMUNITY GROUPS	66
Mariposa County WUI Community Map Tile #1	70
Mariposa County WUI Community Map Tile #2	71
Mariposa County WUI Community Map Tile #3	72
Mariposa County WUI Community Map Tile #4	73
Mariposa County WUI Community Map Tile #5	74
Mariposa County WUI Community Map Tile #6	75
Mariposa County WUI Community Map Tile #7	76
WUI Community: Allred Road	77

WUI Community: Ashworth Road	79
WUI Community: Bear Valley	81
WUI Community: Ben Hur Road	83
WUI Community: Bootjack	85
WUI Community: Boyer Road	87
WUI Community: Bridgeport	89
WUI Community: Buck Meadows	91
WUI Community: Carlton Road	93
WUI Community: Catheys Valley	95
WUI Community: Coulterville	97
WUI Community: Don Pedro	99
WUI Community: East Westfall Road	101
WUI Community: El Portal	103
WUI Community: Fish Camp	105
WUI Community: Foresta	107
WUI Community: Greeley Hill	109
WUI Community: Hirsch Road	111
WUI Community: Hornitos	113
WUI Community: Hunters Valley	115
WUI Community: Incline	117
WUI Community: Indian Peak Road	119
WUI Community: Jerseydale	121
WUI Community: Kemble Road	123
WUI Community: Lushmeadows	125
WUI Community: Mariposa	127
WUI Community: Midpines	129
WUI Community: Mormon Bar	131
WUI Community: Mt. Bullion	133
WUI Community: Ponderosa Basin	135
WUI Community: Stumpfield Road	137
WUI Community: Tip Top Road	139
WUI Community: Triangle Road - WEST	141
WUI Community: Usona Road	143
WUI Community: Wawona	145
WUI Community: Woodland Drive	147

WUI Community: Worman Road	149
WUI Community: Yosemite West	151

List of Figures

Figure 1. Mariposa County Wildfire History Map 2008-2018	14
Figure 2. USDA Forest Service Tree Mortality Aerial Survey Results 2010-2018	16
Figure 3. Mariposa County Tree Mortality Map	17
Figure 4. Components of the Wildfire Risk Triangle	23
Figure 5. The Mariposa County No-HARM risk assessment map	25
Figure 6. Example of Map Tile of the Mariposa County WUI Community Group Map Tiles	27
Figure 7. Relative wildfire risk rankings of Mariposa County WUI "Community Groups."	28
Figure 8. Using a Wildfire Risk Assessment to Anticipate Post-Fire Effects	32
Figure 9. CAL FIRE delineates two defensible space zones	35
Figure 10. 14 County fire stations are responsible for 14 response zones within the County	38
Figure C1: Fuel model data showing the typical pixel-based nature of this type of input data	58
Figure C2: Sample FireShed derived from local topography	58
Figure C3: The impact of external FireSheds.	59
Figure C4: Landscape divided into Wildland, Intermix and Interface areas	59
Figure D1. Mariposa County WUI Communities ranked in order from very high to moderate	69

Acronyms

CAL FIRE	California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CPAW	Community Planning Assistance for Wildfire
CWPP	Community Wildfire Protection Plan
CCR	California Code of Regulations
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FMAG	Fire Management Assistance Grant
FRA	Federal Responsibility Area
FRAP	Fire and Resource Assessment Program
GNA	Good Neighbor Authority
HMGP	Hazard Mitigation Grant Program
HVRA	Highly Valued Resources and Assets
IBHS	Insurance Institute for Business and Home Safety
IRWM	Integrated Regional Water Management
LHMP	Local Hazard Mitigation Plan
LRA	Local Responsibility Area
MCFAC	Mariposa County Fire Advisory Committee
MMU	Madera-Mariposa-Merced Unit
NFPA	National Fire Protection Association
NPS	National Park Service
PDM	Pre-Disaster Mitigation
PRC	Public Resources Code
SIZ	Structure Ignition Zone
SRA	State Responsibility Area
USDA	United States Department of Agriculture
VHFHSZ	Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone
WUI	Wildland-Urban Interface

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Mariposa County Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP) functions as the County's principal document to prepare for wildfires to minimize negative impacts and increase desired ecological outcomes. This plan is intended to serve as the County's primary reference for strategic wildfire planning and guide future wildfire prevention and mitigation activities. This plan updates the previous CWPP (referred to as the Mariposa Countywide CWPP) with an expanded geographic scope to cover the entire County.

Important takeaways that affect wildfire planning activities in Mariposa County include:

- The historical fire regime has been significantly altered by human and forest health impacts, such as drought-induced insect outbreaks and drought-induced tree mortality. Climate change projections that include increasing temperatures, declining snowpack, and more frequent drought conditions will exacerbate imbalances in the natural fire environment. Without significant intervention and management, these factors will contribute to more aggressive and difficult to control wildfires that adversely affect forests, watersheds, communities, the local economy, and more.
- The Mariposa County Wildfire Risk Assessment identified and assessed 38 Wildland Urban Interface Community Groups where concentrations of development are at risk of negative wildfire impacts. Of these 38 communities, 13 are rated Very High, 13 are rated High, and 12 are rated Moderate. The Wildfire Risk Assessment further defines the specific factors that influence these risk ratings for each community.
- Demographic and economic factors, such as heavy seasonal tourism in the summer, higher than state average poverty rates, and an aging population, shape how the County must consider outreach and mitigation activities in terms of messaging, timing, and resources.
- Critical infrastructure and facilities across the County are vulnerable to wildfire and may also be affected by Pacific Gas & Electric (PG&E) Public Safety Power Shutoffs (PSPS). These factors will shape preparedness efforts for mass evacuation planning and mitigation priorities, such as vegetation management along critical evacuation corridors.
- More than half of the total land area in Mariposa County is managed by various state or federal land management agencies. This broadens the scope of partnerships and working agreements required to plan and implement wildfire response and mitigation measures and reinforces the need for collaborative planning.

Parts 1-2 analyze these and other issues in more detail and also highlight the relationships that this CWPP has with applicable federal, regional, state, and local plans. Parts 3-4 provide strategies to address resilient landscapes, fire-adapted communities, and safe and effective wildfire response, and a prioritized set of actions to meet the goals of this CWPP.

High priority actions include:

- maintaining the County's new wildfire risk assessment to continue accurately informing strategic decision-making and risk reduction activities.
- initiating a streamlined development review process for fire mitigation to coordinate across County fire and planning departments.
- implementing a robust parcel-level assessment program to expand mitigation activities and reduce structural ignitability.
- promoting and educating communities on prescribed fire as a tool for landscape resilience and forest health.

- revisit existing fuel treatments and update as required to enhance the management of hazardous fuels and increase community protection.
- providing information for residents on PSPS and other timely safety notices.
- engaging with local WUI communities to develop or update community-specific CWPPs that address unique risk considerations.

Key to this plan's success will be its implementation and future updates. An implementation strategy is provided to track progress and ensure CWPP updates occur on a regular schedule. In addition, appendices will be added for individual communities in the future to provide additional detail at a more refined scale. Finally, stakeholder collaboration will occur at the forefront of planning efforts to ensure ongoing support and awareness across agencies and communities.

INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION

This Mariposa County Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP) updates and expands the previous plan version: Mariposa Countywide Community Wildland Fire Protection Plan (adopted in 2012). Throughout this document, this updated plan will be referred to as the "Mariposa County CWPP," "CWPP," or "this plan." The prior County CWPP will be identified as the "Mariposa County CWPP (2012 version)".

This updated CWPP is organized into the following parts:

Part 1. Local Environment summarizes information about Mariposa County's geography, demographics, economy, land use, and the environment as it relates to wildfire planning. These summaries help inform management strategies and actions in Parts 2, 3, and 4 by identifying trends, characteristics, or other factors for consideration.

Part 2. Risk Assessment identifies the County's wildfire hazard and risk and defines the wildland-urban interface. This section details the comprehensive assessment approach of addressing all three components of the wildfire risk triangle (likelihood, intensity, and susceptibility) to provide a scientifically based tool for supporting wildfire mitigation planning and implementation decision making.

Part 3. Cohesive Strategy Approach focuses on appropriate management strategies to address the values at risk discussed in Parts 1 and 2. This section is organized into three main topics: resilient landscapes, fire-adapted communities, and safe and effective wildfire response. Each topic provides management strategies to help the County strategically prepare, respond, mitigate, or recover from wildfires.

Part 4. Action Plan and Implementation identifies a prioritized set of actions to meet the goals of this CWPP and includes an implementation strategy to track progress and ensure CWPP updates occur on a regular schedule.

Appendices provide additional content and information to support the strategic information presented in this CWPP, including definitions, risk assessment methodology, outreach activities, and community-specific analyses and recommendations.

Minimum Plan Requirements

CWPPs must meet three minimum requirements as established by the Healthy Forests Restoration Act (HFRA), enacted in 2003. These requirements are:

Collaboration: A CWPP must be collaboratively developed by local and state government representatives, in consultation with federal agencies and other interested parties. The local government, local fire department, and state entity responsible for forest management must agree to the final contents of a CWPP.

Prioritized Fuel Reduction: A CWPP must identify and prioritize areas for hazardous fuel reduction treatments and recommend the types and methods of treatment that will protect one or more at-risk communities and essential infrastructure.

Treatment of Structural Ignitability: A CWPP must recommend measures that homeowners and communities can take to reduce the ignitability of structures throughout the area addressed by the plan.

This CWPP satisfies the HFRA requirements through demonstrating the collaborative process by which it was developed (Appendix B), the signature page that confirms the final entities who agree to this plan and identifying prioritized fuel reduction treatments and structural ignitability measures in the action plan (Part 4).

Mariposa County CWPP Goals

The goals of the Mariposa County CWPP are:

- 1. **Inclusivity.** Reduce wildfire risk to the County by identifying communities in the wildland-urban interface and including their needs in the planning process.
- 2. **Safety.** Improve public and first responder safety through coordinated planning, education, and response measures.
- 3. **Adaptation.** Reduce ignitability of structures, critical infrastructure, and other values at risk to minimize losses and damage from wildfire and improve local recovery.
- 4. **Resilience.** Increase the resilience of the environment to environmental shifts anticipated from climate change through innovative and long-term actions.
- 5. **Collaboration.** Provide an effective framework for partners and agencies to collaborate, leverage expertise, and prioritize projects on a regularly established schedule.
- 6. Action. Implement and track the CWPP to leverage successes for funding opportunities and resources.
- 7. **Alignment.** Align with relevant local, county, state, and federal plans to reinforce mutually compatible wildfire risk reduction goals.

PART 1: LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

PART 1: UNDERSTANDING THE LOCAL ENVIRONMENT

Part 1 provides summary information about Mariposa County's geography, demographics, economy, land use, and the environment as it relates to wildfire planning. These summaries help inform management strategies and actions in Parts 2, 3, and 4 by identifying trends, characteristics, or other factors for consideration. More detailed information about each topic below is also available in other plans, as identified in the Plan Linkages subsection, which provides a list of plans and their relationship to this CWPP.

Area Description

Mariposa County is located in central California, adjacent to the San Joaquin Valley and within the central Sierra Nevada. The County's jurisdictional boundaries encompass a total area of 1,463 square miles (931,200 acres), the majority of which is land (1,449 square miles) and 14 square miles is water.¹

Demographic Information

The 2019 population of Mariposa County is 17,203.² Mariposa County's population has experienced a decline of nearly 1,000 since 2010 and ranks as California's sixth least-populated county with residents dispersed throughout rural areas.³ The County's median age (51.1 years) is also much higher than the state average (36.1 years), and the population has been steadily aging over the past several decades.⁴ Table 1 summarizes key demographic characteristics of the County.

TABLE 1: KEY DEMOGRAPHICS	
Category	Mariposa County
Total Population	17,203
Population Density (ppl/ sq. mile) – excluding public lands	26.3
Median Age (years)	51.1
Housing Units	10,445
Owner-Occupied Housing Unit Rate	69%
Building Permits (2019)	72
Median Home Value, 2014-2018	\$259,500
Median Household Income, 2014-2018	\$51,199
Households, 2014-2018	7,700

¹ U.S. Census Bureau. 2010.

³ Ibid.

² United States Census Bureau. Annual Estimates of the Resident Population: April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2018. U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division. Web. May 2019. http://www.census.gov/.

⁴ Mariposa County Needs Assessment. 2017.

TABLE 1: KEY DEMOGRAPHICS			
Category	Mariposa County		
Persons per household, 2014-2018	2.13		
Language other than English spoken at home	10.9%		
Poverty Rate	14.9%		
Unemployment Rate	10%		
Data Sources: U.S. Census Bureau 2019 Quick Facts; Mariposa County Planning Department			

There are no incorporated jurisdictions in Mariposa County; however, there are many small towns and residential communities with concentrated clusters of homes. The Town of Mariposa, also the County seat, has approximately 2,200 people and is the largest community in Mariposa County. In total, 38 residential areas were identified as part of this CWPP. More information about individual communities as related to wildfire risk is provided in Part 2 and Appendix D.

KEY POINTS: Mariposa County has a higher than state average poverty rate and aging population, which may have implications for both the ability to pay for some wildfire mitigation measures, such as exterior home improvements, or the ability to implement property mitigation measures that require physical labor, such as tree removal.

Local Economy

Mariposa County's local economy is highly concentrated and heavily dependent on seasonal tourism. The majority of employment is in the hospitality sector (e.g., hotels, restaurants, and bars) and is located in and around the Town of Mariposa and Yosemite National Park. Public sector employment is the second largest employment sector and includes county government, local public schools, and federal and state government (national forests, BLM, national park, CAL FIRE, and Highway Patrol. The next three largest industry sectors are retail trade, healthcare/social assistance, and construction. These five industry sectors account for 81.2 percent of all local employment.⁵ Tourism connected to Yosemite National Park, which attracts more than five million visitors annually, is expected to remain the County's primary major economic generator.

KEY POINTS: Mariposa County experiences an influx of tourists during the summer, typically coinciding with wildfires. This makes the local businesses more vulnerable to wildfire events and impacts (e.g., smoke, evacuations), and also increases the potential causes for wildfires. This may shape local messaging and education campaigns.

⁵ Mariposa County Economic Vitality Strategy. May 2017. Prepared by Craft Consulting Group.

Land Management and Ownership

Approximately 52% of land in Mariposa County is under public ownership. These lands include Yosemite National Park, the Sierra and Stanislaus National Forests, and Bureau of Land Management (BLM) holdings. Public land managers include the Department of Interior's National Park Service and Bureau of Land Management (whose combined holdings total over 40% of the county) and the US Forest Service. The State of California has minor land ownership with Caltrans responsible for state highway rights-of-way and maintenance facilities located throughout the County. Other public landowners include Mariposa County, Merced Irrigation District, which owns lands along the Merced River and around Lakes McClure and McSwain, the Mariposa County Unified School District, and Mariposa Public Utility District.⁶

KEY POINTS: More than half of the total land area in Mariposa County is managed by various state or federal land management agencies. This broadens the scope of partnerships and working agreements required to plan and implement wildfire response and mitigation measures and reinforces the need for collaborative planning.

Land Use and Development

Commercial development is generally directed to town planning areas with services. Similarly, most residential development occurs near existing infrastructure with access to state highways or county roads. Existing residential development is largely characterized by low-density development (2.5-acre or 5.0-acre lots). Traditionally, these lots were zoned for one dwelling unit per lot, but recent changes in state law have allowed accessory dwelling units (ADUs) on residential lots to expand affordable housing options.

Topography and terrain constrain many lands within the County from future development. In addition, a significant portion (22%) of privately-owned land in Mariposa County is under Williamson Act contracts, which function as voluntary agreements entered into by landowners that vest local governments with conservation easements to keep their lands in agricultural or other open space uses for a 20 year period.⁷ Of those lands that will be developed, the Mariposa County General Plan notes that future development will be directed toward town planning areas or in close proximity to existing development.

KEY POINTS: Development is limited by land agreements and geographic constraints. Future development will be directed toward existing service areas. State laws allowing additional accessory dwelling units on residential property may expand the number of structures at risk to wildfire in the County.

Critical Infrastructure and Communications

Infrastructure

Critical infrastructure includes roads, airports, facilities, utilities, communication towers, hospitals, fire and sheriff stations, and other structures or uses that would have a significant negative impact on the County if they were compromised and could not fulfill their intended function. The Mariposa County Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (2020) identifies 128 County-

⁶ County of Mariposa General Plan – Volume I. Chapter 5.

⁷ Mariposa County Economic Vitality Strategy. May 2017. Prepared by Craft Consulting Group.

owned and County-related critical facilities, as well as local, private critical facilities collected from various County departments and agencies.

The County's overall transportation network relies heavily on private roads, many of which are single-access and are not suitable for a coordinated mass evacuation under fast-moving events such as wildfires. The Mariposa County Fairgrounds can accommodate medium-scale Incident Bases and serve as an Evacuation Center for several hundred people at a time. The Mariposa Airport can also serve as a base of operations for light fixed-wing aircraft and as a base for helicopters.

Communications

Mariposa County has one 911 center operated by Mariposa County Sheriff's office. CAL FIRE has a dispatch center for fire and medical dispatching, and Yosemite National Park has a dispatch center for all hazards located in El Portal for Yosemite National Park. The majority of phone lines are located underground, and cell towers located throughout Mariposa County result in approximately 70% cell phone coverage. The Sierra and Stanislaus National Forests maintain repeaters that allow for radio communications. Residents can register for home phone calls, cell phone calls, text and email alerts from the Mariposa County Sheriff's Office.

Public Safety Power Shutoffs

Due to the potential for wildfire ignitions resulting from power lines during extreme fire potential or "Red Flag" conditions, power utility companies are now shutting power supplies down to minimize this ignition potential. All of Mariposa County is subject to PSPS. Although the intent of PSPS is to prevent ignitions, de-energization of electrical systems in affected areas can result in potential compounding secondary outcomes, such as increased life safety risks to residents. Impacts may include: loss of power to critical infrastructure such as fire flow water supply pumps; reduced capabilities of local agencies to respond to wildfire due to loss of alert, warning, and public information communications systems including internet and cellular towers; loss of traffic control systems that could support evacuation; power loss to residential homes that result in the loss of critical home cooling during extreme heat and power to critical medical equipment required by vulnerable populations (e.g., dialysis, oxygen pumps, respirators) as well as the loss of power to individual well pumps that supply critical home drinking water.

KEY POINTS: Numerous County-owned and private critical facilities across Mariposa County are vulnerable to wildfire. Planning for mass evacuations should take into account the County's network of single-access private roads, reliance on cell phone coverage, heavy tourist populations, and public safety power shutoffs. Some wildfire ignition prevention actions, such as public safety power shut offs can lead to secondary public safety hazards.

Historic and Cultural Resources

There are many historical structures, archaeological sites, and cultural resources throughout Mariposa County. Towns, districts, and areas within Mariposa County that continue to retain a significant level of historical resources include Mariposa Town, Bear Valley, Hornitos, El Portal, Fish Camp, Coulterville, and Greeley Hill.⁸ The Mariposa County Historic Sites and Records Preservation Commission maintains a system for surveying, inventorying, and compiling information related to cultural and historic resources within the County. The Southern Sierra

⁸ County of Mariposa General Plan – Volume I. Chapter 14.

Miwok Indians also have a responsibility and role in reviewing and monitoring projects that would affect known archaeological sites, archaeologically sensitive areas, and traditional cultural places.

KEY POINTS: Unique considerations for historic buildings, structures, sites, and other resources of historic and cultural significance should factor into wildfire response planning and mitigation measures to support the preservation of Mariposa County's history.

Natural Environment and Ecosystem

The Merced River is the primary watercourse flowing through the County and is most known for its swift and steep course through the southern part of the Yosemite Valley. The river's character changes dramatically once it reaches the western plains and becomes a slow-moving meandering stream that enters Lake McClure.

Yosemite-Mariposa Watershed

The Yosemite-Mariposa (Y-M) Integrated Water Management Region is largely forested vegetation capable of supporting wildfire. The Merced River Watershed comprises about 64% of the Y-M Region; federal lands comprise 53% of the Y-M Region. The Y-M Region is a major tributary to the San Joaquin River, which combines with other Delta tributaries to provide water for millions of people in the San Joaquin Valley and Bay Area, and water for irrigating hundreds of thousands of acres of prime farmland. Wildfire is a significant threat to this watershed.

KEY POINTS: Large fire impact on the Yosemite-Mariposa Region watershed can have a potentially devastating impact on the water supply to millions of people.

Threatened and Endangered Species

Many of the ecosystems within the County are fire-adapted or fire-dependent ecosystems. Historical forest management and fire suppression practices have altered many of these ecosystems to the extent that their current condition is detrimental to the habitat of these threatened or endangered species. Additionally, human activity and forest management practices have led to the introduction of non-native species and noxious plants that are not only contributing to the further degradation of important habitat, but in some cases contributing to changing the natural fire regime. While the exclusion of fire has led to the decline of many threatened and endangered species or the proliferation of non-native species, increasing extreme wildfire conditions can negatively impact these species as well. Conversely, inappropriately implemented mitigation efforts can inadvertently contribute to the further decline of threatened or endangered species or promote unwanted non-native species. In many cases, this is further exacerbated by climate change influences.

KEY POINTS: It is important to assess and mitigate the potential impacts that mitigation strategies may have on threatened and endangered species, or non-native species

Fire Environment

The natural fire regime within Mariposa County is that of frequent fires. Historically, humans played an important role in maintaining this natural fire regime. Native Americans used fire on the landscape for many reasons, including hunting, crop management, forest management,

warfare, and brush clearing for traveling. These fires were often undertaken by tribal "fire specialists" who initiated burns under specific conditions (e.g., prescriptions) to achieve specific objectives. Earlier European settlers in the areas also used fire land clearing for some of the same reasons that Native Americans had. In many areas, particularly the settled areas of the County, this natural regime has been significantly altered by human and forest health impacts, such as drought-induced insect outbreaks and drought-induced tree mortality, contributing to more aggressive and harder to control wildfires near human development. With the historical frequent fire intervals, stand-replacing fires were rare prior to the 1940s. The influence of 100 years of fire suppression (exclusion) policies has resulted in significant fuel load build-up and an increase in stand-replacing fires since that time.⁹

Current and forecasted changes to climate conditions are also expected to further exacerbate this situation. The 2012 Mariposa Countywide Community Wildland Fire Protection Plan¹⁰ states: "Every community in Mariposa County has been threatened by major wildland fires within the past twenty years. The Town of Mariposa has burned down several times since 1854; the original County seat, Agua Fria, was destroyed by fire in the 1800s and was not rebuilt." The threat of wildfire to human development and life is a significant and frequent concern within the County. Table 2 and Figure 1 provide details on wildfire history.

Date	Fire Name	Size (acres)	Start Location	Community Impacts
October 6, 2019	Briceburg	4,905	Highway 140 and Briceburg Bridge Road north of Midpines	1 structure destroyedEvacuation advisoryHighway 140 closed
July 13, 2018	Ferguson	96,901	Highway 140 and Hites Cove, near El Portal	 Two firefighter fatalities 10 structures destroyed \$171.2 million in suppression costs Yosemite National Park closed and area evacuated Compromised air quality
August 29, 2017	Railroad	12,407	Highway 41, south of Fish Camp	 Highway 41 closed to traffic Access to Wawona Yosemite West and Yosemite National Park cut off from the south
August 14, 2017	South Fork	7,000	East of Wawona (off Wawona Road)	 Community of Wawona evacuated
August 1, 2017	Empire	8,094	1 Mile South of Bridalveil Campground in Yosemite	 Significantly impacted the tourism industry associated with Yosemite National Park

TABLE 2. NOTABLE RECENT WILDFIRES AND IMPACTS 11,12,13

⁹ County of Mariposa General Plan – Volume I. Chapter 14.

¹⁰ Mariposa County Firesafe Council. 2012. Mariposa Countywide Community Wildland Fire Protection Plan.

¹¹ California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection Incident Database

https://www.fire.ca.gov/incidents/IncidentSearch?g=mariposa

¹² Mariposa County. 2015. Mariposa County Local Hazard Mitigation Plan.

¹³ Inciweb <u>https://inciweb.nwcg.gov/</u>

TABLE 2. NOTABLE RECENT WILDFIRES AND IMPACTS 11,12,13				
Date	Fire Name	Size (acres)	Start Location	Community Impacts
July 16, 2017	Detwiler	81,826	Detwiler Road and Hunters Valley Road, 2 miles east of Lake McClure	 5,000 structures threatened Community of Mariposa evacuated 131 structures, 63 homes destroyed: 21 damaged Compromised air quality
October 7, 2014	Dog Rock	311	Hwy 140 at Indian Creek, El Portal Community	 Community of Foresta evacuated El Portal Rd closed
July 26, 2014	El Portal	4,689	Near Highway 140 and community of El Portal	EvacuationsStructures threatened
August 17, 2013	Rim	257,314	3 miles east of Groveland along Hwy 120	 Primarily burned in Tuolumne County, impacted some portions of Mariposa County
August 25, 2011	Motor	5,231	Hwy 140 near the Ferguson rockslide, southwest of Yosemite National Park	•



Figure 1. Mariposa County Wildfire History Map 2008-2018

Assessing the factors that contribute to wildfires that can potentially threaten homes and communities is an important step in developing a CWPP. Those factors include the topography, vegetation (often referred to as fuels in a fire context), general climate, and specific fire weather patterns. Broadly, these physical characteristics combine to comprise the fire environment. The combination of this physical fire environment with ignition sources (both lightning and human) is responsible for a long history of wildfire activity in Mariposa County. This section aims to describe the general characteristics of the fire environment and a summary of recent fire activity, with the goal of providing an understanding of the role of wildfire in the landscapes of Mariposa County.

Topography

Elevations range from approximately 300 feet to more than 10,000 feet above sea level. The western edge of the County is characterized by gentle terrain that blends into the agricultural and grazing lands of the San Joaquin Valley. The eastern portion of the County includes rugged mountainous terrain. Heavily forested ridges and valleys, agricultural landscapes, small lakes, and free-flowing rivers and streams are found throughout the County.

Climate (Weather)

The climate in Mariposa County varies greatly with elevation. The County has a moderate climate with snow in some areas during the winter. Abundant rainfall is the norm during the rainy season, which lasts from October through March. The annual average rainfall: 29.9 inches. In the Jerseydale area, the rainfall averages 42 inches a year. At 12,000 feet, it is not unusual to receive snowpacks of more than 30 feet.¹⁰

Summers are characterized by long dry periods, which are occasionally punctuated by electrical storms. Vegetation dries during the long, hot summers, decreasing plant moisture content and increasing the ratio of dead fuel to living fuel. As a result, fire susceptibility increases dramatically, particularly in late summer and early autumn.¹⁰

With respect to climate change, Cal-Adapt climate projections for the North Sierra Region include:¹⁴

- Temperature changes: January increase in average temperatures of 2.5 F to 4 F by 2050 and 6 F to 7 F by 2100, with the largest changes in the southern part of the region (including Mariposa County).
- Precipitation: A decline in precipitation, with decreases varying from 3 to 5 inches by 2050 and 6 inches to more than 10 inches by 2100, with the largest rainfall reductions projects for the southern portions of the region (including Mariposa County).
- Heatwaves: The number of heatwaves (5 consecutive days over 83 F to 97 F, depending on location) is expected to increase by two events by 2050, and an increase of 8 to 10 events is projected by 2100.
- Snowpack: Levels are projected to decline by nearly 15 inches in the southern portion of the region by 2090 (including Mariposa County).

Due to these changes in the climate, the overall wildfire risk is projected to increase in a range of 1.1 to 10.5 times throughout the region, with the high risks expected in the northern and southern parts of the region (including Mariposa County).

Vegetation (Fuels)

The health of Mariposa County's forests is a significant and rapidly changing influence on the vegetative fuel conditions within the County. Forest health generally describes the condition of a forest in terms of either the ability to meet human needs or its ability to remain resilient in sustaining desirable ecological conditions. Overall, California has been facing the worst epidemic of tree mortality in modern history. Results from the most recent (2018) aerial tree mortality surveys indicate that multiple years of drought, combined with the increased infestation of native bark beetles, have contributed to the death of 147 million trees (Figure 2) on federal, state, and private lands across California since 2010.¹⁵

¹⁴ CDPH -- Climate Change and Health Profile Report 2017

¹⁵ USDA Forest Service Pacific Southwest Region

https://www.fs.usda.gov/detailfull/r5/home/?cid=FSEPRD613875&width=full



Figure 2. USDA Forest Service Tree Mortality Aerial Survey Results 2010-2018 (source: https://www.fs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/fseprd609297.pdf)

In 2014, the State of California proclaimed a Forest Health State of Emergency, and as of 2017, more than 47% of the dead trees in the state were on the Sequoia, Stanislaus (Mariposa County), and Sierra National Forests¹⁶ (Figure 3). Furthermore, multiple fires in recent years have left millions of trees weakened and with a higher susceptibility to beetle attacks. This has left millions of acres of California forestland containing elevated levels of bark beetle or wood borer activity.

Ongoing drought conditions are expected to persist and worsen in association with climate change, which is expected to lead to increased large fire activity and acres burned into the future. As a result, increased tree mortality and weakened trees will further exacerbate the susceptibility of the forest lands within the County to bark beetle and other negative forest health impacts.

KEY POINTS: Extensive and rapidly worsening forest health conditions are resulting in increasing aggressive and larger wildfires. These fires, along with climate change, are increasing the vulnerability of forests to negative forest health impacts.

¹⁶ 2017 California Forest Health Highlights, California Forest Pest Council <u>https://www.fs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/fseprd578578.pdf</u>





Influence on Other Natural Hazards

Wildfires can indirectly influence other natural hazards. The Mariposa County Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (LHMP) identifies the compounding effects of wildfire on drought, flooding, and debris flow. These secondary wildfire effects can be catastrophic. For example, soils exposed to the intense heat of a wildfire may lose their ability to absorb moisture and support vegetation, which is further exacerbated in the current drought condition. This can reduce the capacity of soil to moderate overland flow (run-off), leading to sudden, dramatic peak flows of streams and rivers. These exposed soils also can erode quickly, increasing the likelihood of slope failures and river and stream siltation. Furthermore, the removal of forest canopy reduces the ability of vegetation to intercept and moderate the effects of heavy rainfall, further contributing to peak flows, slope failures and siltation. In addition to the obvious public safety impacts of flash flooding and slope failures, these conditions can harm aquatic life and degrade water quality.

KEY POINTS: Higher intensity wildfires can result in secondary negative influences on other natural hazards, such as drought, flooding and slope failures.

Relevant Plans

Multiple plans adopted at the federal, regional, state or local level can influence wildfire planning and coordination activities within Mariposa County. Table 3 identifies those plans that have a high level of relevance to content and actions in this CWPP. Plans listed below are updated on various cycles—dates provided represent the most recently updated or amended version available. Relevant plans adopted in the future will be added to this table during subsequent CWPP updates.

TABLE 3: PLANS RELEVANT TO CWPP						
Plan	General Purpose	Lead	Relevance to CWPP			
Federal						
Yosemite Fire Management Plan (2017)	Guides the implementation of a complex fire management program within the park to reduce the risk of catastrophic fire to park communities, restore ecosystems, and provide a safe environment for the public and firefighters.	National Park Service	 Covers portions of Mariposa, Madera, and Tuolumne Counties. Addresses wildland fire suppression, wildland fire used to achieve natural and cultural resource benefits, fire prevention, prescribed fire, fire ecology research, and the use of mechanical methods to reduce and thin vegetation in and around communities. 			
Revised Draft Land Management Plan for the Sierra National Forest (2019)	Identifies long-term desired conditions and provides general direction to achieve these outcomes within the Sierra National Forest. Establishes a framework for integrated resource management and a plan monitoring program.	USDA Forest Service	 Covers portions of Mariposa, Madera, and Fresno Counties. Includes proposed and probable activities that may occur to help maintain existing conditions or achieve future desired conditions by addressing fire, air, water, soils, watershed, ecosystems, animal and plant species, invasive species, timber, range, and more. 			
Stanislaus National Forest – Forest Plan Direction (2017)Provides guidance for developing annual and multi- year implementation programs and resource allocation; sets the standard for future forest conditions; identifies goals and strategies that address old forest ecosystems; aquatic, riparian, and meadow ecosystems; fire and fuels management; noxious weeds; lower westside hardwood ecosystems.		USDA Forest Service	 Covers portions of Alpine, Calaveras, Mariposa, and Tuolumne Counties. Provides standards and guidelines for fire, fuels management, fuel break construction, mechanical thinning treatments, fire prevention, fire suppression and other practices. 			

TABLE 3: PLANS RELEVANT TO CWPP					
Plan	General Purpose	Lead	Relevance to CWPP		
State					
California's Wildfire and Forest Resilience Action Plan (2021)	Provides a comprehensive strategy of the Governor's Forest Management Task Force that accelerates efforts to restore natural areas, improve community fire safety, and sustain rural economic opportunities.	California Natural Resources Agency, CAL FIRE, California EPA	 Contains statewide goals and actions that support implementation efforts at the local level. Identifies opportunities and incentives that align with actions of this CWPP. 		
CAL FIRE Strategic Plan (2019)	Affirms the mission, vision, and values of state agency and sets forth goals and objectives to improve core capabilities, enhance internal operations, ensure health and safety, and build an engaged, motivated, innovative workforce.	CAL FIRE	• Addresses improvements to emergency response, natural resource protection, and wildland fire protection on SRA lands throughout California, including those in Mariposa County.		
Regional (Mul	ti-County)				
Yosemite- Mariposa Integrated Regional Water Management Plan (2016)	Defines a clear long-term vision for the management of water resources in the region; sets goals to improve regional water self-reliance and security; adapt to the effects of climate change on water supply; and incentivize collaboration between water agencies.	Mariposa County Resource Conservation District	 Recognizes relationship between catastrophic wildfire and impacts to water quality and supply. Supports wildfire fuel management projects in watersheds, resource stewardship, and ecosystem protection. 		
Madera- Mariposa- Merced (MMU) Strategic Fire Plan (2020)	Establishes annual goals and priorities that align with CAL FIRE's Strategic Plan and California Fire Plan to reduce wildfire risk to communities and lands within the boundaries of the Madera- Mariposa-Merced Unit.	CAL FIRE Madera- Mariposa- Merced Unit	 Provides pre-fire management strategies (fire prevention, engineering and structure ignitability, education, vegetation management) and tactics (training). Lists firefighting capabilities such as unit operational facilities, equipment, and mutual aid agreements. 		
County					
Mariposa County General Plan and Area Plans	Addresses range of long- range planning topics through mandatory and optional elements, including land use, economic development,	Mariposa County Planning Department	 Addresses wildfire and other hazards primarily through Safety Element 		

TABLE 3: PLANS RELEVANT TO CWPP			
Plan	General Purpose	Lead	Relevance to CWPP
(various dates of adoption)	housing, circulation, agriculture, safety, conservation and open space, tourism, recreation, cultural resources, and arts; also identifies planning areas for communities and towns to define local land use and planning policies.		 Incorporates by reference other plans, including the CWPP and LHMP Implements policy priorities through the Strategic Implementation Work Plan (which includes tasks related to fire hazard), and adoption of local ordinances
Mariposa County Local Hazard Mitigation Plan (2020)	Identifies local hazards (climate change, drought, earthquake, flood, landslide, public safety power shutoff, wildfire, and winter storm) and corresponding risk assessment and mitigation strategies.	Mariposa County Office of Emergency Services	 Identifies wildfire mitigation actions such as public outreach, critical facility fireproof coating, auxiliary power, WUI classification expansion policy, defensible space enhancement program and structure ignition zone assessment program. Links to best practices, state and local plans to support implementation.
Local			
Local CWPPs	Provides locally relevant information to support wildfire risk reduction at a specific community scale that reflects unique goals, assets, and actions developed by stakeholders.	Various	 Includes plans for Jerseydale, Yosemite West, and Midpines. Provides additional detail on local projects, such as fuel breaks and treatments.
Mariposa Creek Parkway Master Plan (2019)	Guides the implementation of a four-mile recreational amenity in the Town of Mariposa for residents and tourists; creates a vision for an interconnected regional trail system with connections to Yosemite Valley.	Mariposa County Planning Department	Recommends reestablishing a healthy ecosystem through native revegetation, invasive species management, and widening the riparian corridor.



PART 2: RISK ASSESSMENT

41

PART 2: RISK ASSESSMENT

Part 2 provides an assessment of the wildfire risk in Mariposa County using computer simulation modeling of hypothetical wildfires to display a robust and defensible means of mapping wildfire likelihood and potential intensity. This spatial context of wildfire risk provides a decision support tool that can be used to determine where different wildfire management and mitigation strategies will be most effective. The core of the wildfire risk assessment uses the primary inputs of fuel, weather and topography to determine modeled potential fire behavior. Further inputs regarding the characteristics that affect the vulnerability of human development are evaluated to provide a spatial delineation of wildfire risk. Detailed information on the wildfire risk assessment methodology can be found in Appendix C. In addition, two key concepts incorporated into the risk assessment are the spatial definition of the Wildland-Urban Interface and the components of the Wildfire Risk Triangle.

Understanding the Wildfire Risk Triangle

Wildfire risk is a measure of both the probability and consequences of uncertain future wildfire events.¹⁷ For any location within Mariposa County, wildfire risk depends on the chances of a fire occurring there, the likely intensity of the fire, and the vulnerability of something of value at that location. Scientists describe these three components of risk using a triangle where the sides are likelihood, intensity, and susceptibility (Figure 4).¹⁸ These three factors, and the resulting wildfire risk, vary across the County.

Wildfire risk can be visualized as a triangle consisting of three components:

1. **Likelihood** of a wildfire occurring based on topography, weather, and ignition patterns; this can also include ignition sources from hazardous land uses (e.g., sawmills or propane storage facilities).

2. Predicted **intensity** of a wildfire (usually measured in flame length) based on vegetation type and weather conditions.

3. **Susceptibility** of values, sometimes referred to as Highly Valued Resources and Assets (HVRAs). Typical HVRAs can include:

- o communities
- o structures
- o infrastructure
- o recreation/ tourism-based activities
- o viewsheds
- o watersheds
- o timber
- o ecosystem values

 ¹⁷ Thompson, M.P., T. Zimmerman, D. Mindar, and M. Taber. 2016. Risk Terminology Primer: Basic Principles and a Glossary for the Wildland Fire Management Community. Fort Collins, CO: USDA Forest Service Rocky Mountain Research Station. Gen. Tech. Rep. RMRS-GTR-349. https://www.fs.usda.gov/treesearch/pubs/50912
 ¹⁸ Scott, J.H., M.P. Thompson, and D.E. Calkin. 2013. A wildfire risk assessment framework for land and resource management. Fort Collins, CO: USDA Forest Service Rocky Mountain Research Station. Gen. Tech. Rep. RMRS-GTR-315. https://www.fs.fed.us/rmrs/publications/wildfire-risk-assessment-framework-land-and-resource-management



Figure 4. Components of the Wildfire Risk Triangle

Parcel-Level (Structure Ignition Zone) Susceptibility Assessments

Individual parcel-level assessments complete the risk triangle by providing the susceptibility component. This focuses on assessing the susceptibility characteristics of each structure and the immediate surroundings (100 feet), otherwise defined as the Structure Ignition Zone (SIZ). In order to address the susceptibility component of the risk triangle, comprehensive parcel-level assessments that include the entire SIZ should be conducted for both existing and new development.

By understanding the components that contribute to wildfire risk and engaging in a coordinated and collaborative planning effort, the County can take steps to influence each side of the risk triangle in different ways. For example, prevention measures that reduce human-caused fires can reduce the likelihood of fire occurrence, particularly in areas of human activity. Vegetation treatments focused on reducing fuel loads can reduce the intensity of fires that do occur, and efforts to reduce the flammability of building materials and manage the key zones around structures and communities can reduce the susceptibility of homes and other structures to wildfire.

KEY POINTS: A comprehensive risk assessment that addresses all three components of the wildfire risk triangle provides a scientifically defendable decision support tool for identifying and prioritizing wildfire mitigation strategies.

Updated Risk Assessment Approach

Historically, Mariposa County used the 2007 CAL FIRE Wildfire Hazard Severity Assessment that was developed by the Fire and Resource Assessment Program (FRAP) to provide wildfire hazard information classed into Moderate, High and Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones. This product provides likelihood and intensity information but does not address the susceptibility component to complete the risk triangle on its own and does not have a mechanism for updating by the County to reflect local conditions in a timely manner.

CAL FIRE actively conducts parcel-level defensible space inspections on existing lots within the State Responsibility Area (SRA) of the County. However, they only follow the minimum brush clearing requirements referenced in Public Resource Code (PRC) 4290 and 4291, which currently do not address aspects of the non-combustible zone closest to the structure, such as combustible material storage or building and built accessory features (e.g., fences, outbuildings, decks). This results in gaps in addressing SIZ susceptibility. Furthermore, the results of the defensible space inspections are not currently integrated with the likelihood and intensity components of the FRAP Hazard Severity Assessment to provide a complete risk assessment.

Mariposa County does not currently undertake any form of SIZ assessments, nor do the three Federal land management agencies (USDA Forest Service, the National Park Service, and the Bureau of Land Management) responsible for the Federal Responsibility Area (FRA) lands within the County.

KEY POINTS: To provide an effective risk assessment decision support tool for Mariposa County, the updated wildfire risk assessment should include:

- 1. An updated assessment of the likelihood and intensity components of the wildfire risk triangle.
- 2. Spatial identification of the WUI and integration into the updated assessment.
- 3. Integration of a comprehensive SIZ assessment program for a comprehensive risk assessment.
- 4. The ability to access and update information in a timely manner.

The National Hazard and Risk Model (No-HARM) is a risk evaluation methodology and mapping product customized at the local level and designed to assess the exposure of critical infrastructure and property to wildfire impacts. The No-HARM risk assessment was conducted for Mariposa County and areas within approximately ½ mile of the County limits (Figure 5).

Drawing on a large variety of data sets, No-HARM provides a wildfire exposure for the jurisdiction at regional and neighborhood scales. The focus is to address the complexity of the WUI through the use of data sets that accurately identify the boundaries of the WUI and analyze the threat to these areas from fire effects present in adjacent fuel. Embers, smoke, and direct flame exposure all represent dangers to people and property that are captured in the model. This provides the probability, likelihood, and exposure components of the risk assessment decision support tool.

The No-HARM risk assessment defines the "neighborhood" or local risk to provide context for decision making. Although No-HARM integrates ecosystem management elements, its core is in the evaluation of the built environment. Factors such as parcel density, road system complexity, distance to fire stations, and other anthropogenic elements are incorporated into the final hazard ratings susceptible to embers, smoke, and evacuation in combination with traditional flame impingement exposure.


Figure 5. The Mariposa County No-HARM risk assessment map

Assessment Methodology

This section provides a summary of the assessment methodology that is explained in more detail in Appendix C.

Frequency (Probability). This is expressed in a scientifically defendable and accurate methodology that has recently emerged to calculate fire probability or frequency. One very important element that is not typically considered when looking solely at critical fire weather is live and dead fuel moisture content. Particularly in areas where critical fire weather days may occur (from high winds, for example), it is essential to provide each area with a statement of the probability that a fire will occur. This is necessary to evaluate probability or frequency so that it can be combined with severity to give a holistic risk picture. No-HARM uses a combination of Burn Probability Modeling, fire behavior calculations that utilize pre-conditioning for fuel moisture, and anthropomorphic risk elements to provide an accurate definition of frequency.

Severity (Intensity). The No-HARM methodology utilizes calculations including the utilization of 40 different fuel models, Digital Elevation Models for slope, aspect and topography, and local

weather, including fuel moistures. The fire behavior modeling utilizes the Fire Behavior Prediction and Fuel Modeling (FlamMap/BEHAVE) system, a national standard. This produces a clear definition of fire behavior at 30m resolution. Intensity is expressed by Fireline Intensity Level (FIL). Fire Behavior modeling is an expression of the likely damage that may occur based on the predicted model outputs of flame length, rate of spread, and fireline intensity.

The No-HARM methodology also utilizes several fire behavior calculations such as Probability of Ignition, Crown Fire, and Max Distance Ember Cast to help define an Ember Zone, areas where embers are the main ignition threat. Once the zone is defined, several additional calculations are used to help predict the possibility of home-to-home ignition or urban conflagration.

Defining the Wildland-Urban Interface

The Healthy Forests and Restoration Act (HFRA) gives communities the flexibility to define their own WUI. Current WUI research and best practices typically describe the wildland-urban interface as a "set of conditions" in which both vegetation (wildland fuels) and the built environment (built fuels) are influenced by weather and topography to create an environment where fire can ignite and spread through this combined fuel complex (the combination of wildland and built fuels). The identification and spatial delineation of the WUI are necessary to provide consistent decision support for developing and implementing land-use policies and regulations that reduce wildfire risk. Using the FRAP Fire Hazard Severity Mapping, Mariposa County identified the WUI as any lands that were within the Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ). Many of the areas of higher development density or expected growth are not within the VHFHSZ. These developed areas have been repeatedly challenged, and in some cases (e.g., Mariposa Town), destroyed by wildfire more than once.

This CWPP takes a new approach by first defining the concept of WUI as:

Any area where the combination of human development and vegetation have a potential to result in negative impacts from wildfire on a community.

For a specific geographic definition of the WUI, "community groups," which are clusters of development grouped into common geographic locations, were first identified and spatially represented by stakeholders. This resulted in 38 separate spatially represented "WUI Community Groups." Due to the geographic extent of Mariposa County and the detail and complexity of this spatial layer, it is best viewed using a digital mapping platform to allow for the ability to "pan and zoom" among other functions. For clarity in this report, the map was separated into seven "tiles" (Appendix D), where the general location and ranking of each community group can be referenced. Figure 6 provides an example tile.



Figure 6. Example of Map Tile of the Mariposa County WUI Community Group Map tiles illustrating the location and relative wildfire risk ranking for the Don Pedro WUI Community Group.

As part of the risk assessment, these community groups were then evaluated for further delineation and relative ranking (Figure 7 and Appendix D). Finally, each community group was further delineated internally based on potential impacts from embers and radiant heat, as well as community characteristics that influence wildfire vulnerability.



Figure 7. Relative wildfire risk rankings of Mariposa County WUI "Community Groups."

Integrating a SIZ Assessment Program

The development of a custom SIZ assessment program or the integration of an existing SIZ program is crucial for undertaking SIZ assessments and integrating the information to address the susceptibility component of a comprehensive risk assessment. Important characteristics of a successful SIZ assessment program include:

- alignment or integration with regulatory requirements
- efficient data collection and management
- measurable and trackable susceptibility change over time

Using the Wildfire Risk Assessment Results for Decision Making

The Mariposa County wildfire risk assessment is delineated into classes based on several inputs. Community stakeholders, including first responders, policymakers, elected officials, and neighborhood groups, use this information to inform their activities. It's important to keep in mind that classifications such as "moderate" risk do not mean that there is *no* risk. Many wildfires occur in areas other than "high" or "very high" risk areas and can have negative consequences. For this reason, stakeholders should consider all risks when discussing potential wildfire impacts. Ultimately, stakeholders must determine what level of risk is acceptable and make appropriate risk reduction decisions.

PART 3: COHESIVE STRATEGY APPROACH

PART 3: TAKING A COHESIVE STRATEGY APPROACH

Part 3 focuses on appropriate management strategies to address the values at risk discussed in Parts 1 and 2. The framework of this section is generally based on the holistic planning approach taken by the National Cohesive Wildland Fire Management Strategy (i.e., Cohesive Strategy), which organizes wildfire planning efforts into three national goals: resilient landscapes, fire-adapted communities, and safe and effective wildfire response. Each topic provides management strategies to help the County strategically prepare, respond, mitigate, or recover from wildfires. Specific actions that support the implementation of these strategies are provided in Part 4.

Resilient Landscapes

Through fire suppression, human development, and the changing climate, the terrestrial ecosystem and the role of wildland fire have been significantly altered over time. Restoring landscapes to a resilient state and promoting fire's natural role in ecosystems where appropriate must be an integral part of increasing the County's resilience to wildfire and becoming fire-adapted. To achieve this, an ecosystem-based approach to fire management that incorporates prescribed fire in overall land management planning objectives is important in achieving the desired fire effects and mitigating undesirable fire effects on the ecosystem and the public. Finally, post-wildfire recovery is an important component in resiliency to ensure that any negative fire effects that impact the ecosystem and the community can be addressed to minimize their impact. With the diverse ownership of land, restorative land management will require a collaborative effort among multiple stakeholders.

Restoration and Maintenance Strategies

Restoration and maintenance strategies should align with the National Cohesive Strategy, as outlined below.

Ecology/Ecosystem-Based Fire Management

- Where allowed and feasible, manage wildfire for resource objectives and ecological purposes to restore and maintain fire-adapted ecosystems and achieve fire-resilient landscapes, including the importance of the high-intensity fire regime component.
- Restore forest processes that are currently under-represented in the landscape, compared to historical conditions, including low- and mixed-severity fire regimes.
- Maintain and promote the growth of specific large tree species, which are also underrepresented, across the landscape.
- Control and eradicate invasive and noxious weeds.

Fuel Treatments for Landscapes (Public and Private)

The 2012 Mariposa County CWWP includes community-specific plans that identified priority fuel treatment areas across the County and within specific communities. The CAL FIRE MMU Plan identifies these treatment areas, as well as landscape-level treatments. These priorities should be re-visited and re-prioritized based on the No-HARM outputs within the WUI Community Group risk ratings (Appendix D) using the criteria outlined in Table 4.

TABLE 4. FUEL WUI COMMUNITY GROUP FUEL TREATMENT PRIORITIES					
Treatment Priority	No-HARM Fire Behavior, Fuels and Burn Probability Outcomes				
1	High Crown Fire Potential				
2.	Moderate Crown Fire Potential				
3.	Vegetation Cover > 50%				
4.	Vegetation Cover < 50%				

Moving forward, the following general fuel treatment guidance should be followed:

- Continue to design and prioritize fuel treatments (prescribed fire and mechanical treatments) to reduce fire intensity, structure ignition, and negative wildfire impacts to values.
- Where feasible, implement strategically placed fuel treatments to interrupt fire spread across landscapes.
- Use and expand fuel treatments involving mechanical, biological, or chemical methods where economically feasible and sustainable, and where they align with landowner objectives.
- Reduce the risk of wildfire by removing fuels, especially small-diameter trees and other vegetation that contributes to high-intensity fire and crown fire development, while maintaining forest structure to protect ecosystem components.

Prescribed Fire

Prescribed fire continues to be recognized as an important fuel treatment and ecological restoration tool, where appropriate; therefore, stakeholders should:

- Continue and expand the use of prescribed fire to meet landscape objectives, improve ecological conditions, and mitigate negative wildfire impacts on human development.
- Ensure that prescribed fire planning includes the management of smoke in accordance with the Clean Air Act and the regulations and policies of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).
- Ensure that prescribed fire planning follows state and local regulations.

Post-Fire Effects and Recovery

Several post-fire effects can result from either wildfire or prescribed fire occurrence. Prescribed fire planning goals and objectives are typically driven by desired ecosystem or hazard reduction outcomes. These goals and objectives should be clearly stated in the prescribed fire plan, and a monitoring program should be in place to measure the post-fire effects.

Wildfire events can result in significant post-fire impacts—both positive and negative. Risk assessments can provide guidance in anticipating post-wildfire impacts (Figure 8), mitigating these impacts before a fire occurs, and reducing recovery efforts. The development of a post-wildfire recovery plan, based on the anticipated impacts, can help the communities affected become more resilient to wildfire.



Figure 8. Using a Wildfire Risk Assessment to Anticipate Post-Fire Effects

Land Management Planning (State, National Park, and National Forest)

Collaborative planning efforts between County stakeholders, state, Yosemite National Park, and the Stanislaus and Sierra National Forest land managers should be ongoing. Actions resulting from the update of the Mariposa County CWPP and updated community-specific CWPPs should be incorporated into state, national park, and national forest land management plans.

Conversely, specific resiliency actions identified within this plan and community-specific CWPP's should align with the Yosemite-Mariposa Integrated Regional Water Management Plan, Mariposa County Recreation and Resiliency Master Plan, General Plan, the Stanislaus National Forest and Sierra National Forest Land Management Plans, and Yosemite Fire Management Plan and the CAL FIRE Madera-Mariposa-Merced (MMU) Strategic Fire Plan.

Increasing Resiliency of Landscapes

Increasing resiliency of the landscapes within the County involves reducing the wildfire potential and requires an integrated approach. Specific CWPP strategies to increase the resiliency of landscapes are outlined in Table 5.

TABLE 5: RESILIENT LANDSCAPES STRATEGY							
Strategy	Purpose	Implementation Considerations					
Review and identify priority landscapes and potential treatment options	The priorities that are identified in each of the community CWPP's should be reviewed for relevance, and new potential priorities considered based on the updated risk assessment information. Appropriate treatments (e.g., commercial thinning, hand thinning, mastication, prescribed fire) should also be determined and undertaken.	 Buy-in from the public and community groups is important Environmental and ecological impacts must be considered Should involve pre- and post-treatment monitoring Will require expert resources Dependent upon funding 					
Advance prescribed fire activities	Prescribed fire use should be advanced in areas where it is determined to be the appropriate treatment for achieving ecological restoration or hazard reduction goals and objectives.	 Buy-in from the public and community groups is important Air quality regulations and smoke sensitivities Environmental and ecological impacts must be considered Should involve pre- and post-treatment monitoring Will require expert resources Timing is dependent upon available burn window Dependent upon funding 					
Implement post-fire recovery activities	The impacts of wildfire on ecosystems will vary from positive effects to negative effects. Objectives in a post-fire recovery plan should be developed to address the anticipated negative effects of wildfire on ecosystem values	 Dependent upon post-fire disaster funding Plans and resources should be in place ahead of time Environmental and ecological impacts must be considered Plans must remain flexible Should involve short-term and long-term monitoring 					

Fire-Adapted Communities

Fire-adapted communities take actions to prepare for, adapt to, and recover from wildfire in ways that minimize social, economic, and environmental disruptions. Actions can occur at the different scales, typically categorized at the property/lot scale, the neighborhood/subdivision scale, and community-wide (e.g., across the entire County). The more actions a community takes, the more fire-adapted it becomes.

Property Scale

Fire-adaptation at the property scale focuses on the Structure Ignition Zone (SIZ)—an area around a specific structure and associated accessory structures, including all vegetation that contains potential ignition sources and fuels. Science and research, including from the U.S. Forest Service, CAL FIRE, Insurance Institute for Business and Home Safety (IBHS), and National Institute of Standards and Technology, has shown that reducing structural ignitability is greatly influenced by factors within the SIZ.

Structures

Building materials and construction standards, including roofing materials, vents, siding, gutters, and windows, should require ignition-resistant materials and construction techniques to reduce exposure to radiant heat, embers, and direct flame contact. Building standards may also apply to accessory dwelling units, sheds, or other structures that pose a vulnerability to primary structures. Decks and attachments, such as fences, should also be required to use ignition-resistant or noncombustible materials to reduce the likelihood of ignition. Structural requirements are tied to the issuance of building permits.

Surroundings

Mitigating the immediate surroundings around a home or other structure, also known as defensible space, is also essential to improving a structure's chance of survival during a wildfire. CAL FIRE delineates this area into two zones: Zone 1 extends 30 feet from buildings, structures, decks; Zone 2, which extends 100 feet from buildings, structures, decks (Figure 9). Note that zone distances need to be extended further when structures are located on slopes. When mitigated properly, this area creates an environment that does not sustain ignition or spread wildfire to the home, either from direct flame contact or radiant heat. This area is also important for the protection of the firefighters defending a home.

Mitigation activities in Zone 1 include:

- removing all dead plants, grass, and weeds
- removal of dead or dry leaves and pine needles from the yard, roof, and rain gutters
- removing or trimming branches that hang over the roof and keeping dead branches 10 feet away from the chimney
- trimming trees regularly, relocating firewood to Zone 1
- removing or trimming flammable plants and shrubs near windows
- removing vegetation and items that could catch fire from around and under decks
- creating a separation between trees, shrubs, and items that could catch fire, such as patio furniture, woodpiles, and swing sets

Mitigation activities in Zone 2 include:

- cutting or mowing grass to a maximum height of 4 inches
- creating horizontal space between shrubs and trees
- creating vertical space between grass, shrubs, and trees (Figure 9), limiting fallen leaves, needles, twigs, bark, cones, and small branches



Figure 9. CAL FIRE delineates two defensible space zones – Zone 1 (extends 30 feet from all buildings, decks, structures) and Zone 2 (extends 100 feet from all buildings, decks, and structures). Note that these zones are extended when on slopes. Image credit: CAL FIRE (www.readyforwildfire.org/prepare-for-wildfire/get-ready/defensible-space/)

Activities at the property scale are typically implemented through a combination of mandatory and voluntary efforts, including adopting and enforcing local building, zoning, and/or WUI codes to address structure and landscaping requirements, compliance with CAL FIRE home inspections and other local SIZ assessment programs, development of plans and policies that support fire-adapted communities, and participation in home retrofit programs and community recognition programs.

Neighborhood / Subdivision Scale

Fire-adaptation at this scale focuses on clusters of homes and associated infrastructure, including transportation routes, parks, waterways, and other features. These can be formally established through Homeowner associations (HOA) or Property owner associations (POA). At this scale, communities can improve resident and first responder safety and take strategies to reduce property loss or damage. Interventions at the subdivision scale can include:

- requiring buffering or screening measures that reduce installation or plantings of hazardous fuels
- ensuring specific criteria are met for developing and maintaining water supply, emergency routes, roads, and bridges to ensure safe public evacuation and first responder access
- creating development setbacks from features such as forested areas, steep slopes, or other elements that may exhibit extreme fire behavior

• implementing vegetation management plans in neighborhoods to reduce hazards and limit allowable tree and plant species

Activities at this scale are typically implemented through a combination of mandatory and voluntary efforts, including adopting access, water supply, landscaping, and other safety regulations in the subdivision, zoning, WUI, and/or fire codes, development of plans and policies that support neighborhood risk reduction (e.g., creation of neighborhood CWPPs), and participation in community recognition programs and community evacuation planning efforts.

County Scale

Fire-adaptation at the county scale focuses on activities or development that occurs across an entire community. Interventions at this scale can include:

- directing development away from areas with wildfire hazard that cannot be sufficiently mitigated due to site constraints
- identifying safe zones within a community to designate safe locations when evacuation is not achievable
- restricting or mitigating hazardous land uses in wildfire hazard areas to reduce the potential for ignition
- burying power lines
- requiring land uses with dense populations or mass gatherings to show fire mitigation and fire protection plans as part of their approval process
- connecting management of public open spaces, trails, and parks with fire mitigation planning efforts

Activities at this scale are typically implemented through a combination of mandatory and voluntary efforts, including development and adoption of plans and policies that support countywide approaches toward wildfire risk reduction and safety (e.g., local hazard mitigation plan, General Plan, countywide CWPP), regulation of growth and land uses through the land development code, and promotion of education and outreach campaigns for residents, businesses, and visitors.

Increasing Community Fire-Adaptation

Increasing community fire-adaptation within Mariposa County should target activities at the parcel, subdivision, and county scale. A summary of all strategies to increase fire adaptation within and across the county is provided in Table 6.

TABLE 6: FIRE-ADAPTED COMMUNITY STRATEGIES						
Strategy	Purpose	Implementation Considerations				
Implement and enforce regulations	Reduces ignitability of structures; improves the effectiveness of response; increases public and first responder safety	 Regulatory tools include building, fire, WUI, zoning, subdivision, and/or development codes and can target parcel, subdivision, and county scales Local demographics should be considered to determine challenges such as fixed incomes, limited mobility, or capacity to install and maintain required mitigation features 				

TABLE 6: FIRE-ADAPTED COMMUNITY STRATEGIES							
Strategy	Purpose	Implementation Considerations					
Align plans and policies with wildfire risk reduction and resiliency objectives	Guides strategic decisions such as resource planning and future growth; links strategies to strengthen outcomes and avoid duplication	 A regular CWPP update schedule with a crosswalk component for other plans helps increase alignment and reduce duplication with other plans (Table 3) Plans should be informed by countywide risk assessment 					
Support voluntary neighborhood planning efforts	Engages residents in mitigation, evacuation planning, and other safety measures at the parcel and subdivision scales	 Can support the development of community-specific CWPPs or similar planning efforts Communities can participate in Firewise/USA[®] program, Ready, Set, Go! program, and other state or national recognition programs 					
Mitigate existing development	Ensures that mitigation of vegetation and properties is maintained over time on properties and in neighborhoods	 Can be implemented through incentives, education, or regulations Often requires funding to support mitigation objectives 					
Educate the public	Provides ongoing information to the public to increase awareness about wildfire risk, roles, and responsibilities and promote action	 There are multiple audiences in this category to consider: full-time homeowners, part-time residents, renters, and visitors Efforts should also engage community leaders, including elected officials and local business leaders Due to potential resident and visitor turnover, steps should be taken to ensure efforts are ongoing Messengers may vary, but messages should be consistent 					
Secure future grants and funding	Provides opportunities to incentivize residents, implement other mitigation activities	 Continue to leverage federal, state, and local funds Some state programs that target broader goals (e.g., climate adaptation) include wildfire funding opportunities 					

Response and Suppression Capabilities

Mariposa County is one of three operational divisions within the Madera-Mariposa-Merced Unit (MMU) of CAL FIRE. The other two divisions are defined by the Madera County and Merced County lines. Overall, the MMU protects a total area of 3,570,000 acres and a total population of 284,000 residents.

CAL FIRE is contracted to administer the operations of the Mariposa County Fire Protection District, which consists of 14 fire stations corresponding with 14 response zones dispersed across the County (Figure 10) and resourced by volunteer firefighters. In addition to these 14 stations, further regional response support is available in the form of CAL FIRE initial attack resources that include 333 full-time personnel, 89 seasonal personnel, 363 volunteer personnel assigned within cooperative fire protection agreements, 81 inmate firefighters assigned at Mt. Bullion Conservation Camp (max capacity is 110), and 43 Volunteers in Prevention. The total number of available stations and equipment is summarized in Table 7.



Figure 10. 14 County fire stations are responsible for 14 response zones within the County

TABLE 7. MADERA-MARIPOSA-MERCED UNIT OPERATIONAL FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT						
Facilities						
State Fire Stations	11					
Madera County Fire Stations	17					
Mariposa County Fire Stations	14					
Merced County Fire Stations	20					
Madera City Fire Stations	2					
Atwater City Fire Stations	2					
Central California Women's Facility Fire Station	1					
Mount Bullion Conservation Camp 1						
Unit Operational Equipment						
State Fire Engines		22				

TABLE 7. MADERA-MARIPOSA-MERCED UNIT OPERATIONAL FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT

53
35
19
1
30
3
3
2
8
2
2
3
4
1
1

Interagency Cooperation

Additional resources in the region available through cooperative agreement include National Park Service fire resources and USDA Forest Service fire response resources.

Community Limitations

Many roads, driveways, and homes were built prior to any state or local wildfire mitigation requirements. In addition, the County does not have a comprehensive database of all structures because some may have been built without obtaining the proper permits or they pre-dated local requirements for permits. Finally, there is uncertainty as to whether the features that were regulated by the County have been maintained due to the lack of a monitoring and enforcement program beyond the minimum defensible space requirements on properties within State Responsibility Areas. This has resulted in the following limitations that impact fire response and suppression capabilities:

- o Access and egress in some communities do not meet current requirements
- Fire flow water supply is challenged or non-existent in some communities; placing reliance on mobile water tenders that must travel long distances for water re-supply
- o Multiple small water utilities with infrastructure that is highly vulnerable to wildfire
- Fire suppression staff and equipment capacity is limited, considering the geographic extent and potential suppression challenges presented in the County
- o Residential structures do not meet the current WUI building code requirements

Increasing Community Fire Response

Increasing community fire response within Mariposa County should target activities that increase suppression resource capacity and effective evacuation pre-planning. A summary of all strategies to increase fire response within and across the County is provided in Table 8.

TABLE 8: RESPONSE STRATEGIES						
Strategy	Purpose	Implementation Considerations				
Promote and support the County fire department to increase capacity, funding opportunities	Stakeholders and all levels of government should work together in developing a coordinated approach to increasing fire department capacity and funding with respect to wildfire response.	 Volunteer capacity Training Recruitment Gaps in location of resources Funding requirements 				
Re-visit cooperative response agreements	Re-visit cooperative response agreements and re-evaluate for gaps in geographic coverage and operational capacity.	Personnel capacityCross-trainingEquipment locations and capabilities				
Coordinate evacuation pre-planning	Work with all agencies and WUI community groups to develop coordinated evacuation pre- plans	 Seasonal and permanent resident populations Visitors and recreation use Road capacity Coordination with roadside fuel modification Coordination with access requirements and density of future subdivision developments Integrate into WUI Community Group specific CWPP's 				

PART 4: ACTION PLAN & IMPLEMENTATION

PART 4: ACTION PLAN AND IMPLEMENTATION

Part 4 provides the action plan and an implementation strategy to track progress and ensure CWPP updates occur regularly. This section of the plan is intended to be referenced and updated frequently.

Action Plan

Table 9 provides a list of actions that address wildfire concerns in Mariposa County related to resilient landscapes, fire-adapted communities, and safe and effective response. Each action has corresponding information to identify those agencies and partners responsible for implementation, a suggested timeframe for the action to occur, resources required to successfully accomplish the action, the priority (high, medium, low), and the status for implementation (not started, in progress, or complete).

ТА	TABLE 9. MARIPOSA COUNTY CWPP ACTION PLAN								
	Action	Proposed Leads	Timeframe	Resources and Notes	Priority	Status	Landscapes	Communities	Response
1.	Review Action Plan: identify coordinators, refine timeframe, and priorities	MCFAC	Upon final plan adoption	Also set up a regular schedule for the action plan review and status updates	High	Not started	×	×	×
2.	Update and maintain County's wildfire risk assessment	County GIS Department, Fire Department, RCD, Fire Safe Council	Minor updates to occur annually; major updates every 5 years or after significant events	Risk assessment updates in the first year provided by the consultant team if County experiences significant changes (e.g., wildfires). Fire Safe Council, RCD can help secure future funding for updates; consider incorporating Lidar data from Univ of WA in future updates (requires additional analysis)	High	Not started	X	x	х
3.	Initiate streamlined development review process for fire mitigation	County Planning Department	Begin process in 2021	Goal is to set up a framework to provide a package for development applications (e.g., house, subdivisions, existing development) to more efficiently communicate information on required mitigation depending on type of application; include updated checklists, software improvements, information on building code requirements	High	Not started		×	X

				Includes implementation of new statewide Fire Safe Regulations that will become effective in 2021 Mariposa County CPAW report (2019) provides implementation tips					
4.	Implement SIZ assessment program to expand parcel-scale mitigation activities	County Fire Department (in cooperation with CAL FIRE)	Inspections being done currently but will be done more in- depth in the future and additional details developed	County has hired a fire inspector to assist. Can potentially pull data from CAL FIRE inspections. Align the program with local development code regulations (action 3) Mariposa County CPAW report (2019) provides implementation tips RCD could be a potential funding resource for property mitigation	High	Not started		×	
5.	Promote and educate communities on prescribed fire	Prescribed Fire Association, RCD, Fire Safe Council	Occurs annually, as conditions allow	Establishing a local Prescribed Fire Association is underway; other groups also engaged in Rx fire activities The county is looking toward building new projects – training burns, local prescribed burns, in partnership with UC system to help educate ranchers, large rangeland managers	High	In progress	×		
6.	Update existing fuel treatments	Fire Department in coordination with CAL FIRE and other land management agencies	Occurs annually, as conditions allow Treatments require regular maintenance	Based on existing and future priority areas informed by the risk assessment outcomes Look at projects from multiple points of view and assess entire county to slow fire progression, protect communities, homes, assets at risk	High	Not started	х	X	
7.	Provide information on PSPS for homeowners	County Fire Department in coordination with CAL FIRE, Sheriff's Office, Health Department, RCD, Fire Safe Council, Master Gardeners	Initiate in Spring/ Summer 2021	Processes were created to ensure consistent and uniform message to community Agreements in place between PG&E and FSC, RCD, Master Gardeners, and others to distribute information on PSPS Fire Dept receives questions on generators on a weekly basis and has guidance for public on hiring, permitting, and installation Additional actions should encourage the public to sign up for county alert systems on PSPS notifications, expand	High	In progress		X	

				social media updates, and provide more information on PG&E generator rebate information for generators				
8.	Engage with local WUI communities to develop or update local CWPPs	County Fire Department, County Planning Department, RCD, Fire Safe Council, other MCFAC members	Initiate in 2021	Utilize risk ratings developed through County CWPP as a decision-support tool to help communities identify specific risks Pursuing local CWPPs/ appendices allows deeper dive into local risks; the ideal goal is to lower risk and help with future insurance rates, home survivability Each CWPP should align with local priorities and broad strategy of county CWPP, local unit, and state fire protection priorities; alignment of plans gives opportunity to apply for grants to support activities (for example, maintaining fuel reduction projects, Firewise Communities program participations and recognition)	High	Not started	×	
9.	Engage with local WUI communities and partner agencies to develop community- specific evacuation pre-plans	County Fire Department, Sheriff's Office	Initiate in Spring/ Summer 2021	Different agencies may take the lead on evacuation planning depending on specific activity Community outreach also undertaken by various agencies and organizations The Ready Set Go! program administered by Int'I Assoc. of Fire Chiefs provides public education and engagement	High	Not started		x
10.	Develop a County Fire Service fire resource capacity sustainability plan	County Fire Department	Initiate in Spring 2021	Identify capacity gaps and determine strategies for improving capacity through increased retention and recruitment (County fire department is 100% volunteer and requires different recruitment strategies to increase participation) Strategies should align with other policy and development strategies to support staffing and equipment CAL FIRE availability cannot always be a guarantee	High	Not started		x

11. Initiate local home retrofit program	County Planning Department, County Fire Department	Align with statewide program unless funding becomes available sooner	State agencies (Cal OES and CAL FIRE) are developing a home hardening/retrofit program, monitor for details and opportunities	Medium	Not started	Х	
12. Prioritize mitigation of critical infrastructure	County Planning Department, County Fire Department, Public Works	Initiate in Spring/ Summer 2021	See inventory list in LHMP	Medium	Not started	х	
13. Support local WUI communities in wildfire preparedness and mitigation activities, such as recognition programs and annual clean up days	Fire Safe Council, County Fire Department, RCD, additional MCFAC members	Community Preparedness s Day Occurs annually at the beginning of May	Goal of Fire Safe Council is to work with communities, associations, districts, etc. to support grant writing process, become partners, Council handles fiscal management and reporting, but they are partners to guide local mitigation activities National program resources include: Firewise/USA administered by NFPA (<u>state</u> <u>liaison is CAL FIRE</u>) and the Ready, Set, Go! program administered by Int'l Assoc. of Fire Chiefs NFPA has a prep day toolkit available; grants sometimes available from State Farm Free chipping signs have been effective; more information like this is helpful	Medium	In progress	×	
14. Update and renew cooperative response agreements	Various	Initiate as each agreement is due for renewal; many agreements had been updated in 1990s, 2000s; ensure updates occur on a regular basis to maintain currency	MCFAC brings various organizations and agencies together to plan for future. There are also many additional cooperators and collaborative efforts that should be communicated to the public (e.g., SWIFT) Cooperative agreements and automatic aid agreements with other counties are important because of some limitations of local response capabilities Typically update annually or every three years (regular)	Medium	Not started		×

15. Develop Post- Fire Recovery Plan	County Fire Department in coordination with other MCFAC members	Initiate in Fall 2021	Connect with OES, Health and Human Services, Mariposa Community Foundation for additional potential support and engagement Include economic, ecosystem, and social needs and other considerations Also provide guidance to people who are returning after evacuations on how to stay safe	Low	Not started	X	×	
16. Create visitor education campaign	County Fire Department in coordination with Economic Development	Occurs annually in spring/ summer	Target broader audiences, especially those affected by tourist activities, smoke, and how to prevent ignitions	Low	Not started		x	

Tracking and Monitoring

Tracking and monitoring ensure plan implementation occurs, and adaptive management strategies are employed as necessary. Table 9 will be updated during annual action plan reviews to note whether actions have been completed, if they are in progress, and changes to priority levels. As actions are completed, specific, measurable outcomes that show how the community has successfully reduced its risk will be noted for reporting to decision-makers and future project funding.

Tracking and monitoring the effectiveness of fuel management projects is particularly critical for the following reasons:

- 1. Provides important vegetation structure information that can support fuel modeling and long-term habitat monitoring efforts. This, in turn, provides the following effectiveness metrics:
 - a. measurable habitat improvement based on vegetation structure change
 - b. measurable change in fire behavior potential based on fuel structure change
 - c. measurable change in fire suppression success based on fuel structure change
- 2. Provides important cost- effectiveness information for future budget forecasting and strategic planning.
- 3. Provides data for overall fuel treatment effectiveness research.

The tracking effort to collect the initial pre-and post-treatment data is minimal. Pre- and posttreatment photos will be taken using a simple, standardized procedure to provide a significant amount of baseline information. Additionally, the measurement and recording of site-specific, pre-and post-treatment fuel loading information using rapid assessment plots, Brown's transects, future available satellite post-processed satellite imagery (e.g., Light Detection and Ranging (LiDAR)), or other similar procedures can provide a significant amount of valuable information with minimal additional effort.

Plan Updates

Minor Updates. Specific sections in this plan will be reviewed annually for minor updates to ensure the CWPP remains accurate with respect to key implementation features and relevant statistics. Sections may include, but are not limited to:

- CWPP Action Plan and associated data collection for tracking and monitoring
- Tables that provide information and statistics relevant for current planning, such as: Key Demographics, Significant Recent Wildfires and Impacts, Plans Relevant to CWPP, Madera-Mariposa-Merced Unit Operational Facilities and Equipment
- Updates to the Executive Summary to reflect any significant changes

Major Updates. A major plan update will occur a minimum of every five years. A major update is a comprehensive review of the entire plan's contents to incorporate significant changes in landscapes, communities, response protocols, and the risk assessment. A major update will include an outreach component to seek public input on the plan to ensure community members remain engaged in the planning process. Major updates can align with other plan update cycles, such as the Local Hazard Mitigation Plan, to increase consistency and efficiencies in coordination efforts.

Appendices. Appendices will be updated on an as needed basis, which may coincide with minor and major updates or occur outside of those update cycles.

Crosswalk with Other County Plans

Mariposa County administers and implements many other plans that may reference or address wildfire in some capacity, as noted in Table 3 (Plans Relevant to CWPP). This CWPP is intended to be the primary guidance document that directs strategic wildfire planning activities within the County, while other plans and policies related to wildfire should point to this CWPP. To ensure a systematic and consistent approach toward wildfire planning activities across the County, the County can initiate a crosswalk process. That is, a crosswalk is triggered when other plans undergo a major update to review any content or policies for alignment with this CWPP.

APPENDICES

APPENDICES

TABLE 10. LIST OF APPENDICES	
Name	Description
A. Key Terms Defined	 Provides a glossary of key terms used in the CWPP
B. Public Engagement and Collaboration	 Summarizes public engagement that occurred during the development of this CWPP update, including virtual public workshops and an online public survey
	 Includes a placeholder for documentation of outreach associated with future CWPP updates
C. Risk Assessment Methodology	 Describes the methodology used to develop the wildfire risk assessment
D. Local WUI Communities	 Identifies the WUI communities assessed as part of this CWPP update Creates a placeholder for future projects specific to each community (e.g., fuel reduction projects)
	References community-specific CWPP, if applicable

APPENDIX A. KEY TERMS DEFINED

Defensible Space: The selection, location, grouping, and maintenance of vegetation on the property in such a manner that the opportunity for fire to burn directly to a structure is minimized.

Desirable Ecological Conditions: the condition of an ecosystem that land managers have determined to be the most appropriate based on science, best practices, and land management objectives

Ecosystem: a biological community of interacting organisms and their physical environment

Exposure: The contact of an entity, asset, resource, system, or geographic area with a potential hazard. Note: In incident response, fire responder exposure can be characterized by the type of activity

Fire adapted community: A human community consisting of informed and prepared citizens collaboratively planning and taking action to safely coexist with wildland fire.

Mitigation: The act of modifying the environment or human behavior to reduce potential adverse impacts from a natural hazard. Mitigation actions are implemented to reduce or eliminate risks to persons, property, or natural resources, and can include mechanical and physical tasks, specific fire applications, and limited suppression actions.

Prevention: Activities directed at reducing the incidence of fires, including public education, law enforcement, personal contact, and reduction of fuel hazards (fuels management); actions to avoid an incident, to intervene for the purpose of stopping an incident from occurring, or to mitigate an incident's effect to protect life and property.

Fire Regime: Description of the patterns of fire occurrences, frequency, size, severity, and sometimes vegetation and fire effects as well, in a given area or ecosystem. A fire regime is a generalization based on fire histories at individual sites. Fire regimes can often be described as cycles because some parts of the histories usually get repeated, and the repetitions can be counted and measured, such as fire return interval.

Risk assessment: Product or process that collects information and assigns values to risks for the purpose of informing priorities, developing or comparing courses of action, and informing decision making.

Structure ignition zone: The area around a specific structure and associated accessory structures, including all vegetation that contains potential ignition sources and fuels.

Suppression: A wildfire response strategy to "put the fire out" as efficiently and effectively as possible while providing for firefighter and public safety.

Values: Items identified by a community as having measurable or intrinsic worth that could be negatively impacted by a wildfire. Values include property, structures, physical improvements, natural and cultural resources, community infrastructure, and economic, environmental, and social values.

Wildland fuels: All vegetation (natural and cultivated).

Wildfire: An unplanned wildland fire, including unauthorized human-caused fires and escaped prescribed fire projects. Wildfire management objectives may vary based on site-specific circumstances and conditions

Wildfire risk: The wildfire hazard plus the addition of the factors that contribute to susceptibility, or the impact of a wildfire on highly valued resources and assets.

Wildfire hazard: The combination of the likelihood of a fire occurring and the intensity of the fire. Also refers to the wildland or built fuels present in a given area, or the combustibility of a given fuel type or fuel complex in general.

Wildland-urban interface: Any developed area where conditions affecting the combustibility of natural and cultivated vegetation (wildland fuels) and structures or infrastructure (built fuels) allow for the ignition and spread of fire through these combined fuels.

Source Planning the Wildland-Urban Interface (American Planning Association 2019)

Additional terms are available in the National Wildfire Coordinating Group. 2018. "Glossary A-Z." Available at <u>www.nwcg.gov/glossary/a-z</u>

APPENDIX B. PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT AND COLLABORATION

Overview

Public engagement and collaboration are essential to any CWPP development or update process. Due to the timing of this grant-funded project coinciding with the COVID-19 pandemic, in-person meetings were not held. However, the project team worked closely with the CWPP steering group to identify alternatives for virtual meetings, webinars, or other forms of engagement that could result in input from stakeholders.

As part of this CWPP update, the following public engagement and collaborative activities occurred:

- Ongoing collaboration with the CWPP steering group, which represented multiple stakeholders from across Mariposa County
- Coordination and feedback from MCFAC on the CWPP draft (October/November 2020)
- Public review and comment period on the CWPP draft (October/November 2020)
- Public survey (August/September 2020)
- Public workshops (October 2020)

Public Survey Summary

A survey was posted on the Mariposa County CWPP website in August 2020 to solicit input on the development of the CWPP. Twenty-eight respondents from across the County provided input. Survey respondents were from (alphabetical order): Bootjack, Bridgeport, Carlton Road, Catheys Valley, Coulterville, El Portal, Fish Camp, Greeley Hill, Hornitos, Indian Peak Road, Lushmeadows, Mariposa, Midpines, Mormon Bar, Ponderosa Basin, Tip Top Road, and Yosemite West. 80% of those who responded were full-time residents; 20% were part-time/seasonal residents.

Wildfire Concerns

Respondents shared their thoughts on what concerned them most about the threat of wildfires in Mariposa County. Responses covered a range of concerns about forest health, property loss, human health impacts, proposed development, limited response capacity, and more. In their own words, responses included:

- Smoke exposure and people's respiratory health
- Power outages due to loss of air conditioning for vulnerable groups
- No legal ability to remedy dangerous fuel loads on privately held property. This is a
 particular concern in higher population density areas or strategically located poorly
 maintained parcels between subdivisions.
- Although I do not like the extra smoke, I would like expert people to think through conducting additional controlled burns to bring health back to the land.
- Human lives lost
- Infrastructure (homes, schools, water supply system, commercial buildings)
- Loss of forest and watershed
- My concern is that the Bootjack basin area has not had a wildfire in many years. This leaves behind thick fuels that could create a "perfect storm" situation along with other variables that could decimate the area. On Indian Peak Road, there are several areas where brush and weeds are thick right along the roadside, and there is no shoulder area to provide a buffer from backfires, chain drags and other fire-starting components in a vehicle.

- Lack of fuel breaks, blocked and overgrown trails, and not enough water retention, which also decreases area humidity.
- PG&E's lack of preparedness/infrastructure maintenance old power poles, trees near power lines, etc.
- The catastrophic nature of fires in this community because we don't maintain enough fire breaks
- Undergrowth, beetle kill, Lightning strikes, terrain, and the fact that the undergrowth/overgrowth of this area has not been dealt with in years until just recently, removal of these materials is making a significant difference
- Main concerns lie with the lack of caution by local residents. Seeing chains dragging, no repercussions for not cutting back grass and shrubbery, cigarettes on the side of the road, etc. And our dry creek beds are now home to large overgrown trees and bushes that create fuel for fires to race along
- Escape route and fuel loads
- Air support. Not having forests thinned
- The overgrowth of forest vegetation from eliminating the natural spread of wild-land fires through aggressive suppression has created congested growth. This leads to higher tree mortality due to lack of water and pine beetle infestation. Fires started in these forests causes complete destruction
- We desperately need forest thinning. Selective logging and thinning are the only answer. Particularly, public lands adjacent to existing communities, such as Fish Camp. Also, all public highways should be made fire breaks
- Negligence of others
- Losing my stuff
- My house burning down from a wildfire
- Evacuation routes, lack of maintained fuel breaks between communities
- The fact that we're not lowering the fuel load with prescription burning
- I'm concerned that our community is not protected. It's my understanding that other communities have been successful with taking measures.
- Too much development being permitted in Very High Fire Hazard Severity (CalFire designated) of County, particularly Yosemite West.
- Current proposal for rezoning to develop commercial operations in Yosemite West, now with County Planning.
- Lack of 4291 Defensible Space inspections in Yosemite West.
- Lack of County ordinance to address fuels build-up on vacant lots
- Loss of life & pulmonary assaults
- Loss of property
- Economic impact: loss of tourism revenues; loss of employment
- Negative impacts on the environment
- We need to clear underbrush and dead trees. Forest needs to be managed to prevent large scale fires. State of Ca needs more resources, including night flying helicopters, to give an advantage to fighting fires before they get too large.
- Lack of defensible space around and within communities and lack of hardening of buildings (correct vent coverings, etc.)
- Losing home and animals to wildfire
- Insufficient forest management on surrounding lands owned by BLM, private logging companies, or National Forest areas
- Loss of life and homes. Loss of community infrastructure
- Lack of second road access to Yosemite West, to escape in case of fire

• Fire insurance at a reasonable cost

Specific Evacuation Concerns

- 43% of respondents expressed concerns related to pets or livestock that may pose logistical issues during an evacuation
- 18% of respondents expressed concerns related to a disability or limitation that may hinder the ability to evacuate without delay, such as vulnerable or dependent individuals living at home (children, seniors with limited mobility), others who cannot drive, or a single vehicle
- 14% of respondents expressed concerns related to a limitation that may hinder the ability to receive notifications (e.g., poor cell and internet service)

Other evacuation concerns included limited evacuation routes, uncertainty where to go, not enough time to evacuate, and continued or proposed new development in areas like Yosemite West that have single ingress & egress

Wildfire Preparedness & Mitigation

Many respondents reported having taken multiple actions to prepare themselves, families, and their property for wildfire, including:

- 93% of respondents have created a fire-safe landscape (trimmed weeds, trees, etc.)
- 64% of respondents have purchased a generator for backup power
- 64% of respondents have relocated firewood 30 ft. away from their home
- 54% of respondents have cut vegetation along the driveway
- 50% of respondents have put up non-combustible, reflective signs/addressing on house
- 50% of respondents have retrofitted their home with ignition-resistant materials
- 11% of respondents have retrofitted their garage/accessory structure

Other activities have included adding a firetruck hose connection to two 2500-gal rainwater tanks; cleaning out gutters; coordinating with neighbors; preparing a local CWPP for Yosemite West; and clearing a 300 ft radius around the house and fire breaks throughout their 100-acre property

Resources Required

Respondents ranked **Funding** as the most important resource from the County to help them prepare for wildfire. Coordination ranked second-most helpful, and education ranked as the least helpful resource.

Other resources that would be helpful identified by respondents included (in their own words):

- More county support for community connected interventions and the other larger policy/population focused items
- Real-time information during wildland fires
- Timely private property inspections
- Home inspections and tips on how to further fireproof your home
- 4291 inspections
- Inclusion of YW in RCDC planning
- Equipment rental vouchers for local residents to preform fuels reduction
- More resources for people who can't afford to hire help for defensible space
- Cutting vegetation on public lands like creeks and around bridges
- Air Support; enlarge airport for larger fire fighting aircraft and personnel staging

- Brushing of private roads
- A prescription burn association
- Community-wide perimeter or planning
- Yosemite West needs funding to remove downed logs. Our last two tree mortality grants dropped almost 2,000 beetle-killed trees. The trunks are flat on the ground, the limbs were all removed and chipped. But property owners have not followed through to remove the logs themselves, which has always been their responsibility. Additionally, we are starting to see a new wave of beetle-killed trees.
- Funding to manage forest lands
- Consolidation of forest management needs into larger grant applications
- Resources for property owners who rent their residences
- Apply for Grants
- Community neighborhood meetings to discuss evacuation plans

Future Actions

Respondents also ranked in order of importance the actions that Mariposa County should take to help communities prepare for wildfire (listed in order of most to least important).

- 1. Increase fuel management activities to reduce hazardous vegetation for protecting communities
- 2. Limit or restrict future development in high-hazard areas
- 3. Increase local response capabilities
- 4. Conduct more prescribed fire
- 5. Increase fuel management activities to reduce hazardous vegetation for protection of watershed
- 6. Increase public education and outreach activities
- 7. Offer free property assessments to provide guidance on home improvements
- 8. Adopt additional property/landscaping requirements
- 9. Create local evacuation plans
- 10. Create post-wildfire recovery plans

Additional suggestions from respondents for County actions included: rainwater retention and assistance programs for creating fuel breaks on private lands, outage alerts, coordinated projects for grant funding to address wildfire threats in VHFHSZ, continued support for the local fire council, and increased support for fire protection resources.

Additional Comments

Finally, respondents offered additional comments and suggestions for Mariposa County to help inform the CWPP update process, communications, and discussions on local wildfire risk. In their own words:

- The communication system to the public is lacking real-time information. FaceBook fire community groups, Nixle, and Sheriff Alerts seem to be the most time-sensitive source.
- Blocked off NFS roads/trails allows for them to become overgrown and reduces their ability to serve as a minor fuel break and reduces access.
- When there are fires in the area, it would be great if the county or the sheriff would post live updates on their webpages. Cal Fire's 2x/day incident report is great once there is a large active fire and the emergency texts from the sheriff are great as well, but for smaller fires that pop up, there's no reliable information until it is a crisis. People who use social media always seem to have some less-than-reliable information, but the rest of us don't have a place to get information.

- Most important for the county to clean up roadsides so that we don't have chaindragging or cigarette fires along the roadways.
- The fire agencies are doing a significant job in getting out and taking care of business such as fuel removal and just making themselves visible to the general public. I believe they are reassuring the public just by being noticed.
- Enforce restrictions on trailer and RV parks, excessive debris, hazardous materials, negligent owners.
- More educational home inspections to improve fire safety.
- Yosemite West only has one water source, and Mariposa County is in violation of our State water permit and has been for years. Despite this Mariposa County is supporting irresponsible development on Henness Ridge, i.e., by changing zoning from Rural Residential to allow for high-density housing and other commercial enterprises, and by adding "new" customers to our water system to include high-density housing and a commercial laundry facility. Jeopardizing our water system without first securing a second water source is unfathomable and certainly places our community at greater risk of wildfire.
- Include Yosemite West in CWPP and all planning, including grant funding. Identify specific person in County for this.
- Let's get the forest under control, clear the underbrush and tree mortality
- An off- (fire) season program conducted by the county and CAL FIRE to inspect local residences for fire hazards and to make recommendations on remediation and provide funding resources to local residents to enact a fire plan.
- Fire station in Yosemite West
- Last year, when our small residential community had made some progress in getting included in a forest management and debris removal grant being organized by the Yosemite/Sequoia RC&D, the application fell apart when we were told that the application needed to be made larger by coordination with other surrounding landowners. But the other private landowners did not have an interest in pursuing forest management grant applications.
- Non-county-maintained roads are a serious issue. Evacuation will be greatly complicated in areas with excessive fuel loads, such as Midpines. These roads pose a threat to life and to fire response.
- Ensure every resident is part of the emergency text/phone network.
- Share ranked evaluation of most vulnerable neighborhoods to drive awareness/action.
- Pay for videos showcasing fire prevention activities/successes both as 'your \$\$ at work', and how residents can act to prevent/address fires.
- Increase affordable housing.

Public Workshop Outcomes

Two public workshops were held during the CWPP update to provide residents with an opportunity to learn more about the plan and shape the County's future wildfire planning activities. Workshops were held on Saturday, October 24th, from 10:00 am -12:00 pm and Wednesday, October 28th, from 6:00 pm - 8:00 pm. Residents had the option to attend the workshop in person or online.

A total of 15 residents attended the public workshops and represented a range of communities and geographic areas from across the county, including Bootjack, Allred Road, Yosemite West, Triangle Road, Bear Valley, Tip Top Road, Midpines, Town of Mariposa, Fish Camp, Ponderosa Basin, and Windy Hollow. The workshops were facilitated by members of the CWPP Steering Group (Mariposa County Fire Department, Mariposa County Fire Safe Council, Mariposa County Planning Department, and Mariposa County Resource Conservation District) and consulting team.

During each workshop, residents expressed a variety of interests in attending the workshops, including:

- Seeking an orientation to what a CWPP is for and how it can address
- Understanding the contents of the updated plan and implications for determining wildfire risk
- Clarifying the relationship of the CWPP to other county and state fire plans and agency activities
- Learning about what communities and residents can do to address specific concerns such as evacuation routes, overgrown forests, fuel reduction, and retaining insurance.

Residents also provided input to support the development of actions. These suggestions were integrated into the Mariposa County CWPP Action Plan (Table 9). Additional information on public workshops is available by contacting MCFAC: <u>mcfac@mariposacounty.org.</u>

Public Comments

A CWPP draft was posted online to the Mariposa County CWPP website (https://www.mariposacounty.org/2448/Community-Wildfire-Protection-Plan) in October 2020 to provide the public with an opportunity to review the draft and submit comments. Seven written comments were submitted and fully reviewed by the CWPP Steering Group (Mariposa County Fire Department, Mariposa County Fire Safe Council, Mariposa County Planning Department, and Mariposa County Resource Conservation District) and consulting team.

Public comments primarily focused on specific corrections on charts, tables, and text, suggestions on the inclusion of additional topics, and questions on the relationship of the CWPP to other local planning activities. Revisions were made to the final CWPP to address all applicable comments. Additional information on public comments is available by contacting MCFAC: mcfac@mariposacounty.org.

APPENDIX C. RISK ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

The National Hazard and Risk Model (No-HARM) is a decision support tool for wildfire hazard and risk assessment developed by Anchor Point. Incorporating the predicted severity (hazard) and the predicted frequency (risk) of wildfire in a location, No-HARM gives a comprehensive view of the threat context a structure is exposed to. Anchor Point used No-HARM to undertake a wildfire risk assessment as part of the Mariposa County CWPP.

Many wildfire-related data sets are delivered in a format that breaks the landscape up into squares or pixels (Figure C12). This approach typically allows wide variation from square to square on the landscape. A square (or pixel) has very little to do with how a fire burns and the variation from square to square can be difficult to interpret. No-HARM takes a different approach. All of the data sets which No-HARM uses to create the final analysis (many of which come in the "squares" format) are integrated into shapes on the landscape that has something to do with how wildfires burn.

No-HARM divides the data up into "FireSheds" (Figure C11) that are based on the topography (hills and valleys) of the landscape. These FireSheds tend to correlate to the vegetation and the directions that fires will burn in the absence of wind. This means that FireSheds divide the landscape up into like planning units. The wildland and intermix modules of No-HARM (see below) use FireSheds to aggregate the landscape.



Figure C12: Fuel model data showing the typical pixel-based nature of this type of input data



Figure C11: Sample FireShed derived from local topography

No-HARM also accounts for the fact that FireSheds experience wildfire hazard and risk from outside their boundaries (Figure C13). A FireShed may contain mostly grass meadow but be surrounded by dense forest. If a house is built in the meadow, it is not only subject to the threat from the grass fuel in the meadow; it is also subject to the threat from the timber fuel in the surrounding FireSheds. Because of this, No-HARM incorporates the threat from surrounding FireSheds into the threat profile for every adjacent FireShed.

No-HARM uses the concept of dividing the landscape based on the relative amount of built



environment (structures, roads, and other infrastructure) vs. wildland fuels. The rationale for this distinction is that wildland fires behave differently when burning in pure wildland fuels than when burning through fuel interrupted by structures and roads. Similarly, suppression of wildland fires is conducted differently and with varying degrees of success when in remote areas compared with densely-populated areas. These differences are captured in No-HARM by categorizing the landscape into three separate threat types, each of which is modeled with its own individual set of inputs and associated methodology. The three threat types are divided into the following modules of the model: Wildland, Intermix, and Interface (Figure C14).

Figure C13: The impact of external FireSheds is taken into account in assigning the overall rating.

The **Wildland** module (Figure C14) operates in areas that are best represented by relatively continuous fuel with limited presence of structures, roads, and other human-caused disturbances. Relatively few people live in these areas, limiting one type of ignition source



(anthropogenic), but any structures located in these areas are surrounded by fuel. Depending on weather and topography (both accounted for in No-HARM), this can make suppression difficult or impossible. Potential mitigation measures are typically focused on the treatment of the vegetation immediately surrounding a structure and the hardening of the structure itself. Fires occurring in the **Wildland** will typically burn uninterrupted until conditions are no longer favorable or until the fire moves into less volatile fuel.

Figure C14: Landscape divided into Wildland, Intermix and Interface areas

The relative absence of the built environment in the **Wildland** module means that the factors included are mostly related to the fuel, topography, and typical weather patterns, along with the history of wildfires experienced in a given area.

The one nod to the influence of suppression capabilities in this module is the distance to the nearest fire station.

Primary Wildfire Risk Measures:

- RISKDESC This is a measure of threat due to wildfire that is broken up into four descriptive categories: Wildland Low, Wildland Moderate, Wildland High, and Wildland Very High. This category is appropriate when the data are being used for a general overview or when the audience is not familiar with No-HARM or wildfire hazard and risk rating in general.
- RISK50 This field is for displaying more detail in the data or when greater refinement is desired. In this field, the wildfire threat is broken into 50 values (1-50). This field is good for mapping patterns when it is not necessary to know the exact value based on the color (human eyes can't differentiate 50 colors effectively).

Other Factors:

- SEVERITY This module input is an estimate of how severe fire behavior would be in the event of an ignition. Factored into this estimate are the topography (slope, aspect, and elevation), the prevailing weather patterns in the area (based on readings at weather stations located nation-wide), and the fuel type present (40 different subsets of grass, shrub, and timber vegetation types). (1 is the lowest severity, 50 is the highest)
- FREQUENCY The Frequency input is designed to indicate the relative likelihood that a fire requiring suppression will occur on the landscape. To map this likelihood a combination of Burn Probability and Probability of Ignition predictions were used. Burn Probability was created by simulating 500,000 fires with random ignition locations and capturing where they overlapped most often. Areas with the highest number of overlapping fire perimeters are considered to be most likely to burn. Probability of Ignition refers to how likely it is that an ember will ignite in each location. It is based on historic weather patterns along with topographic factors such as slope, aspect, and elevation. Higher Probability of Ignition means that a fire is more likely to start. The combination of these two maps yields a single map of lower or higher likelihood of burning. (1 is the least likely, 50 is the most likely)
- FSTATPROX The only human-related variable in the **Wildland** module is the distance to the nearest fire station. Structures located nearer to fire stations may have a greater probability of a successful wildfire suppression or structure protection effort. (1 is closer to a fire station and 50 is farther away)
- CROWNFIRE Crown fire activity, whether in the form of isolated trees or clumps of trees or the complete involvement of the canopy, represents a worst-case scenario in terms of fire behavior. (Low, Moderate, and High)
- NON-BURN The amount of non-burnable area (mostly agricultural and urban) in the fireshed. Greater percentages of non-burnable area have a mitigating impact on the overall risk rating. (Low, Moderate and High) Note: "High" in this
field refers to the magnitude of non-burnable area, which, for this factor, represents a mitigating impact on wildfire risk. This is the opposite of the CROWNFIRE factor above, where "High" refers to a greater magnitude of Crown Fire, which would be an aggravating effect on wildfire risk.

- VEG_MODS Modification of vegetation through purposeful fuel treatment, as a by-product of a particular land use (e.g., golf courses) or as a natural element (bare ground or open water) should be reflected in the overall risk rating of an area. VEG_MODS is an effort to capture these factors in the landscape. Included in this layer are manually digitized human-disturbed areas (golf courses, mines, other industrial areas) and lakes/rivers and bare ground (from the fuel data set used for fire behavior analysis). Each of these polygons is assigned a maximum point value based on the amount of disturbance (a golf course or lake gets more points than a timber thinning project). Each FireShed in No-HARM is then assigned a composite vegetation modification (VEG_MODS) rating based on the number, point value, and distance away from these "treated" polygons. (Present, Absent)
- MOD_POINTS This field, along with MOD_NOTES (see below), is an effort to give the client the opportunity to modify the data over time. These modifications may arise from a disagreement with No-HARM's ratings or from a change in the status of ratings in FireSheds. Regardless, these two columns are provided so that No-HARM ratings can be altered by authorized personnel to document changes. More detailed instructions for how to use this field will be given below; however, the purpose of MOD_POINTS is to record the number of points (positive or negative) that should be added to or subtracted from the overall risk rating (RISK50). (This field is set to zero to start but is intended to be altered by the user as the need arises.)
- MOD_NOTES While the MOD_POINTS field is used to record a number of points, the VEG_NOTES field is for recording the reason that the points in VEG_POINTS were added or subtracted from the RISK50 rating. This is so that the user can go back and look at the field in the future to determine what changes have been made to a particular FireShed. (Blank to start, populated by user, 254 text character limit)

The **Intermix** module is characterized by a higher density of structures, roads, and other infrastructure breaking up the continuity of natural fuel on the landscape. Threats to values-at-risk in this module focus not only on fuels but also on the complexity of suppression in this environment. Higher road densities allow better access for suppression resources, but they also introduce an element of potential confusion for access and egress. Suppression strategies in **Intermix** areas must account for groups of houses as opposed to single structures as might be encountered in the **Wildland**. Along with suppression complexities, the presence of greater numbers of people in the **Intermix** also can mean a higher risk of ignitions due to barbecues, fireworks, matches, etc. The **Intermix** module accounts for this added complexity and added built environment by adding a greater number of appropriate input data sets. The inclusion of these added input data sets in conjunction with the wildland data sets (mentioned above) as a "baseline" threat profile captures the threat to structures in areas represented by this fuel/structure mixture.

Primary Wildfire Threat Measures:

- RISKDESC This is a measure of threat due to wildfire broken up into four descriptive categories: Intermix Low, Intermix Moderate, Intermix High, and Intermix Very High. (see above for further description).
- RISK50 see above

Other Factors:

- SEVERITY see above
- FREQUENCY see above
- FSTATPROX see above
- TOTPTS This is the total number of points aggregated from all of the following fields. The total point value is added to or subtracted from (depending on the sign of the value) the baseline risk value (calculated using SEVERITY, FREQUENCY, and FSTATPROX).
- ASPECT The direction a slope faces can influence how wet or dry it is both daily and seasonally. In the northern hemisphere, south-facing slopes will typically be drier than north-facing slopes. This can have a large impact on the density of fuel and how severe the fire behavior will likely be in the event of a wildfire. (Low, Moderate, and High)
- CONTINUITY Fuel continuity refers to how broken up the fuel in the area is. discontinuous fuel is a mitigating factor for wildfire risk. CONTINUITY captures coarser-scale interruptions in fuels than the VEGCOVER component listed below. (Low, Moderate, and High)
- CROWNFIRE see above
- FOEHN Some areas are subject to strong, relatively-warm and dry winds that can increase fire behavior, and therefore, risk. Examples of FOEHN winds are the Chinooks of the Rocky Mountains and Santa Anas of southern California. Usually, this rating is uniform across the entire area. (All polygons in No-HARM for this project study area are "High.")
- ROADDIST The distance to the nearest larger road will impact access by suppression resources and ease of evacuation. (Low, Moderate, and High)
- SLOPE Higher slopes make suppression operations more complex/less effective and will also increase fire behavior. (Low, Moderate, and High)
- VEGCOVER Vegetation Cover, a measure of the continuity of fuel, is important because fire will, all other things being equal, burn with more severity and speed through a continuous fuel bed than one that is interrupted by patches of bare ground. VEGCOVER represents fuel at a finer scale than CONTINUITY above. (Low, Moderate, and High)
- VEG_MODS see above
- WATERDIST Having a rural water source (river, lake, reservoir) closer to a given area will make suppression operations more effective. These water features allow suppression apparatus to be filled more frequently due to shorter

drive times and potential dip sites for helicopters. Hydrant systems are not considered in No-HARM. (Low, Moderate, and High)

- MOD_POINTS see above
- MOD_NOTES see above

Interface: When structures and roads become the defining elements of a landscape, these areas are assigned to the interface module of No-HARM. Unlike wildland and intermix areas, structures in the interface are primarily threatened by flame impingement on one or two sides, ember cast, and smoke from adjacent areas. Fuel does not surround structures and, therefore, the risk to houses is very different. (Note: Individual structures are not assessed directly for flammability.)

Primary Wildfire Threat Measures:

- RISKDESC This is a measure of threat due to wildfire that is broken up into 3 descriptive categories: Interface Low, Interface Moderate, and Interface High (see above for further description).
- RISK50 This is an attempt to designate values that are on the same 1-50 scale as the Intermix and Wildland RISK50 for interface buffers. Because these values are not modeled explicitly but are cross-walked from a combination of the TIER and RISK fields, they do not have the same grain (smooth and even distribution of values) that is present in the Intermix and Wildland components.

Factors Considered:

- Adjacent FireShed severity and frequency see above, not included as fields in the data
- TIER This refers to the type of threat present (1 (flame impingement/embers/smoke) or 2 (just embers and smoke).
- MOD_POINTS see above
- MOD_NOTES see above

Use of the MOD_POINTS and MOD_NOTES Fields

NOTE: Before attempting to edit any fields in the No-HARM shapefiles, we recommend storing an altered version of the data in case anything unintended happens during the editing process and for future comparison.

The MOD_POINTS and MOD_NOTES fields are designed to be used by GIS and wildfire planning personnel to modify the fields supplied in the No-HARM model. The need to change the values in the fields may arise based on a correction to the model using local knowledge or field observation or because the condition within a FireShed polygon has changed since the model was run. It is important to note that, since the data were delivered as data sets without an interface to display and interact with them, they will need to be updated using GIS software and by personnel with a beginning to moderate level of knowledge of how to operate it. Because of the need for knowledgeable GIS personnel to perform this task, detailed explanations of the "button-pushing" aspect of this operation will not be included in this write-up.

There are two fields that will need to be edited in the three (interface, intermix, and wildland) No-HARM shapefiles delivered to the client. The MOD_POINTS field will need to be edited with the

number of points that will either be added to or subtracted from the RISK50 field to modify the overall hazard rating. The MOD_NOTES field is for recording a memo of why the points were added or subtracted. MOD_POINTS is designed to hold a signed (positive or negative) integer since RISK50 is also an integer field. MOD_NOTES can hold up to 254 characters of text. The procedure, then, would be to determine the number of points that need to be added (a positive integer) or subtracted (negative integer). Once the points are entered into the MOD_POINTS field, the reasoning for the adjustment should then be edited into the MOD_NOTES field. In the event that multiple reasons for adjusting the points are found, the two-point values should be added together, and the sum entered into the MOD_POINTS field. The multiple reasons (and probably their individual integer values) should be stored in the MOD_NOTES field for future reference.

Just editing the MOD_POINTS field will not be enough to change the rating of a given FireShed or interface buffer. The MOD_POINTS value must be added or subtracted from (We suggest storing positive integers for factors that increase the overall risk and negative integers for mitigating factors. This allows the user to add the MOD_POINTS to the RISK50 column rather than have to keep track of whether to add or subtract.) the RISK50 column. Be sure to keep track of which FireSheds have had their MOD_POINTS values added/subtracted from RISK50 – you don't want to do this operation more than once, and there is nothing to indicate that it has already been done.

Once the MOD_POINTS values have been added/subtracted from RISK50, there is one final step that has to be taken to ensure that the database is updated properly. Since RISK50 values are used directly to assign the RISKDESC adjective ratings, it is necessary to also update the RISKDESC field to ensure that any point modifications have not changed an adjective rating. The following table can be used to update the RISKDESC ratings:

RISK50 0-9: Low RISK50 10-23: Moderate RISK50 24-35: High RISK50 >35: Very High

Note that these ratings are generic descriptions that can be used for both wildland and intermix (and technically interface). In order to get the correct value in the RISKDESC field, "Interface," "Intermix" or "Wildland" should be placed before the ratings in the table above. Editing the RISKDESC field completes the modification process.

The following example is provided to capture the workflow of the steps above. It is hypothetical, but it is designed to represent a real-life example. Let's say that wildfire planning personnel decide that an intermix No-HARM FireShed, currently assigned a RISK50 value of 20 and a RISKDESC value of "Intermix Moderate," is underestimated based on their knowledge of the community in that FireShed. The wildfire planning personnel have decided that, because most of the houses in the FireShed have older cedar shake roofs/combustible siding AND most of the houses are exposed to overhead power lines, the rating in this FireShed ought to be higher. The wildfire planning personnel go to the GIS department and ask a GIS tech for help in modifying the ratings. The GIS tech, wisely, makes a copy of the three shapefiles that were delivered to the client. She then starts to edit the shapefile. The wildfire planners have decided that the lack of ignition-resistant construction should add four points to the rating while the above-ground propane tanks are worthy of a two-point increase. Having read the above instructions, the tech knows that the first step is to add the two-point values (construction and propane tank) together to get 6 points. This number is then entered into the MOD_POINTS field (if the points had been mitigating factors such as abundant turn-around and pullouts for engines or the presence of

defensible space around homes, the values would have been negative). The MOD_NOTES field is then updated with something like "4 points were added for construction type, and 2 points were added for above-ground propane tanks." Next, the RISK50 field contents are added to the MOD_POINTS field contents to get a new rating of 26 (20 + 6 = 26 points). The GIS tech checks the table above and notices that the transition from 20 to 26 crosses a boundary for adjective ratings shifting the FireShed from an "Intermix Moderate" to an "Intermix High." The GIS tech then edits the RISKDESC field to update the adjective description. The above example is for a single FireShed. If multiple FireSheds are being edited simultaneously, the process can be made more efficient by performing some of the operations above at the end of the procedure rather than individually.

APPENDIX D. LOCAL WUI COMMUNITY GROUPS

The Mariposa County CWPP recognizes that there are many local CWPPs, fuel risk reduction activities, and other efforts underway within local communities across the County. In an effort to further support local planning and coordination efforts and help inform future planning activities, this CWPP identifies thirty-eight residential areas as WUI community groups across the County.

These communities are alphabetically listed along with their associated wildfire risk rating and referenced Map Tile number in Table D1. Figure D1 provides a graph of the communities ranked by risk rating from Very High to Moderate. The WUI Community Map Tiles, numbered one to seven, illustrate the geographic location and overall risk rating of each WUI Community Group. Finally, specific risk rating details and CWPP action tables for each community group are provided by the community in alphabetical order. Ratings were obtained through the No-HARM risk assessment process, which included "boots on the ground" field validation and steering group reviews.

Ratings are designed to increase awareness of local wildfire risk and direct mitigation priorities between and within each community. Mariposa County will support local implementation by working with communities, relevant agencies, and organizations on wildfire risk mitigation to update each community section, which includes incorporating references to local plans, identifying risk reduction activities, and assisting in the coordination of future opportunities.

TABLE DI. LIST OF WOI COMMONITIES & WILDFIKE RISK RATINGS							
Name (in alphabetical order)	Map Tile Ref	Risk Rating					
Allred Road	4,5	Very High – 35					
Ashworth Road	4,5	High – 27.5					
Bear Valley	3	Moderate – 14.5					
Ben Hur Road	4	High – 29					
Bootjack	4,5	Moderate – 23.5					
Boyer Road	5	High – 24					
Bridgeport	4	Moderate – 8.5					
Buck Meadows	2	High – 28					
Carlton Road	4,5	Moderate – 12.5					
Catheys Valley	3	Moderate – 11.5					
Coulterville	2	Very High – 30.5					
Don Pedro	1	Moderate – 3.5					
East Westfall Road	5	Very High – 33					

TABLE D1. LIST OF WUI COMMUNITIES & WILDFIRE RISK RATINGS					
Name (in alphabetical order)	Map Tile Ref	Risk Rating			
El Portal	6	Moderate – 18.5			
Fish Camp	7	Very High – 30			
Foresta	6	High – 24			
Greeley Hill	2	High – 29			
Hirsch Road	5	Moderate – 21			
Hornitos	3	Moderate – 22.5			
Hunters Valley	3	Moderate- 22.5			
Incline	6	Very High – 31			
Indian Peak Road	4,5	Very High – 31.5			
Jerseydale	5,6	High – 27.5			
Kemble Road	7	Very High – 32			
Lushmeadows	5	Moderate – 21.5			
Mariposa	4	Moderate – 18			
Midpines	4,5	Very High – 31			
Mormon Bar	4	Very High – 34.5			
Mt. Bullion	3,4	Moderate – 22.5			
Ponderosa Basin	7	Moderate – 16.5			
Stumpfield Road	5	Very High – 35			
Tip Top Road	5	High – 27			
Triangle Road – WEST	4,5	High – 26			
Usona Road	5	High – 25.5			
Wawona	7	Very High – 36.5			
Woodland Drive	5	Very High – 32			

TABLE D1. LIST OF WUI COMMUNITIES & WILDFIRE RISK RATINGS						
Name (in alphabetical order)	Map Tile Ref	Risk Rating				
Worman Road	7	Very High – 34				
Yosemite West	6	High – 26				



Figure 15. Mariposa County WUI Communities ranked in order from very high to moderate















WUI Community: Allred Road

Map Tile 4,5

Community-Specific CWPP: N/A

CWPP Action Plan (Insert below)

Community Risk Rating: Very High (35)

COMMUNITY-SPEC	COMMUNITY-SPECIFIC CWPP ACTION PLAN TEMPLATE								
Action	Coordinators	Timeframe	Resources and Notes	Priority	Status	Landscapes	Communities	Response	
1.									
2.									
3.									
4.									
5.									
6.									
7.									
8.									
9.									
10.									
11.									
12.									

Allred Road							
NOTE: Yellow rows are alread	NOTE: Yellow rows are already calculated by No-HARM but values and points are provided in data table for reference						
NOTE: No-HARM rating comp	prises 40% of the overall points (20 points), BOG* is 60% (30 points plu	s add'l factors)					
NOTE Green elements	to be filled in by field surveys						
Community Topograph	ic Position (Average Inside Comm. Boundary)	Value	Desc. (Points)				
Slope (%)	Lowest = -1 (Flat), Highest = 6 (>42%)		Low (1)				
Aspect	Lowest = -2 (NW to NE), Highest = 4 (SW to SE) (Others medium)		Moderate (1)				
Fire Behavior, Fuels, an	d Burn Probability (Average Within Nearest FireSheds)	Value	Desc. (Points)				
Flame Length (ft)	Lowest = 1, Highest = >50ft	14 feet					
Crown Fire Activity	Lowest = 0 points, Highest = 4 points		Moderate (2)				
Vegetation Cover (%)	Lowest = -3 (0%), Highest = 3 (>85%)		Low (-1)				
Nonburnable (%)	Lowest = -5 (70%), Highest = 5 (>0%)		High (4)				
Frequency	Lowest = 1, Highest = 29	Hign (20)	Deinte				
Construction and initias	Mostly Close A (2) Mixed (Close B (2) Close C (4)	Mixed	Points				
Siding/Deck Type	Non-complustible (-1) Mix (2) Complustible (4)	Mixed	2				
Defensible Space	Full (-2) Partial (2) None (4)	Partial	2				
Utilities	Linderground (0) Mix (1) All Above (2)	All above	2				
Suppression Factors (In	uside Community Boundary)	Description	Points				
Ingress/Egress	Multiple Ways In/Out (-2) One Way In/Out (4)	Multiple	1				
Road Slopes	<pre>////////////////////////////////////</pre>		4				
Road Widths	(10.76(0)) = 10.76(1)	>+10%	<u> </u>				
	22411, with 2 of mole lates (0) $<=2411$ (3)	<+24	3				
	Yes (0) Mixed (0.5) No (1)	NO	1				
Street Signs	4" Reflective (-2) Mixed (0.5) Not Present (1)	Mixed	0.5				
Hydrants	Municipal hydrants available (-4) No water available (2)	None	2				
Dip/Draft Water	Lowest -3 (0mi), Highest = 0 (>5mi)		Low (-2)				
Dist. to Imp. Road	Lowest -2 (0mi), Highest = 2 (>5mi)		Low (-1)				
Dist. to Fire Station	Lowest 0 (0mi), Highest = 50 (> 5mi)		Moderate (31)				
Non-Fuel Elements	Lowest = -10 points, Highest > 0 points		High (0)				
Additional Rating Factor	rs (Put Value in Points if Present)	Poss. Pts.	Points				
Frequent Lightning		1	1				
Close Railroads		1	0				
Mid-slope Homes		0.5	0.5				
Homes on Ridge Tops		0.5	0.5				
Homes in Saddles		0.5	0.5				
Ravines		0.5	0.5				
Chimneys		0.5	0.5				
Many Campfires		2	0				
Frequent Burning (Ag. De	ebris. Wood Stove etc.)	1	1				
Wood Fencing		2	0				
Non-vear-round Population	0	1	0				
Other (Maxium of 2 Points		2	0				
Other (Maxium of -2 Points	s (Good Stuff)) Specify: Equil break along ridgeton with many	-2					
Final Points	s (bood blain) opeonyr cur break along hegetop with many	Value	Points				
Overall Rating (RISK50)	I owest = 1 Highest = 20 from Nearest FireSheds		11				
Overall ROC Deting	Lowest _ 1, Highest _ 20, Add! Dating Easters		24				
	Lowest = -15, Fighest = 50+ Add1 Rating Factors		24				
			Pating				
			kating				
Final Rating	Moderate <24, High 24-29, Very High >29						
*Boots on Ground (BOG)							

WUI Community: Ashworth Road

Map Tile 4,5

Community-Specific CWPP: N/A

Community Risk Rating: High (27.5)

COMMUNITY-SPECIFIC CWPP ACTION PLAN TEMPLATE									
Action	Coordinators	Timeframe	Resources and Notes	Priority	Status	Landscapes	Communities	Response	
1.									
2.									
3.									
4.									
5.									
6.									
7.									
8.									
9.									
10.									
11.									
12.									

	Ashworth Road						
NOTE: Yellow rows are alread	dy calculated by No-HARM but values and points are provided in data	table for reference	e				
NOTE: No-HARM rating comprises 40% of the overall points (20 points), BOG* is 60% (30 points plus add'I factors)							
NOTE Green elements	to be filled in by field surveys						
Community Topograph	ic Position (Average Inside Comm. Boundary)	Value	Desc. (Points)				
Slope (%)	Lowest = -1 (Flat), Highest = 6 (>42%)		Low(1)				
Aspect	Lowest = -2 (NW to NE), Highest = 4 (SW to SE) (Others medium)		Moderate (0)				
Fire Behavior, Fuels, an	d Burn Probability (Average Within Nearest FireSheds)	Value	Desc. (Points)				
Flame Length (ft)	Lowest = 1, Highest = >50ft	18 feet					
Crown Fire Activity	Lowest = 0 points, Highest = 4 points		Moderate (2)				
Vegetation Cover (%)	Lowest = -3 (0%), Highest = 3 (>85%)		Moderate (0)				
Nonburnable (%)	Lowest = -5 (70%), Highest = 5 (>0%)	Lligh (22)	High (5)				
Construction and Infras	Lowest = 1, Hignest = 29	High (22)	Pointe				
Roof Type	Mostly Class A (-2) Mixed/Class B (2) Class C (4)	Mixed	2				
Siding/Deck Type	Non-compustible (-1) Mix (2) Compustible (4)	Mixed	2				
Defensible Space	Full (-2) Partial (2) None (4)	Partial	2				
Utilities	Underground (0) Mix (1) All Above (2)	All above	2				
Suppression Factors (In	side Community Boundary)	Description	Points				
Ingress/Egress	Multiple Ways In/Out (-2) One Way In/Out (4)	Multiple	-2				
Road Slopes	<15% (0) >=15% (1)		2				
Road Widths	>24ft with 2 or more lanes (0) <=24ft (3)	<24' 50% dirt	3				
Adequate Turnarounds	Yes (0) Mixed (0.5) No (1)	No					
Street Signs	4" Reflective (-2) Mixed (0.5) Not Present (1)	A" signs					
Hydrants	Municipal hydrants available (-4) No water available (2)	none	-2				
Din/Draft Water	1 owest -3 (Omi) Highest $-0 (>5mi)$	none	2				
Dist to Imp Road	Lowest -2 ($(0\pi i)$) Highest - 2 ($(25\pi i)$)		Low (-2)				
Dist. to Fire Station	Lowest -2 (only) Highest -2 (2011)		Modorato (22)				
Non-Fuel Elements	Lowest -10 points. Highest > 0 points.						
Additional Pating Factor	re (But Value in Points if Procent)	Pocc Bto					
		P055. Ft5.	Politis				
		1	1				
Close Railroads		1	0				
Mid-slope Homes		0.5	0.5				
Homes on Ridge Tops		0.5	0.5				
Homes in Saddles		0.5	0.5				
Ravines		0.5	0.5				
Chimneys		0.5	0.5				
Many Campfires		2	0				
Frequent Burning (Ag, De	ebris, Wood Stove etc.)	1	1				
Wood Fencing		2	0				
Non-year-round Population	n	1	0				
Other (Maxium of 2 Points	(Bad Stuff)) Specify:Heavy fuel loading	2	1				
Other (Maxium of -2 Points	s (Good Stuff)) Specify:	-2	0				
Final Points		Value	Points				
Overall Rating (RISK50)	Lowest = 1, Highest = 20, from Nearest FireSheds		12				
Overall BOG Rating	Lowest = -15, Highest = 30+ Add'l Rating Factors		15.5				
TOTAL POINTS			27.5				
		F	Rating				
Final Rating	Moderate <24, High 24-29, Very High >29						
*Boots on Ground (BOG)							

WUI Community: Bear Valley

Map Tile 3

Community-Specific CWPP: N/A

Community Risk Rating: Moderate (14.5)

COMMUNITY-SPECIFIC CWPP ACTION PLAN TEMPLATE								
Action	Coordinators	Timeframe	Resources and Notes	Priority	Status	Landscapes	Communities	Response
1.								
2.								
3.								
4.								
5.								
6.								
7.								
8.								
9.								
10.								
11.								
12.								

Bear Valley							
NOTE: Yellow rows are already calculated by No-HARM but values and points are provided in data table for reference							
NOTE: No-HARM rating comp	NOTE: No-HARM rating comprises 40% of the overall points (20 points), BOG* is 60% (30 points plus add'I factors)						
NOTE Green elements	to be filled in by field surveys						
Community Topograph	ic Position (Average Inside Comm. Boundary)	Value	Desc. (Points)				
Slope (%)	Lowest = -1 (Flat), Highest = 6 (>42%)		Low (0)				
Aspect	Lowest = -2 (NW to NE), Highest = 4 (SW to SE) (Others medium)		Moderate (0)				
Fire Behavior, Fuels, an	d Burn Probability (Average Within Nearest FireSheds)	Value	Desc. (Points)				
Flame Length (ft)	Lowest = 1, Highest = >50ft	14 feet					
Crown Fire Activity	Lowest = 0 points, Highest = 4 points		Moderate (2)				
Vegetation Cover (%)	Lowest = -3 (0%), Highest = 3 ($>85\%$)		Ligh (2)				
Frequency	Lowest $= -3$ (70%), highest $= 3$ (20%)	High (23)	riigit (3)				
Construction and Infras	tructure (Inside Community Boundary)	Description	Points				
Roof Type	Mostly Class A (-2) Mixed/Class B (2) Class C (4)	Mixed	2				
Siding/Deck Type	Non-combustible (-1) Mix (2) Combustible (4)	Mixed	2				
Defensible Space	Full (-2) Partial (2) None (4)	Partial	0				
Utilities	Underground (0) Mix (1) All Above (2)	All above	2				
Suppression Factors (In	side Community Boundary)	Description	Points				
Ingress/Egress	Multiple Ways In/Out (-2) One Way In/Out (4)	Multiple	-2				
Road Slopes	<15% (0) >=15% (1)	<15%	0				
Road Widths	>24ft, with 2 or more lanes (0) <=24ft (3)	>24'	0				
Adequate Turnarounds	Yes (0) Mixed (0.5) No (1)	Mixed	0.5				
Street Signs	4" Reflective (-2) Mixed (0.5) Not Present (1)	Mixed	0.5				
Hydrants	Municipal hydrants available (-4) No water available (2)	none	2				
Dip/Draft Water	Lowest -3 (0mi), Highest = 0 (>5mi)		High (0)				
Dist. to Imp. Road	Lowest -2 (0mi), Highest = 2 (>5mi)		Low (-1)				
Dist. to Fire Station	Lowest 0 (0mi), Highest = 50 (> 5mi)		High (50)				
Non-Fuel Elements	Lowest = -10 points, Highest > 0 points		Low (-9)				
Additional Rating Facto	rs (Put Value in Points if Present)	Poss. Pts.	Points				
Frequent Lightning		1	0				
Close Railroads		1	0				
Mid-slope Homes		0.5	0.5				
Homes on Ridge Tops		0.5	0.0				
Homes in Saddles		0.5	0				
Ravines		0.5	0				
Chimneys		0.5	0				
Many Campfires		2	0				
Frequent Burning (Ag. De	shris Wood Stove etc.)	1	0				
Wood Fencing		2					
Non-vear-round Population	0	1	0				
Other (Maxium of 2 Points	(Bad Stuff)) Specify:	2					
Other (Maxium of -2 Points	(Good Stuff)) Specify: Community survived the Derwiler Fire	-2	0				
Final Points	s (Good Stan)) SpecifyCommanity survived the Derwier Fire	Value	Points				
Overall Rating (RISK50)	lowest = 1 Highest = 20 from Nearest FireSheds		6				
Overall BOG Pating	Lowest15 Highest - 30+ Add' Dating Eactors		85				
			14.5				
			Rating				
Final Rating	Moderate <24 High 24-29 Very High >29						
*Boots on Ground (BOG)							

WUI Community: Ben Hur Road

Map Tile 4

Community-Specific CWPP: N/A

Community Risk Rating: High (29)

COMMUNITY-SPEC	COMMUNITY-SPECIFIC CWPP ACTION PLAN TEMPLATE									
Action	Coordinators	Timeframe	Resources and Notes	Priority	Status	Landscapes	Communities	Response		
1.										
2.										
3.										
4.										
5.										
6.										
7.										
8.										
9.										
10.										
11.										
12.										

Ben Hur Road							
NOTE: Yellow rows are alread	NOTE: Yellow rows are already calculated by No-HARM but values and points are provided in data table for reference						
NOTE: No-HARM rating comp	NOTE: No-HARM rating comprises 40% of the overall points (20 points), BOG* is 60% (30 points plus add'I factors)						
NOTE Green elements	to be filled in by field surveys						
Community Topographi	ic Position (Average Inside Comm. Boundary)	Value	Desc. (Points)				
Slope (%)	Lowest = -1 (Flat), Highest = 6 (>42%)		Low(0)				
Aspect	Lowest = -2 (NW to NE), Highest = 4 (SW to SE) (Others medium)		Moderate (1)				
Fire Behavior, Fuels, an	d Burn Probability (Average Within Nearest FireSheds)	Value	Desc. (Points)				
Flame Length (ft)	Lowest = 1, Highest = >50ft	17 feet	Madamata (0)				
Crown Fire Activity	Lowest = 0 points, Highest = 4 points		Moderate (2)				
Nonhurnable (%)	Lowest = -5 (0%), Highest = 5 ($>0\%$)						
Frequency	1 owest = 1 Highest = 29	High (22)	Tilgit (4)				
Construction and Infras	tructure (Inside Community Boundary)	Description	Points				
Roof Type	Mostly Class A (-2) Mixed/Class B (2) Class C (4)	mixed	2				
Siding/Deck Type	Non-combustible (-1) Mix (2) Combustible (4)	mixed	3				
Defensible Space	Full (-2) Partial (2) None (4)	Partial	2				
Utilities	Underground (0) Mix (1) All Above (2)	All above	2				
Suppression Factors (In	side Community Boundary)	Description	Points				
Ingress/Egress	Multiple Ways In/Out (-2) One Way In/Out (4)	Multiple	-2				
Road Slopes	<15% (0) >=15% (1)	<15%	0				
Road Widths	>24ft, with 2 or more lanes (0) <=24ft (3)	<24'	0				
Adequate Turnarounds	Yes (0) Mixed (0.5) No (1)	no	1				
Street Signs	4" Reflective (-2) Mixed (0.5) Not Present (1)	Mixed	0.5				
Hydrants	Municipal hydrants available (-4) No water available (2)	none	2				
Dip/Draft Water	Lowest -3 (0mi), Highest = 0 (>5mi)		 Low (-2)				
Dist. to Imp. Road	Lowest -2 (0mi), Highest = 2 (>5mi)		Moderate (0)				
Dist. to Fire Station	Lowest 0 (0mi), Highest = 50 (> 5mi)		Moderate (27)				
Non-Fuel Elements	Lowest = -5 points, Highest > 0 points		High (0)				
Additional Rating Facto	rs (Put Value in Points if Present)	Poss. Pts.	Points				
Erequent Lightning		1	0				
Close Railroads		1	0				
Mid-slope Homes		0.5	0.5				
Homes on Ridge Tops		0.5	0.5				
		0.5	0.5				
Rovince		0.5	0.5				
Chimpour		0.5	0.5				
Chimneys Manu Compfisso		0.5	0.5				
Francisco Camplifes		2	0				
Frequent Burning (Ag, De	edris, wood Stove etc.)	1	1				
		2	0				
Non-year-round Population		1	1				
Other (Maxium of 2 Points	(Bad Stuff)) Specify: Heavy fuel loads along much of this commi	2	1				
Other (Maxium of -2 Points	s (Good Stuff)) Specify:	-2	0				
		value	Points				
Overall Rating (RISK50)	Lowest = 1, Highest = 20, from Nearest FireSheds		13				
Overall BOG Rating	Lowest = -15, Highest = 30+ Add'l Rating Factors		16				
TOTAL POINTS			29				
			kating				
Final Rating	Moderate 224 High 24.20 Vory High 20						
*Roots on Ground (ROG)	Moderate <24, high 24-29, very high >29						

WUI Community: Bootjack

Map Tile 4,5

Community-Specific CWPP: N/A

Community Risk Rating: Moderate (23.5)

COMMUNITY-SPEC	COMMUNITY-SPECIFIC CWPP ACTION PLAN TEMPLATE									
Action	Coordinators	Timeframe	Resources and Notes	Priority	Status	Landscapes	Communities	Response		
1.										
2.										
3.										
4.										
5.										
6.										
7.										
8.										
9.										
10.										
11.										
12.										

Bootjack							
NOTE: Yellow rows are alread	ady calculated by No-HARM but values and points are provided in data	table for reference	е				
NOTE: No-HARM rating comprises 40% of the overall points (20 points), BOG* is 60% (30 points plus add'l factors)							
NOTE Green elements	to be filled in by field surveys						
Community Topograph	ic Position (Average Inside Comm. Boundary)	Value	Desc. (Points)				
Slope (%)	Lowest = -1 (Flat), Highest = 6 (>42%)		Low(0)				
Aspect	Lowest = -2 (NW to NE), Highest = 4 (SW to SE) (Others medium)		Moderate (1)				
Fire Behavior, Fuels, an	d Burn Probability (Average Within Nearest FireSheds)	Value	Desc. (Points)				
Flame Length (ft)	Lowest = 1, Highest = >50ft	14 feet					
Crown Fire Activity	Lowest = 0 points, Highest = 4 points		Moderate (2)				
Vegetation Cover (%)	Lowest = -3 (0%), Highest = 3 (>85%)		Moderate (0)				
Nonburnable (%)	Lowest = -5 (70%), Highest = 5 (>0%)	High (21)	Hign (4)				
Construction and Infras	Lowest = 1, Highest = 29	Description	Bointo				
Roof Type		Mixed	2				
Siding/Deck Type	Non-complustible (-1) Mix (2) Complustible (4)	Mixed	2				
Defensible Space	Full (-2) Partial (2) None (4)	None	4				
Utilities	Underground (0) Mix (1) All Above (2)	All above	2				
Suppression Factors (In	side Community Boundary)	Description	Points				
Ingress/Egress	Multiple Ways In/Out (-2) One Way In/Out (4)	Multiple	-2				
Road Slopes	<15% (0) >=15% (1)	>15%	0				
Road Widths	>24ft with 2 or more lanes (0) <=24ft (3)	-24'	3				
Adequate Turnarounds	Yes (0) Mixed (0.5) No (1)	Mixed	05				
Street Signs	4" Reflective (-2) Mixed (0.5) Not Present (1)	Mixed	0.5				
Hydrants	Municipal hydrants available (-4) No water available (2)	None	-1				
Din/Draft Water	$1 \text{ owest } -3 \text{ (Omi)}$ Highest $-0 \text{ (5 \text{ mi})}$	None					
Dist to Imp Road	Lowest -2 (0 mi), Highest = 2 (>5mi)		Low (-2)				
Dist. to Fire Station	Lowest 0 (0mi), Highest $= 50$ (> 5mi)		Moderate (20)				
Non-Euel Elements	Lowest -10 points. Highest > 0 points		High (0)				
Additional Pating Factor	rs (But Value in Points if Present)	Poss Die	Points				
		1 1 1	1 011113				
		1	0				
		1	0				
		0.5	0.5				
Homes on Ridge Tops		0.5	0.5				
Homes in Saddles		0.5	0.5				
Ravines		0.5	0.5				
Chimneys		0.5					
Many Campfires		2	0.5				
Frequent Burning (Ag, De	ebris, Wood Stove etc.)	1	1				
Wood Fencing		2	0				
Non-year-round Population	n	1	0				
Other (Maxium of 2 Points	(Bad Stuff)) Specify:_Narrow, overgrown side roads that are po	2	2				
Other (Maxium of -2 Points	s (Good Stuff)) Specify:	-2	0				
Final Points		Value	Points				
Overall Rating (RISK50)	Lowest = 1, Highest = 20, from Nearest FireSheds		10				
Overall BOG Rating	Lowest = -15, Highest = 30+ Add'l Rating Factors		13.5				
TOTAL POINTS			23.5				
		F	Rating				
Final Rating	Moderate <24, High 24-29, Very High >29						
*Boots on Ground (BOG)							

WUI Community: Boyer Road

Map Tile 5

Community-Specific CWPP: N/A

Community Risk Rating: High (24)

COMMUNITY-SPECIFIC CWPP ACTION PLAN TEMPLATE								
Action	Coordinators	Timeframe	Resources and Notes	Priority	Status	Landscapes	Communities	Response
1.								
2.								
3.								
4.								
5.								
6.								
7.								
8.								
9.								
10.								
11.								
12.								

	Boyer Road							
NOTE: Yellow rows are alread	dy calculated by No-HARM but values and points are provided in data	table for reference	e					
NOTE: No-HARM rating comp	NOTE: No-HARM rating comprises 40% of the overall points (20 points), BOG* is 60% (30 points plus add'l factors)							
NOTE Green elements	to be filled in by field surveys							
Community Topograph	ic Position (Average Inside Comm. Boundary)	Value	Desc. (Points)					
Slope (%)	Lowest = -1 (Flat), Highest = 6 (>42%)		Low(1)					
Aspect	Lowest = -2 (NW to NE), Highest = 4 (SW to SE) (Others medium)		Moderate (1)					
Fire Behavior, Fuels, an	d Burn Probability (Average Within Nearest FireSheds)	Value	Desc. (Points)					
Flame Length (ft)	Lowest = 1, Highest = >50ft	15 feet						
Crown Fire Activity	Lowest = 0 points, Highest = 4 points		Moderate (2)					
Vegetation Cover (%)	Lowest = -3 (0%), Highest = 3 (>85%)		Moderate (0)					
Nonburnable (%)	Lowest = -5 (70%), Highest = 5 (>0%)	Lligh (21)	High (5)					
Frequency	Lowest = 1, Hignest = 29	High (21)	Deinte					
Roof Type	Mostly Class A (-2) Mixed/Class B (2) Class C (4)	Mixed	2					
Siding/Deck Type	Non-compustible (-1) Mix (2) Compustible (4)	Mixed	2					
Defensible Space	Full (-2) Partial (2) None (4)	Partial	2					
Utilities	Underground (0) Mix (1) All Above (2)	All above	2					
Suppression Factors (In	side Community Boundary)	Description	Points					
Ingress/Egress	Multiple Ways In/Out (-2) One Way In/Out (4)	One way in/or						
Road Slopes	<15% (0) >=15% (1)	<15%	 					
Road Widths	>24ft with 2 or more lanes (0) <=24ft (3)	< 24'	3					
Adequate Turnarounds	Yes (0) Mixed (0.5) No (1)	Mixed	05					
Street Signs	4" Reflective (-2) Mixed (0.5) Not Present (1)							
Hydrants	Municipal hydrants available (-4) No water available (2)	none	-2					
Din/Draft Water	$1 \text{ owest } -3 \text{ (Omi)}$ Highest $-0 \text{ (5 \text{ mi})}$	none						
Dist to Imp Road	Lowest -2 (0mi), Highest = 2 (>5mi)		Low (-2)					
Dist. to Fire Station	Lowest 0 (0mi), Highest $= 50$ (> 5mi)		Moderate (23)					
Non-Euel Elements	Lowest -10 points. Highest > 0 points							
Additional Pating Facto	rs (Put Value in Points if Present)	Poss Dts	Points					
		1 1 1	1 01113					
		1	0					
			0					
		0.5	0.5					
Homes on Ridge Tops		0.5	0					
Homes in Saddles		0.5	0.5					
Ravines		0.5	0					
Chimneys		0.5	0.5					
Many Campfires		2	0					
Frequent Burning (Ag, De	ebris, Wood Stove etc.)	1	1					
Wood Fencing		2	0					
Non-year-round Population	n	1	1					
Other (Maxium of 2 Points	(Bad Stuff)) Specify:Heavy Fuel Loads/No recent fires	2	1					
Other (Maxium of -2 Points	s (Good Stuff)) Specify:Fuel Break and EQUIP projects through	-2	-1					
Final Points		Value	Points					
Overall Rating (RISK50)	Lowest = 1, Highest = 20, from Nearest FireSheds		11					
Overall BOG Rating	Lowest = -15, Highest = 30+ Add'l Rating Factors		13					
TOTAL POINTS			24					
		F	lating					
Final Rating	Moderate <24, High 24-29, Very High >29							

WUI Community: Bridgeport

Map Tile 4

Community-Specific CWPP: N/A

Community Risk Rating: Moderate (8.5)

COMMUNITY-SPECIFIC CWPP ACTION PLAN TEMPLATE								
Action	Coordinators	Timeframe	Resources and Notes	Priority	Status	Landscapes	Communities	Response
1.								
2.								
3.								
4.								
5.								
6.								
7.								
8.								
9.								
10.								
11.								
12.								

Bridgeport							
NOTE: Yellow rows are alread	dy calculated by No-HARM but values and points are provided in data	table for reference	e				
NOTE: No-HARM rating comp	prises 40% of the overall points (20 points), BOG* is 60% (30 points plu	s add'l factors)					
NOTE Green elements	to be filled in by field surveys						
Community Topograph	ic Position (Average Inside Comm. Boundary)	Value	Desc. (Points)				
Slope (%)	Lowest = -1 (Flat), Highest = 6 (>42%)		Low (0)				
Aspect	Lowest = -2 (NW to NE), Highest = 4 (SW to SE) (Others medium)		Moderate (0)				
Fire Behavior, Fuels, an	d Burn Probability (Average Within Nearest FireSheds)	Value	Desc. (Points)				
Flame Length (ft)	Lowest = 1, Highest = >50ft	14 feet					
Crown Fire Activity	Lowest = 0 points, Highest = 4 points		Moderate (2)				
Vegetation Cover (%)	Lowest = -3 (0%), Highest = 3 (>85%)		Moderate (0)				
Nonburnable (%)	Lowest = -5 (70%), Highest = 5 (>0%)	Lligh (21)	High (4)				
Construction and Infras	Lowest = 1, Highest = 29	High (21)	Pointo				
Roof Type	Mostly Class A (-2) Mixed/Class B (2) Class C (4)	Mixed A/B	Points				
Siding/Deck Type	Non-compustible (-1) Mix (2) Compustible (4)	Mixed	2				
Defensible Space	Full (-2) Partial (2) None (4)	Full	-2				
Utilities	Underground (0) Mix (1) All Above (2)	All above	2				
Suppression Factors (In	side Community Boundary)	Description	Points				
Ingress/Egress	Multiple Ways In/Out (-2) One Way In/Out (4)	Multiple	2				
Road Slopes	<15% (0) >=15% (1)	<15%	2				
Road Widths	>24ft with 2 or more lanes (0) <=24ft (3)	<1070	0				
Adequate Turnarounds	Yes (0) Mixed (0.5) No (1)		0				
Street Signs	4" Reflective (-2) Mixed (0.5) Not Present (1)	1°C3	0				
Hydrants	Municipal hydrants available (-4) No water available (2)	Hydrants	-2				
Din/Draft Water	$1 \text{ owest } -3 \text{ (Omi)}$ Highest $-0 \text{ (5\text{mi})}$	Tyurants					
Dist to Imp Road	Lowest -2 (0mi), Highest = 2 ($>$ 5mi)		Low (-1)				
Dist. to Fire Station	Lowest 0 (0mi), Highest $= 50$ (> 5mi)		Low (14)				
Non-Euel Elements	Lowest -10 points. Highest > 0 points						
Additional Pating Factor	rs (Put Value in Points if Present)	Pose Die	Points				
		1 1 1	1 011113				
		1	0				
			0				
		0.5	0.5				
Homes on Ridge Tops		0.5	0.5				
Homes in Saddles		0.5	0.5				
Ravines		0.5	0				
Chimneys		0.5	0				
Many Campfires		2	0				
Frequent Burning (Ag, De	ebris, Wood Stove etc.)	1	1				
Wood Fencing		2	0				
Non-year-round Population	n	1	0				
Other (Maxium of 2 Points	(Bad Stuff)) Specify:	2					
Other (Maxium of -2 Points	s (Good Stuff)) Specify:_Hydrants are rated for 250gpm. Relativ	-2	-2				
Final Points		Value	Points				
Overall Rating (RISK50)	Lowest = 1, Highest = 20, from Nearest FireSheds		10				
Overall BOG Rating	Lowest = -15, Highest = 30+ Add'l Rating Factors		-1.5				
TOTAL POINTS			8.5				
		F	Rating				
Final Rating	Moderate <24, High 24-29, Very High >29						
*Boots on Ground (BOG)							

WUI Community: Buck Meadows

Map Tile 2

Community-Specific CWPP: N/A

Community Risk Rating: High (28)

COMMUNITY-SPECIFIC CWPP ACTION PLAN TEMPLATE								
Action	Coordinators	Timeframe	Resources and Notes	Priority	Status	Landscapes	Communities	Response
1.								
2.								
3.								
4.								
5.								
6.								
7.								
8.								
9.								
10.								
11.								
12.								

	Buck Meadows						
NOTE: Yellow rows are alread	dy calculated by No-HARM but values and points are provided in data	table for reference	e				
NOTE: No-HARM rating comprises 40% of the overall points (20 points), BOG* is 60% (30 points plus add'l factors)							
NOTE Green elements	to be filled in by field surveys						
Community Topograph	ic Position (Average Inside Comm. Boundary)	Value	Desc. (Points)				
Slope (%)	Lowest = -1 (Flat), Highest = 6 (>42%)		Low(0)				
Aspect	Lowest = -2 (NW to NE), Highest = 4 (SW to SE) (Others medium)		Moderate (1)				
Fire Behavior, Fuels, an	d Burn Probability (Average Within Nearest FireSheds)	Value	Desc. (Points)				
Flame Length (ft)	Lowest = 1, Highest = >50ft	15 feet					
Crown Fire Activity	Lowest = 0 points, Highest = 4 points		Moderate (2)				
Vegetation Cover (%)	Lowest = -3 (0%), Highest = 3 (>85%)		Low (-2)				
Nonburnable (%)	Lowest = -5 (70%), Highest = 5 (>0%)	Madarata (10)	High (4)				
Construction and Infras	Lowest = 1, Highest = 29	Noderate (19)	Pointe				
Roof Type	Mostly Class A (-2) Mixed/Class B (2) Class C (4)	Mixed	2				
Siding/Deck Type	Non-compustible (-1) Mix (2) Compustible (4)	Mixed	2				
Defensible Space	Full (-2) Partial (2) None (4)	Partial	2				
Utilities	Underground (0) Mix (1) All Above (2)	All above	2				
Suppression Factors (In	side Community Boundary)	Description	Points				
Ingress/Egress	Multiple Ways In/Out (-2) One Way In/Out (4)	Multiple	-2				
Road Slopes	<15% (0) >=15% (1)	<15%	2				
Road Widths	>24ft with 2 or more lanes (0) <=24ft (3)	<24'	3				
Adequate Turnarounds	Yes (0) Mixed (0.5) No (1)	Mixed	05				
Street Signs	4" Reflective (-2) Mixed (0.5) Not Present (1)	Mixed	0.5				
Hydrants	Municipal hydrants available (-4) No water available (2)	None	0.3				
Din/Draft Water	$1 \text{ owest } -3 \text{ (Omi)}$ Highest $-0 \text{ (5 \text{ mi})}$	None					
Dist to Imp Road	Lowest -2 (0mi), Highest = 2 (>5mi)		Low (-2)				
Dist. to Fire Station	Lowest 0 (0mi), Highest $= 50$ (> 5mi)		LOW (-2)				
Non-Euel Elements	Lowest -10 points. Highest > 0 points		Low (13)				
Additional Pating Factor	rs (Put Value in Points if Present)	Poss Dte	Points				
		1 1 1	1				
		1	1				
			0				
		0.5	0.5				
Homes on Ridge Tops		0.5	0				
Homes in Saddles		0.5	0.5				
Ravines		0.5	0.5				
Chimneys		0.5	0.5				
Many Campfires		2	2				
Frequent Burning (Ag, De	ebris, Wood Stove etc.)	1	1				
Wood Fencing		2	1				
Non-year-round Population	n	1	1				
Other (Maxium of 2 Points	(Bad Stuff)) Specify:	2	0				
Other (Maxium of -2 Points	s (Good Stuff)) Specify:Numerous ruel reduction projects on	-2	-2				
Final Points		Value	Points				
Overall Rating (RISK50)	Lowest = 1, Highest = 20, from Nearest FireSheds		10				
Overall BOG Rating	Lowest = -15, Highest = 30+ Add'l Rating Factors		18				
TOTAL POINTS			28				
		F	Rating				
Final Rating	Moderate <24, High 24-29, Very High >29						
*Boots on Ground (BOG)							

WUI Community: Carlton Road

Map Tile 4,5

Community-Specific CWPP: N/A

Community Risk Rating: Moderate (12.5)

COMMUNITY-SPECIFIC CWPP ACTION PLAN TEMPLATE								
Action	Coordinators	Timeframe	Resources and Notes	Priority	Status	Landscapes	Communities	Response
1.								
2.								
3.								
4.								
5.								
6.								
7.								
8.								
9.								
10.								
11.								
12.								

Carlton Road							
NOTE: Yellow rows are alrea	ady calculated by No-HARM but values and points are provided in data	table for reference)				
NOTE: No-HARM rating comp	prises 40% of the overall points (20 points), BOG* is 60% (30 points plu	us add'l factors)					
NOTE Green elements to be filled in by field surveys							
Community Topographi	ic Position (Average Inside Comm. Boundary)	Value	Desc. (Points)				
Slope (%)	Lowest = -1 (Flat), Highest = 6 (>42%)		Low(0)				
Aspect	Lowest = -2 (NW to NE), Highest = 4 (SW to SE) (Others medium)		Moderate (0)				
Fire Behavior, Fuels, an	d Burn Probability (Average Within Nearest FireSheds)	Value	Desc. (Points)				
Flame Length (ft)	Lowest = 1, Highest = >50ft	15 feet					
Crown Fire Activity	Lowest = 0 points, Highest = 4 points		Moderate (2)				
Vegetation Cover (%)	Lowest = -3 (0%), Highest = 3 (>85%)		Moderate (0)				
Nonburnable (%)	Lowest = -5 (70%), Highest = 5 (>0%)		High (4)				
Frequency	Lowest = 1, Highest = 29	Moderate (19)					
Construction and Infras	tructure (Inside Community Boundary)	Description	Points				
Root Type	Mostly Class A (-2) Mixed/Class B (2) Class C (4)	2					
Siding/Deck Type	Non-combustible (-1) Mix (2) Combustible (4)	3					
Itilitios	$\frac{1}{100} = \frac{1}{100} = \frac{1}$	2					
Suppression Eactors (In	onderground (o) Mix (1) All Above (2)	Description	Points				
		Description	TOINS				
Road Slopes	$\sim 15\%$ (0) $\sim -15\%$ (1)	-2					
Road Widths	(1) = (1)	0					
	>2411, with 2 of more raries (0) <=2411 (3)	3					
		0.5					
Street Signs	4" Reflective (-2) Mixed (0.5) Not Present (1)	0.5					
Hydrants		2					
Dip/Draft Water	Lowest -3 (0mi), Highest = 0 (>5mi)		Low (-2)				
Dist. to Imp. Road	Lowest -2 (0mi), Highest = 2 (>5mi)		Low (-1)				
Dist. to Fire Station	Lowest 0 (0mi), Highest = 50 (> 5mi)		High (45)				
Non-Fuel Elements	Lowest = -10 points, Highest > 0 points		High (0)				
Additional Rating Factor	rs (Put Value in Points if Present)	Poss. Pts.	Points				
Frequent Lightning		1	0				
Close Railroads		1	0				
Mid-slope Homes		0.5	0.5				
Homes on Ridge Tops		0.5	0				
Homes in Saddles		0.5	0.5				
Ravines		0.5	0.5				
Chimneys		0.5	0				
Many Campfires		2	0				
Frequent Burning (Ag, De	ebris, Wood Stove etc.)	1	1				
Wood Fencing		2	0				
Non-year-round Population	n	1	0				
Other (Maxium of 2 Points	(Bad Stuff)) Specify:	2	0				
Other (Maxium of -2 Points	s (Good Stuff)) Specify:	-2	0				
Final Points		Value	Points				
Overall Rating (RISK50)	Lowest = 1, Highest = 20, from Nearest FireSheds		10				
Overall BOG Rating	Lowest = -15, Highest = 30+ Add'l Rating Factors		2.5				
TOTAL POINTS			12.5				
		R	ating				
Final Rating	Madarata 24 Uish 24 20 Vary Uish 20						
*Boots on Ground (BOG)	woderate <24, high 24-29, very high >29						

WUI Community: Catheys Valley

Map Tile 3

Community-Specific CWPP: N/A

Community Risk Rating: Moderate (11.5)

COMMUNITY-SPECIFIC CWPP ACTION PLAN TEMPLATE								
Action	Coordinators	Timeframe	Resources and Notes	Priority	Status	Landscapes	Communities	Response
1.								
2.								
3.								
4.								
5.								
6.								
7.								
8.								
9.								
10.								
11.								
12.								

Catheys Valley								
NOTE: Yellow rows are alrea	dy calculated by No-HARM but values and points are provided in data	table for reference	9					
NOTE: No-HARM rating comp	NOTE: No-HARM rating comprises 40% of the overall points (20 points), BOG* is 60% (30 points plus add'l factors)							
NOTE Green elements	to be filled in by field surveys							
Community Topograph	ic Position (Average Inside Comm. Boundary)	Value	Desc. (Points)					
Slope (%)	Lowest = -1 (Flat), Highest = 6 (>42%)		Low(0)					
Aspect	Lowest = -2 (NW to NE), Highest = 4 (SW to SE) (Others medium)		Moderate (0)					
Fire Behavior, Fuels, an	d Burn Probability (Average Within Nearest FireSheds)	Value	Desc. (Points)					
Flame Length (ft)	Lowest = 1, Highest = >50ft	10 feet						
Crown Fire Activity	Lowest = 0 points, Highest = 4 points		Moderate (2)					
Vegetation Cover (%)	Lowest = -3 (0%), Highest = 3 (>85%)		Moderate (0)					
Nonburnable (%)	Lowest = -5 (70%), Highest = 5 (>0%)		High (4)					
Frequency	Lowest = 1, Highest = 29	High (23)	Deinte					
Construction and Infras	tructure (Inside Community Boundary)	Description	Points					
Siding/Dock Type	Non-complustible (-1) Mix (2) Complustible (4)	Mixeu a, D, C	2					
Defensible Space	Full (-2) Partial (2) None (4)	Full	-2					
Utilities	$\frac{1}{1} \ln(2) \ln(2) \ln(2) \ln(2) \ln(2)$	All Above	2					
Suppression Factors (In	uside Community Boundary)	Description	Points					
Ingress/Egress	Multiple Ways In/Out (-2) One Way In/Out (4)	Multiple	-2					
Road Slopes	<pre></pre>	<15%	-2					
Road Widths	~ 24 ft with 2 or more lanes (0) <-24ft (3)	<1370	0					
Adequate Turnarounds	$Y_{2} = (0) Mixed (0.5) No (1)$	<24	<u></u>					
Street Signs	4" Pofloctive (2) Mixed (0.5) Not Present (1)	4" Deflective						
Street Signs	4 Reflective (*2) Mixed (0.5) Not Fresent (1) Municipal bydrants available (-4) No water available (2)	4 Reliective	-2					
		None	Z					
Dip/Drait water	Lowest -3 (0mi), Highest = 0 (>5mi)		LOW (-2)					
Dist. to Imp. Road	Lowest -2 (Oni), Highest = 2 (>501)		LOW (-1)					
Dist. to Fire Station	Lowest 0 (0mi), Highest = 50 (> 5mi)		Moderate (24)					
Non-Fuel Elements	Lowest = -10 points, Highest > 0 points	Dana Dia	LOW (-6)					
Additional Rating Facto	rs (Put value in Points if Present)	Poss. Pts.	Points					
Frequent Lightning		1	1					
Close Railroads		1	0					
Mid-slope Homes		0.5	0.5					
Homes on Ridge Tops		0.5	0.5					
Homes in Saddles		0.5	0.5					
Ravines		0.5	0.5					
Chimneys		0.5	0.5					
Many Campfires		2	0					
Frequent Burning (Ag, De	ebris, Wood Stove etc.)	1	1					
Wood Fencing		2	0					
Non-year-round Population	n	1	0					
Other (Maxium of 2 Points	(Bad Stuff)) Specify:	2	0					
Other (Maxium of -2 Point	s (Good Stuff)) Specify: Majority of this community was burned	-2	-2					
Final Points		Value	Points					
Overall Rating (RISK50)	Lowest = 1, Highest = 20, from Nearest FireSheds		4					
Overall BOG Rating	Lowest = -15, Highest = 30+ Add'l Rating Factors		7.5					
TOTAL POINTS			11.5					
		F	Rating					
Final Rating	Moderate <24. High 24-29. Verv High >29							
*Boots on Ground (BOG)								
WUI Community: Coulterville

Map Tile 2

Community-Specific CWPP: N/A

Community Risk Rating: Very High (30.5)

COMMUNITY-SPECIFIC CWPP ACTION PLAN TEMPLATE								
Action	Coordinators	Timeframe	Resources and Notes	Priority	Status	Landscapes	Communities	Response
1.								
2.								
3.								
4.								
5.								
6.								
7.								
8.								
9.								
10.								
11.								
12.								

Coulterville							
NOTE: Yellow rows are alread	dy calculated by No-HARM but values and points are provided in data	table for reference	е				
NOTE: No-HARM rating comprises 40% of the overall points (20 points), BOG* is 60% (30 points plus add'l factors)							
NOTE Green elements to be filled in by field surveys							
Community Topograph	ic Position (Average Inside Comm. Boundary)	Value	Desc. (Points)				
Slope (%)	Lowest = -1 (Flat), Highest = 6 (>42%)		Low(1)				
Aspect	Lowest = -2 (NW to NE), Highest = 4 (SW to SE) (Others medium)		Moderate (1)				
Fire Behavior, Fuels, an	d Burn Probability (Average Within Nearest FireSheds)	Value	Desc. (Points)				
Flame Length (ft)	Lowest = 1, Highest = >50ft	12 feet					
Crown Fire Activity	Lowest = 0 points, Highest = 4 points		Moderate (2)				
Vegetation Cover (%)	Lowest = -3 (0%), Highest = 3 (>85%)		Low (-1)				
Nonburnable (%)	Lowest = -5 (70%), Highest = 5 (>0%)		High (3)				
Frequency	Lowest = 1, Highest = 29	High (23)	D.1.4				
Construction and Infras	tructure (Inside Community Boundary)	Description	Points				
Root Type	Niostiy Class A (-2) Mixed/Class B (2) Class C (4)	Mixed A/B	2				
Defensible Space	Full (-2) Partial (2) None (4)	Partial	2				
Litilities	$\frac{1}{1} \frac{1}{1} \frac{1}$		2				
Suppression Factors (In	side Community Boundary)	Description	Points				
Ingress/Egress		Evito	1 01113				
Road Slopes	(1) = (1) = (1)		0				
Road Widths	<13%(0) >=13%(1)	>=15%	1				
	>24it, with 2 of more raries (0) <=24it (3)	<24	3				
Adequate Turnarounds	Yes (U) Mixed (U.5) NO (1)	Mixed	0.5				
Street Signs	4" Reflective (-2) Mixed (0.5) Not Present (1)	Mixed					
Hydrants	Municipal hydrants available (-4) No water available (2)	Yes 2.5 town	2				
Dip/Draft Water	Lowest -3 (0mi), Highest = 0 (>5mi)		Low (-2)				
Dist. to Imp. Road	Lowest -2 (0mi), Highest = 2 (>5mi)		Low (-2)				
Dist. to Fire Station	Lowest 0 (0mi), Highest = 50 (> 5mi)		Low (5)				
Non-Fuel Elements	Lowest = -10 points, Highest > 0 points		High (0)				
Additional Rating Factor	rs (Put Value in Points if Present)	Poss. Pts.	Points				
Frequent Lightning		1	0				
Close Railroads		1	0				
Mid-slope Homes		0.5	0.5				
Homes on Ridge Tops		0.5	0.5				
Homes in Saddles		0.5	0				
Ravines		0.5	0.5				
Chimneys		0.5	0.5				
Many Campfires		2	0				
Frequent Burning (Ag. De	ebris. Wood Stove etc.)	1	1				
Wood Fencing	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	2	2				
Non-vear-round Population	n	1	1				
Other (Maxium of 2 Points	(Bad Stuff)) Specify: Heavy fuel loads in non burned over a	2	2				
Other (Maxium of -2 Pointe	(Good Stuff)) Specify:	-2					
Final Points		Value	Points				
Overall Rating (RISK50)	lowest = 1 Highest = 20 from Nearest FireSheds		8				
Overall BOG Pating	Lowest15 Highest - 30+ Add' Rating Factors		22.5				
			30.5				
			Rating				
Final Rating	Moderate <24, High 2 <u>4-29. Very High >29</u>						
*Boots on Ground (BOG)							

WUI Community: Don Pedro

Map Tile 1

Community-Specific CWPP: N/A

Community Risk Rating: Moderate (3.5)

COMMUNITY-SPECIFIC CWPP ACTION PLAN TEMPLATE								
Action	Coordinators	Timeframe	Resources and Notes	Priority	Status	Landscapes	Communities	Response
1.								
2.								
3.								
4.								
5.								
6.								
7.								
8.								
9.								
10.								
11.								
12.								

Don Pedro								
NOTE: Yellow rows are alread	NOTE: Yellow rows are already calculated by No-HARM but values and points are provided in data table for reference							
NOTE: No-HARM rating comprises 40% of the overall points (20 points), BOG* is 60% (30 points plus add'I factors)								
NOTE Green elements to be filled in by field surveys								
Community Topograph	ic Position (Average Inside Comm. Boundary)	Value	Desc. (Points)					
Slope (%)	Lowest = -1 (Flat), Highest = 6 (>42%)		Low (1)					
Aspect	Lowest = -2 (NW to NE), Highest = 4 (SW to SE) (Others medium)		Moderate (1)					
Fire Behavior, Fuels, an	d Burn Probability (Average Within Nearest FireSheds)	Value	Desc. (Points)					
Flame Length (ft)	Lowest = 1, Highest = >50ft	9 feet						
Crown Fire Activity	Lowest = 0 points, Highest = 4 points		Moderate (2)					
Vegetation Cover (%)	Lowest = -3 (0%), Highest = 3 (>85%)		LOW (-1)					
Frequency	Lowest = $-5 (70\%)$, Highest = $5 (>0\%)$	High (22)	High (3)					
Construction and Infras	tructure (Inside Community Boundary)	Description	Points					
Roof Type	Mostly Class A (-2) Mixed/Class B (2) Class C (4)	Mostly A	-1					
Siding/Deck Type	Non-combustible (-1) Mix (2) Combustible (4)	Mix	2					
Defensible Space	Full (-2) Partial (2) None (4)	Full	-2					
Utilities	Underground (0) Mix (1) All Above (2)	All above	2					
Suppression Factors (In	side Community Boundary)	Description	Points					
Ingress/Egress	Multiple Ways In/Out (-2) One Way In/Out (4)	Multiple	-2					
Road Slopes	<15% (0) >=15% (1)	<15%	0					
Road Widths	>24ft, with 2 or more lanes (0) <=24ft (3)	Road width	1					
Adequate Turnarounds	Yes (0) Mixed (0.5) No (1)	Yes	0					
Street Signs	4" Reflective (-2) Mixed (0.5) Not Present (1)	4" Reflect	-2					
Hydrants	Municipal hydrants available (-4) No water available (2)	260GPM	-4					
Dip/Draft Water	Lowest -3 (0mi), Highest = 0 (>5mi)		Low (-2)					
Dist. to Imp. Road	Lowest -2 (0mi), Highest = 2 (>5mi)		Low (-1)					
Dist. to Fire Station	Lowest 0 (0mi), Highest = 50 (> 5mi)		High (33)					
Non-Fuel Elements	Lowest = -10 points, Highest > 0 points		High (0)					
Additional Rating Facto	rs (Put Value in Points if Present)	Poss. Pts.	Points					
Frequent Lightning		1	0					
Close Railroads		1	0					
Mid-slope Homes		0.5	0.5					
Homes on Ridge Tops		0.5	0.5					
Homes in Saddles		0.5	0.5					
Ravines		0.5	0					
Chimnevs		0.5	0					
Many Campfires		2	0					
Frequent Burning (Ag. De	ebris, Wood Stove etc.)	1	1					
Wood Fencing		2	0					
Non-vear-round Population	n	1	1					
Other (Maxium of 2 Points	(Bad Stuff)) Specify	2	0					
Other (Maxium of -2 Points	s (Good Stuff)) Specify:	-2	0					
Final Points		Value	Points					
Overall Rating (RISK50)	Lowest = 1, Highest = 20, from Nearest FireSheds		6					
Overall BOG Rating	Lowest = -15, Highest = 30+ Add'l Rating Factors		-2.5					
TOTAL POINTS			3.5					
		F	Rating					
Final Rating	Moderate <24 High 24-29 Very High >29							
*Boots on Ground (BOG)								

WUI Community: East Westfall Road

Map Tile 5

Community-Specific CWPP: N/A

Community Risk Rating: Very High (33)

COMMUNITY-SPECIFIC CWPP ACTION PLAN TEMPLATE								
Action	Coordinators	Timeframe	Resources and Notes	Priority	Status	Landscapes	Communities	Response
1.								
2.								
3.								
4.								
5.								
6.								
7.								
8.								
9.								
10.								
11.								
12.								

East Westfall Road							
NOTE: Yellow rows are already calculated by No-HARM but values and points are provided in data table for reference							
NOTE: No-HARM rating comprises 40% of the overall points (20 points), BOG* is 60% (30 points plus add'l factors)							
NOTE Green elements	to be filled in by field surveys						
Community Topographi	c Position (Average Inside Comm. Boundary)	Value	Desc. (Points)				
Slope (%)	Lowest = -1 (Flat), Highest = 6 (>42%)		Low (1)				
Aspect	Lowest = -2 (NW to NE), Highest = 4 (SW to SE) (Others medium)		Moderate (1)				
Fire Behavior, Fuels, an	d Burn Probability (Average Within Nearest FireSheds)	Value	Desc. (Points)				
Flame Length (ft)	Lowest = 1, Highest = >50ft	19 feet					
Crown Fire Activity	Lowest = 0 points, Highest = 4 points		High (3)				
Vegetation Cover (%)	Lowest = -3 (0%), Highest = 3 (>85%)		Moderate (0)				
Nonburnable (%)	Lowest = -5 (70%), Highest = 5 (>0%)		High (5)				
Frequency	Lowest = 1, Highest = 29	Moderate (19)					
Construction and Infrast	tructure (Inside Community Boundary)	Description	Points				
Roof Type	Mostly Class A (-2) Mixed/Class B (2) Class C (4)	mixed	2				
Siding/Deck Type	Non-combustible (-1) Mix (2) Combustible (4)	mixed	2				
Defensible Space	Full (-2) Partial (2) None (4)	Partial	2				
	Underground (U) Mix (1) All Above (2)	all above	2				
Suppression Factors (In		Description	Points				
Ingress/Egress	Multiple Ways In/Out (-2) One Way In/Out (4)	multiple	-2				
Road Slopes	<15% (0) >=15% (1)	>15%	1				
Road Widths	>24ft, with 2 or more lanes (0) <=24ft (3)	24' & 14'-16' [3				
Adequate Turnarounds	Yes (0) Mixed (0.5) No (1)	no	1				
Street Signs	4" Reflective (-2) Mixed (0.5) Not Present (1)	mixed	0.5				
Hydrants	Municipal hydrants available (-4) No water available (2)	none	2				
Dip/Draft Water	Lowest -3 (0mi), Highest = 0 (>5mi)		Low (-2)				
Dist. to Imp. Road	Lowest -2 (0mi), Highest = 2 (>5mi)		Low (-1)				
Dist. to Fire Station	Lowest 0 (0mi), Highest = 50 (> 5mi)		Low (13)				
Non-Fuel Elements	Lowest = -10 points, Highest > 0 points						
Additional Rating Factor	rs (Put Value in Points if Present)	Poss. Pts.	Points				
Frequent Lightning		1	1				
Close Railroads		1	0				
Mid-slope Homes		0.5	0.5				
Homes on Ridge Tops		0.5	0.5				
Homes in Saddles		0.5	0.5				
Ravines		0.5	0.5				
Chimpevs		0.5	0.5				
Many Campfires		2	0.0				
Frequent Purping (Ag. Dc	hrie Wood Stove etc.)	1	1				
Mood Fancing (Ag, De		2	1				
Non-voor-round Population			0				
Other (Mexium of 2 Deinte	(Ped Stuff)) Specific Heavy fuel leading one land, steep, side re	2	0				
Other (Maxium of 2 Points	(Bad Stuff)) Specify. Heavy fuel loading.one lane, steep, side to	2	۷				
Other (Maxium of -2 Points		-2 Value	Points				
	Lowest 1 Highest 20 from Nearest Fire Chade	Value					
			13				
Overall BOG Rating	Lowest = -15, Hignest = 30+ Add'l Rating Factors		20				
TOTAL POINTS			33				
			kating				
Final Rating							
	Moderate <24, High 24-29, Very High >29						

WUI Community: El Portal

Map Tile 6

Community-Specific CWPP: N/A

Community Risk Rating: Moderate (18.5)

COMMUNITY-SPECIFIC CWPP ACTION PLAN TEMPLATE								
Action	Coordinators	Timeframe	Resources and Notes	Priority	Status	Landscapes	Communities	Response
1.								
2.								
3.								
4.								
5.								
6.								
7.								
8.								
9.								
10.								
11.								
12.								

El Portal							
NOTE: Yellow rows are alrea	dy calculated by No-HARM but values and points are provided in data	table for reference)				
NOTE: No-HARM rating comprises 40% of the overall points (20 points), BOG* is 60% (30 points plus add'l factors)							
NOTE Green elements to be filled in by field surveys							
Community Topographi	ic Position (Average Inside Comm. Boundary)	Value	Desc. (Points)				
Slope (%)	Lowest = -1 (Flat), Highest = 6 (>42%)		Moderate (3)				
Aspect	Lowest = -2 (NW to NE), Highest = 4 (SW to SE) (Others medium)		High (2)				
Fire Behavior, Fuels, an	d Burn Probability (Average Within Nearest FireSheds)	Value	Desc. (Points)				
Flame Length (ft)	Lowest = 1, Highest = >50ft	10 feet					
Crown Fire Activity	Lowest = 0 points, Highest = 4 points		Low (1)				
Vegetation Cover (%)	Lowest = -3 (0%), Highest = 3 (>85%)		Moderate (-1)				
Nonburnable (%)	Lowest = -5 (70%), Highest = 5 (>0%)		Moderate (1)				
Frequency	Lowest = 1, Highest = 29	High (21)					
Construction and Infras	tructure (Inside Community Boundary)	Description	Points				
Root Type	Mostly Class A (-2) Mixed/Class B (2) Class C (4)	Mixed	2				
Siding/Deck Type		Nixed staings	3				
Utilitios	Full (-2) Patilar (2) None (4)						
Suppression Easters (In	Conderground (0) Mix (1) All Above (2)	Description	Points				
Ingross/Egross		Multiple	Politis				
Read Slance			-2				
Road Widths	<13%(0)>=13%(1)	>15%	1				
	>24it, with 2 of more lanes $(0) <=24it (3)$	<24	3				
Adequate Turnarounds	Yes (0) Mixed (0.5) No (1)	Mixed	0.5				
Street Signs	4" Reflective (-2) Mixed (0.5) Not Present (1)	4" signs	-2				
Hydrants	Municipal hydrants available (-4) No water available (2)	Hydrants	-4				
Dip/Draft Water	Lowest -3 (0mi), Highest = 0 (>5mi)		Low (-2)				
Dist. to Imp. Road	Lowest -2 (0mi), Highest = 2 (>5mi)		Low (-1)				
Dist. to Fire Station	Lowest 0 (0mi), Highest = 50 (> 5mi)		Low (17)				
Non-Fuel Elements	Lowest = -10 points, Highest > 0 points		High (0)				
Additional Rating Factor	rs (Put Value in Points if Present)	Poss. Pts.	Points				
Frequent Lightning		1	0				
Close Railroads		1	0				
Mid-slope Homes		0.5	0.5				
Homes on Ridge Tops		0.5	0				
Homes in Saddles		0.5	0.5				
Ravines		0.5	0.5				
Chimneys		0.5	0.5				
Many Campfires		2	2				
Frequent Burning (Ag, De	ebris, Wood Stove etc.)	1	1				
Wood Fencing		2	2				
Non-vear-round Population	n	1	1				
Other (Maxium of 2 Points	(Bad Stuff)) Specify:Heavy Tourist traffic area	2	2				
Other (Maxium of -2 Points	s (Good Stuff)) Specify:	h that has burn	-2				
Final Points		Value	Points				
Overall Rating (RISK50)	Lowest = 1, Highest = 20, from Nearest FireSheds		7				
Overall BOG Rating	l owest = -15. Highest = 30+ Add'l Rating Factors		11.5				
TOTAL POINTS	·		18.5				
			Rating				
Final Rating	Moderate <24. High 24-29. Very High >29						
*Boots on Ground (BOG)							

WUI Community: Fish Camp

Map Tile 7

Community-Specific CWPP: N/A

Community Risk Rating: Very High (30)

COMMUNITY-SPECIFIC CWPP ACTION PLAN TEMPLATE								
Action	Coordinators	Timeframe	Resources and Notes	Priority	Status	Landscapes	Communities	Response
1.								
2.								
3.								
4.								
5.								
6.								
7.								
8.								
9.								
10.								
11.								
12.								

Fish Camp							
NOTE: Yellow rows are already calculated by No-HARM but values and points are provided in data table for reference							
NOTE: No-HARM rating comprises 40% of the overall points (20 points), BOG* is 60% (30 points plus add'l factors)							
NOTE Green elements to be filled in by field surveys							
Community Topographi	ic Position (Average Inside Comm. Boundary)	Value	Desc. (Points)				
Slope (%)	Lowest = -1 (Flat), Highest = 6 (>42%)		Low(1)				
Aspect	Lowest = -2 (NW to NE), Highest = 4 (SW to SE) (Others medium)		Moderate (1)				
Fire Behavior, Fuels, an	d Burn Probability (Average Within Nearest FireSheds)	Value	Desc. (Points)				
Flame Length (ft)	Lowest = 1, Highest = >50ft	17 feet					
Crown Fire Activity	Lowest = 0 points, Highest = 4 points		Moderate (2)				
Vegetation Cover (%)	Lowest = -3 (0%), Highest = 3 (>85%)		Low (-1)				
Nonburnable (%)	Lowest = -5 (70%), Highest = 5 (>0%)		High (3)				
Frequency	Lowest = 1, Highest = 29	High (15)					
Construction and Infras	tructure (Inside Community Boundary)	Description	Points				
Root Type	Mostly Class A (-2) Mixed/Class B (2) Class C (4)	Maathuwaad	2				
Defensible Space	Full (-2) Partial (2) None (4)	None	2				
Itilitios	$\frac{1}{1000} \frac{1}{1000} \frac{1}{1000} \frac{1}{1000} \frac{1}{1000} \frac{1}{1000} \frac{1}{1000} \frac{1}{1000} \frac{1}{1000} \frac{1}{1000} \frac{1}{10000} \frac{1}{10000} \frac{1}{10000} \frac{1}{10000} \frac{1}{10000} \frac{1}{10000} \frac{1}{100000} \frac{1}{100000} \frac{1}{100000} \frac{1}{1000000} \frac{1}{10000000} \frac{1}{10000000000000000000000000000000000$		4				
Suppression Eactors (In	side Community Boundary)	Description	Points				
Ingross/Egross		Multiple	1 011113				
Read Slopes	(-15%)(-10) = -15%(-1)		0				
Road Widths	<13%(0) >=15%(1)	<15%	0				
	>24it, with 2 of more lanes (0) <=24it (3)	<24	3				
Adequate Turnarounds	Yes (0) Mixed (0.5) No (1)	NO	1				
Street Signs	4" Reflective (-2) Mixed (0.5) Not Present (1)	Mixed	0.5				
Hydrants	Municipal hydrants available (-4) No water available (2)	2"Standpipes	0				
Dip/Draft Water	Lowest -3 (0mi), Highest = 0 (>5mi)		High (-1)				
Dist. to Imp. Road	Lowest -2 (0mi), Highest = 2 (>5mi)		Low (-2)				
Dist. to Fire Station	Lowest 0 (0mi), Highest = 50 (> 5mi)		Low (4)				
Non-Fuel Elements	Lowest = -10 points, Highest > 0 points		High (0)				
Additional Rating Factor	rs (Put Value in Points if Present)	Poss. Pts.	Points				
Frequent Lightning		1	1				
Close Railroads		1	1				
Mid-slope Homes		0.5	0.5				
Homes on Ridge Tops		0.5	0				
Homes in Saddles		0.5	0.5				
Ravines		0.5	0.5				
Chimnevs		0.5	0				
Many Campfires		2					
Frequent Burning (Ag. De	ebris. Wood Stove etc.)	1	1				
Wood Fencing		2	0				
Non-vear-round Population	0	1	3				
Other (Maxium of 2 Points	(Bad Stuff)) Specify: Homes closely spaced. Ecrest is overstock	2	2				
Other (Maxium of -2 Points	(Good Stuff)) Specify: Forest below Fish Camp destroyed by	-2	2				
Final Points	s (Good Stail)) Specilyr orest below rish camp destroyed by	Value	Points				
Overall Rating (RISK50)	Lowest = 1 Highest = 20 from Nearest FireSheds	raide	8				
Overall BOG Pating	Lowest15 Highest - 30+ Add'l Pating Factors		22				
			20				
			Rating				
Final Rating	Moderate <24, High 24-29, Very High >29						
*Boots on Ground (BOG)							

WUI Community: Foresta

Map Tile 6

Community-Specific CWPP: N/A

Community Risk Rating: High (24)

COMMUNITY-SPECIFIC CWPP ACTION PLAN TEMPLATE								
Action	Coordinators	Timeframe	Resources and Notes	Priority	Status	Landscapes	Communities	Response
1.								
2.								
3.								
4.								
5.								
6.								
7.								
8.								
9.								
10.								
11.								
12.								

Foresta						
NOTE: Yellow rows are already calculated by No-HARM but values and points are provided in data table for reference						
NOTE: No-HARM rating comprises 40% of the overall points (20 points), BOG* is 60% (30 points plus add'l factors)						
NOTE Green elements to be filled in by field surveys						
Community Topograph	ic Position (Average Inside Comm. Boundary)	Value	Desc. (Points)			
Slope (%)	Lowest = -1 (Flat), Highest = 6 (>42%)		Low (0)			
Aspect	Lowest = -2 (NW to NE), Highest = 4 (SW to SE) (Others medium)		Low (0)			
Fire Behavior, Fuels, an	d Burn Probability (Average Within Nearest FireSheds)	Value	Desc. (Points)			
Flame Length (ft)	Lowest = 1, Highest = >50ft	15 feet				
Crown Fire Activity	Lowest = 0 points, Highest = 4 points		Moderate (2)			
Vegetation Cover (%)	Lowest = -3 (0%), Highest = 3 (>85%)		Moderate (0)			
Nonburnable (%)	Lowest = -5 (70%), Highest = 5 (>0%)		High (5)			
Frequency	Lowest = 1, Highest = 29	High (21)				
Construction and Infras	tructure (Inside Community Boundary)	Description	Points			
Roof Type	Mostly Class A (-2) Mixed/Class B (2) Class C (4)	Mixed	2			
Siding/Deck Type	Non-combustible (-1) Mix (2) Combustible (4)	Mixed	2			
Defensible Space	Full (-2) Partial (2) None (4)	Full	-2			
Otilities	Underground (0) Mix (1) All Above (2)	Above	2			
Suppression Factors (In	iside Community Boundary)	Description	Points			
Ingress/Egress	Multiple Ways In/Out (-2) One Way In/Out (4)	Multiple	-2			
Road Slopes	<15% (0) >=15% (1)	<15%	0			
Road Widths	>24ft, with 2 or more lanes (0) <=24ft (3)	<24'	3			
Adequate Turnarounds	Yes (0) Mixed (0.5) No (1)	No	1			
Street Signs	4" Reflective (-2) Mixed (0.5) Not Present (1)	Mixed	0.5			
Hydrants	Municipal hydrants available (-4) No water available (2)	None	2			
Dip/Draft Water	Lowest -3 (0mi), Highest = 0 (>5mi)		Low (-2)			
Dist. to Imp. Road	Lowest -2 (0mi), Highest = 2 (>5mi)		Low (-1)			
Dist. to Fire Station	Lowest 0 (0mi), Highest = 50 (> 5mi)		Moderate (35)			
Non-Fuel Elements	Lowest = -10 points, Highest > 0 points		High (0)			
Additional Rating Facto	rs (Put Value in Points if Present)	Poss. Pts.	Points			
Frequent Lightning		1	1			
Close Railroads		1	0			
Mid-slope Homes		0.5	0.5			
Homes on Ridge Tops		0.5	0			
Homes in Saddles		0.5	0			
Ravines		0.5	0			
Chimneys		0.5	0			
Many Campfires		2	0			
Frequent Burning (Ag. De	abris Wood Stove etc.)	1	0			
Mood Econoing		2	i			
Non-vear-round Population	n	1	0			
Other (Mexium of 2 Deinte	(Ped Stuff)) Specify, No level suppression assets. Still a dense	2	<u>ו</u>			
Other (Maxium of 2 Points	(Dead Stuff)) Specifyivo local suupression assets. Still a dense	2	2			
Other (Maxium of -2 Points	s (Good Stuff)) Specify:_Foresta has been burned over several	-2	- Deinte			
	Lowest 4 Lighast 20 from Namest Fire Obarda	value	Points			
	Lowest = 1, Highest = 20, from Nearest FireSheds		11			
Overall BOG Rating	Lowest = -15, Highest = 30+ Add'l Rating Factors		13			
TOTAL POINTS			24			
			Rating			
Final Rating	Moderate <24 High 24-29 Very High >29					
*Boots on Ground (BOG)						

WUI Community: Greeley Hill

Map Tile 2

Community-Specific CWPP: N/A

Community Risk Rating: High (29)

COMMUNITY-SPECIFIC CWPP ACTION PLAN TEMPLATE								
Action	Coordinators	Timeframe	Resources and Notes	Priority	Status	Landscapes	Communities	Response
1.								
2.								
3.								
4.								
5.								
6.								
7.								
8.								
9.								
10.								
11.								
12.								

Greeley Hill							
NOTE: Yellow rows are already calculated by No-HARM but values and points are provided in data table for reference							
NOTE: No-HARM rating comprises 40% of the overall points (20 points), BOG* is 60% (30 points plus add'l factors)							
NOTE Green elements	to be filled in by field surveys						
Community Topograph	ic Position (Average Inside Comm. Boundary)	Value	Desc. (Points)				
Slope (%)	Lowest = -1 (Flat), Highest = 6 (>42%)		Low (1)				
Aspect	Lowest = -2 (NW to NE), Highest = 4 (SW to SE) (Others medium)		Low (0)				
Fire Behavior, Fuels, an	d Burn Probability (Average Within Nearest FireSheds)	Value	Desc. (Points)				
Flame Length (ft)	Lowest = 1, Highest = >50ft	34 feet					
Crown Fire Activity	Lowest = 0 points, Highest = 4 points		High (3)				
Vegetation Cover (%)	Lowest = -3 (0%), Highest = 3 (>85%)		Moderate (0)				
Frequency	Lowest = -5 (70%), Highest = 5 ($>0\%$)	Modorato (10)	High (4)				
Construction and Infras	Lowest = 1, Highest = 29	Description	Points				
Roof Type	Mostly Class A (-2) Mixed/Class B (2) Class C (4)	Mixed	2				
Siding/Deck Type	Non-compustible (-1) Mix (2) Compustible (4)	Mixed	2				
Defensible Space	Full (-2) Partial (2) None (4)	Partial	2				
Utilities	Underground (0) Mix (1) All Above (2)	All above	2				
Suppression Factors (In	side Community Boundary)	Description	Points				
Ingress/Egress	Multiple Ways In/Out (-2) One Way In/Out (4)	Multiple	-2				
Road Slopes	<15% (0) >=15% (1)	<15%	0				
Road Widths	>24ft, with 2 or more lanes (0) <=24ft (3)	<24'	3				
Adequate Turnarounds	Yes (0) Mixed (0.5) No (1)	No	3				
Street Signs	4" Reflective (-2) Mixed (0.5) Not Present (1)	Mixed	0.5				
Hydrants	Municipal hydrants available (-4) No water available (2)	None					
Dip/Draft Water	Lowest -3 (0mi) Highest = 0 (>5mi)	None					
Dist. to Imp. Road	Lowest -2 (0mi), Highest = 2 (>5mi)		Low (-1)				
Dist to Fire Station	Lowest 0 (0mi) Highest = 50 (> 5mi)		Moderate (27)				
Non-Euel Elements	Lowest -10 points. Highest > 0 points		High (-1)				
Additional Rating Factor	rs (Put Value in Points if Present)	Poss Pts	Points				
Frequent Lightning		1	1				
		1	1 0				
Mid along a llonge		0.5	0				
Nid-slope Homes		0.5	0.5				
Homes on Ridge Tops		0.5	0.5				
Homes in Saddles		0.5	0.5				
Ravines		0.5	0.5				
Chimneys		0.5	0.5				
Many Campfires		2	2				
Frequent Burning (Ag, De	ebris, Wood Stove etc.)	1	1				
Wood Fencing		2	1				
Non-year-round Population	n	1	1				
Other (Maxium of 2 Points	(Bad Stuff)) Specify:_Roads are encroached by brush, many ar	2					
Other (Maxium of -2 Points	s (Good Stuff)) Specify: Fuel breaks around the entire area with	-2					
Final Points		Value	Points				
Overall Rating (RISK50)	Lowest = 1, Highest = 20, from Nearest FireSheds		14				
Overall BOG Rating	Lowest = -15, Highest = 30+ Add'l Rating Factors		15				
TOTAL POINTS			29				
		F	Rating				
Final Rating	Moderate <24, High 24-29, Very High >29						
*Boots on Ground (BOG)							

WUI Community: Hirsch Road

Map Tile 5

Community-Specific CWPP: N/A

Community Risk Rating: Moderate (21)

COMMUNITY-SPEC	COMMUNITY-SPECIFIC CWPP ACTION PLAN TEMPLATE							
Action	Coordinators	Timeframe	Resources and Notes	Priority	Status	Landscapes	Communities	Response
1.								
2.								
3.								
4.								
5.								
6.								
7.								
8.								
9.								
10.								
11.								
12.								

Hirsch Road							
NOTE: Yellow rows are alread	dy calculated by No-HARM but values and points are provided in data	table for reference	9				
NOTE: No-HARM rating comprises 40% of the overall points (20 points), BOG* is 60% (30 points plus add'l factors)							
NOTE Green elements	to be filled in by field surveys						
Community Topographi	ic Position (Average Inside Comm. Boundary)	Value	Desc. (Points)				
Slope (%)	Lowest = -1 (Flat), Highest = 6 (>42%)		Low(1)				
Aspect	Lowest = -2 (NW to NE), Highest = 4 (SW to SE) (Others medium)		Moderate (1)				
Fire Behavior, Fuels, an	d Burn Probability (Average Within Nearest FireSheds)	Value	Desc. (Points)				
Flame Length (ft)	Lowest = 1, Highest = >50ft	15 feet					
Crown Fire Activity	Lowest = 0 points, Highest = 4 points		Moderate (2)				
Vegetation Cover (%)	Lowest = -3 (0%), Highest = 3 (>85%)		Moderate (0)				
Nonburnable (%)	Lowest = -5 (70%), Highest = 5 (>0%)	High (22)	Hign (5)				
Frequency Construction and Infras	Lowest = 1, Highest = 29	High (22)	Pointe				
Roof Type	Mostly Class A (-2) Mixed/Class B (2) Class C (4)	Mixed	Points				
Siding/Deck Type	Non-compustible (-1) Mix (2) Compustible (4)	Mixed	2				
Defensible Space	Full (-2) Partial (2) None (4)	Partial	2				
Utilities	Underground (0) Mix (1) All Above (2)	All above	2				
Suppression Factors (In	side Community Boundary)	Description	Points				
Ingress/Egress	Multiple Ways In/Out (-2) One Way In/Out (4)	Multiple	-2				
Road Slopes	<15% (0) >=15% (1)	<15%	0				
Road Widths	>24ft, with 2 or more lanes (0) <=24ft (3)	>24' & Mix	3				
Adequate Turnarounds	Yes (0) Mixed (0.5) No (1)	no	1				
Street Signs	4" Reflective (-2) Mixed (0.5) Not Present (1)	mixed	0.5				
Hydrants	Municipal hydrants available (-4) No water available (2)	none	-4				
Dip/Draft Water	Lowest -3 (0mi). Highest = 0 (>5mi)	nono	High (-1)				
Dist. to Imp. Road	Lowest -2 (0mi), Highest = 2 (>5mi)		Low (-1)				
Dist. to Fire Station	Lowest 0 (0mi), Highest = $50 (> 5mi)$		High (39)				
Non-Fuel Elements	Lowest = -10 points. Highest > 0 points		High (0)				
Additional Rating Factor	rs (Put Value in Points if Present)	Poss. Pts.	Points				
Frequent Lightning		1	0				
Close Railroads		1	0				
Mid-slope Homes		0.5	0.5				
Homes on Ridge Tops		0.5	0.5				
Homes in Saddles		0.5	0.5				
Ravines		0.5	0.5				
Chimneys		0.5	0.5				
Many Campfires		2	0.0				
Frequent Burning (Ag. De	whis Wood Stove etc.)	- 1	0				
Wood Fencing		2	0				
Non-vear-round Population	0	- 1	0				
Other (Maxium of 2 Points	(Bad Stuff)) Specify: Moderate to heavy fuel loads. More than	2	2				
Other (Maxium of -2 Points	s (Good Stuff)) Specify:	-2					
Final Points		Value	Points				
Overall Rating (RISK50)	Lowest = 1, Highest = 20, from Nearest FireSheds		12				
Overall BOG Rating	Lowest = -15, Highest = 30+ Add'l Rating Factors		9				
TOTAL POINTS			21				
		F	Rating				
Final Pating							
	Moderate <24, High 24-29, Very High >29						
*Boots on Ground (BOG)							

WUI Community: Hornitos

Map Tile 3

Community-Specific CWPP: N/A

Community Risk Rating: Moderate (22.5)

COMMUNITY-SPEC	COMMUNITY-SPECIFIC CWPP ACTION PLAN TEMPLATE							
Action	Coordinators	Timeframe	Resources and Notes	Priority	Status	Landscapes	Communities	Response
1.								
2.								
3.								
4.								
5.								
6.								
7.								
8.								
9.								
10.								
11.								
12.								

Hornitos							
NOTE: Yellow rows are already calculated by No-HARM but values and points are provided in data table for reference							
NOTE: No-HARM rating comprises 40% of the overall points (20 points), BOG* is 60% (30 points plus add'l factors)							
NOTE Green elements	to be filled in by field surveys						
Community Topographi	ic Position (Average Inside Comm. Boundary)	Value	Desc. (Points)				
Slope (%)	Lowest = -1 (Flat), Highest = 6 (>42%)		Low(0)				
Aspect	Lowest = -2 (NW to NE), Highest = 4 (SW to SE) (Others medium)		Moderate (0)				
Fire Behavior, Fuels, an	d Burn Probability (Average Within Nearest FireSheds)	Value	Desc. (Points)				
Flame Length (ft)	Lowest = 1, Highest = >50ft	6 feet					
Crown Fire Activity	Lowest = 0 points, Highest = 4 points		Low (1)				
Vegetation Cover (%)	Lowest = -3 (0%), Highest = 3 (>85%)		Low (-1)				
Nonburnable (%)	Lowest = -5 (70%), Highest = 5 (>0%)		Moderate (2)				
Frequency	Lowest = 1, Highest = 29	High (24)					
Construction and Infras	tructure (Inside Community Boundary)	Description	Points				
Roof Type	Mostly Class A (-2) Mixed/Class B (2) Class C (4)	IVIIXEd	3				
Siding/Deck Type	Non-compustible (-1) Mix (2) Compustible (4)	Nono	Z				
Utilitios	Full (-2) Partial (2) None (4)		4				
Suppression Easters (In	cide Community Roundary)	All above	2 Points				
Suppression Factors (in	Nultiple Ways In Out (2) One Way In Out (4)	Description	Points				
			-2				
Road Slopes	<15% (0) >=15% (1)	<15%	0				
Road Widths	>24ft, with 2 or more lanes (0) <=24ft (3)	<24'	3				
Adequate Turnarounds	Yes (0) Mixed (0.5) No (1)	No	1				
Street Signs	4" Reflective (-2) Mixed (0.5) Not Present (1)	Mixed	0.5				
Hydrants	Municipal hydrants available (-4) No water available (2)	No	2				
Dip/Draft Water	Lowest -3 (0mi), Highest = 0 (>5mi)		Low (-2)				
Dist. to Imp. Road	Lowest -2 (0mi), Highest = 2 (>5mi)		Low (-2)				
Dist. to Fire Station	Lowest 0 (0mi), Highest = 50 (> 5mi)		Low (4)				
Non-Fuel Elements	Lowest = -10 points, Highest > 0 points		High (0)				
Additional Rating Factor	rs (Put Value in Points if Present)	Poss. Pts.	Points				
Frequent Lightning		1	0				
Close Railroads		1	0				
Mid-slope Homes		0.5	0				
Homes on Ridge Tops		0.5	0				
Homes in Saddles		0.5	0				
Ravines		0.5	0				
Chimneys		0.5	0				
Many Campfires		2	0				
Frequent Burning (Ag. De	obris. Wood Stove etc.)	1	0				
Wood Fencing		2	1				
Non-vear-round Population	0	1	0				
Other (Maxium of 2 Points	(Rad Stuff)) Specify: Town is yory tightly spaced with soveral de	2	0 				
Other (Maxium of 2 Points	(Dad Stuff)) Specify: Town is very lightly spaced with several de	_2	2				
Final Points		Value	Points				
Overall Rating (RISK50)	l owest = 1. Highest = 20. from Nearest FireSheds	Value	3				
Overall BOG Rating	1 owest = -15 Highest = 30+ Add'L Rating Factors		19.5				
			22.5				
			Rating				
Final Rating	Moderate <24. High 24-29. Very High >29						
*Boots on Ground (BOG)							

WUI Community: Hunters Valley

Map Tile 3

Community-Specific CWPP: N/A

Community Risk Rating: Moderate (22.5)

COMMUNITY-SPECIFIC CWPP ACTION PLAN TEMPLATE								
Action	Coordinators	Timeframe	Resources and Notes	Priority	Status	Landscapes	Communities	Response
1.								
2.								
3.								
4.								
5.								
6.								
7.								
8.								
9.								
10.								
11.								
12.								

Hunters Valley							
NOTE: Yellow rows are already calculated by No-HARM but values and points are provided in data table for reference							
NOTE: No-HARM rating comprises 40% of the overall points (20 points), BOG* is 60% (30 points plus add'l factors)							
NOTE Green elements	to be filled in by field surveys						
Community Topograph	ic Position (Average Inside Comm. Boundary)	Value	Desc. (Points)				
Slope (%)	Lowest = -1 (Flat), Highest = 6 (>42%)		Low (1)				
Aspect	Lowest = -2 (NW to NE), Highest = 4 (SW to SE) (Others medium)		Moderate (1)				
Fire Behavior, Fuels, an	d Burn Probability (Average Within Nearest FireSheds)	Value	Desc. (Points)				
Flame Length (ft)	Lowest = 1, Highest = >50ft	17 feet					
Crown Fire Activity	Lowest = 0 points, Highest = 4 points		Moderate (2)				
Vegetation Cover (%)	Lowest = -3 (0%), Highest = 3 (>85%)		Moderate (0)				
Nonburnable (%)	Lowest = -5 (70%), Highest = 5 (>0%)	Llink (22)	High (5)				
Frequency	Lowest = 1, Highest = 29	Hign (22)	Deinte				
Poof Type	Mostly Class A (-2) Mixed/Class B (2) Class C (4)	Mixed	Points				
Siding/Deck Type	Non-compustible (-1) Mix (2) Compustible (4)	Mixed	2				
Defensible Space	Full (-2) Partial (2) None (4)	None	2				
Utilities	Underground (0) Mix (1) All Above (2)	All above	2				
Suppression Factors (In	side Community Boundary)	Description	Points				
Ingress/Egress	Multiple Ways In/Out (-2) One Way In/Out (4)	Multiple	-2				
Road Slopes	<15% (0) >=15% (1)	<15%	2				
Road Widths	>24 ft with 2 or more lanes (0) <-24 ft (3)	< 24'	0				
Adequate Turnarounds	Ves (0) Mixed (0.5) No (1)	Nived	0.5				
Street Signs	4" Pofloctive (2) Mixed (0.5) Not Present (1)	Mixed	0.5				
Street Signs	4 Reflective (-2) Miked (0.5) Not Fresent (1)	Nere	0.5				
nyarants	Numicipal hydrants available (-4) No water available (2)	None	Z				
			Hign (-1)				
Dist. to Imp. Road	Lowest -2 (0mi), Highest = 2 (>5mi)		Low (-1)				
Dist. to Fire Station	Lowest 0 (0mi), Highest = 50 (> 5mi)		High (42)				
Non-Fuel Elements	Lowest = -10 points, Highest > 0 points		High (0)				
Additional Rating Facto	rs (Put Value in Points if Present)	Poss. Pts.	Points				
Frequent Lightning		1	0				
Close Railroads		1	0				
Mid-slope Homes		0.5	0.5				
Homes on Ridge Tops		0.5	0				
Homes in Saddles		0.5	0				
Ravines		0.5	0				
Chimneys		0.5	0				
Many Campfires		2	0				
Frequent Burning (Ag, De	ebris, Wood Stove etc.)	1	1				
Wood Fencing		2	0				
Non-year-round Population	n	1	1				
Other (Maxium of 2 Points	(Bad Stuff)) Specify: Heavy fuel loading. No recent fire history	2	0				
Other (Maxium of -2 Points	s (Good Stuff)) Specify:	-2	-1				
Final Points		Value	Points				
Overall Rating (RISK50)	Lowest = 1, Highest = 20, from Nearest FireSheds		14				
Overall BOG Rating	l owest = -15. Highest = 30+ Add'L Rating Factors		8.5				
			22.5				
		F	Rating				
Final Rating	Extreme >XX						
*Boots on Ground (BOG)							

WUI Community: Incline

Map Tile 6

Community-Specific CWPP: N/A

Community Risk Rating: Very High (31)

COMMUNITY-SPECIFIC CWPP ACTION PLAN TEMPLATE								
Action	Coordinators	Timeframe	Resources and Notes	Priority	Status	Landscapes	Communities	Response
13.								
14.								
15.								
16.								
17.								
18.								
19.								
20.								
21.								
22.								
23.								
24.								

Incline							
NOTE: Yellow rows are already calculated by No-HARM but values and points are provided in data table for reference							
NOTE: No-HARM rating comprises 40% of the overall points (20 points), BOG* is 60% (30 points plus add'l factors)							
NOTE Green elements	to be filled in by field surveys						
Community Topographi	ic Position (Average Inside Comm. Boundary)	Value	Desc. (Points)				
Slope (%)	Lowest = -1 (Flat), Highest = 6 (>42%)		Moderate (2)				
Aspect	Lowest = -2 (NW to NE), Highest = 4 (SW to SE) (Others medium)		Moderate (2)				
Fire Behavior, Fuels, an	d Burn Probability (Average Within Nearest FireSheds)	Value	Desc. (Points)				
Flame Length (ft)	Lowest = 1, Highest = >50ft	9 feet					
Crown Fire Activity	Lowest = 0 points, Highest = 4 points		Moderate (2)				
Vegetation Cover (%)	Lowest = -3 (0%), Highest = 3 (>85%)		Low (-2)				
Nonburnable (%)	Lowest = -5 (70%), Highest = 5 (>0%)		Moderate (2)				
Frequency	Lowest = 1, Highest = 29	Hign (20)	Delete				
Construction and Infras	tructure (Inside Community Boundary)	Description	Points				
Siding/Dock Type	MOSILY Class A (-2) MIXED/Class B (2) Class C (4) Non-compustible (-1) Mix (2) Compustible (4)	Mixed	2				
Defensible Space	Full (-2) Partial (2) None (4)	None	Z				
Utilities	$\frac{1}{1} \ln \left(\frac{-2}{2}\right) = \frac{1}{1} \ln \left(\frac{2}{1}\right) + \frac{1}{1} \ln \left(\frac{1}{2}\right) + 1$						
Suppression Factors (In	side Community Boundary)	Description	Points				
Ingress/Egress	Multiple Ways In/Out (-2) One Way In/Out (4)	Multiple/ Ope	1				
Road Slones	<15% (0) >-15% (1)		1 0				
Road Widths	-24ft with 2 or more lange (0) $= -24ft$ (3)	< 13 /0	0				
Adagusta Turnaroundo	22411, with 2 of more ranges (0) <=2411 (3)	<24	3				
		NO	1				
Street Signs	4" Reflective (-2) Mixed (0.5) Not Present (1)	Mixed	0.5				
Hydrants	Municipal hydrants available (-4) No water available (2)	None	2				
Dip/Draft Water	Lowest -3 (0mi), Highest = 0 (>5mi)		Low (-3)				
Dist. to Imp. Road	Lowest -2 (0mi), Highest = 2 (>5mi)		Low (-2)				
Dist. to Fire Station	Lowest 0 (0mi), Highest = 50 (> 5mi)		High (47)				
Non-Fuel Elements	Lowest = -10 points, Highest > 0 points		High (0)				
Additional Rating Factor	rs (Put Value in Points if Present)	Poss. Pts.	Points				
Frequent Lightning		1	0				
Close Railroads		1	0				
Mid-slope Homes		0.5	0.5				
Homes on Ridge Tops		0.5	0				
Homes in Saddles		0.5	0				
Ravines		0.5	0.5				
Chimneys		0.5	0.5				
Many Campfires		2	2				
Frequent Burning (Ag, De	ebris, Wood Stove etc.)	1	1				
Wood Fencing		2	0				
Non-year-round Population	n	1	1				
Other (Maxium of 2 Points	(Bad Stuff)) Specify: Road out of Indian Flat not marked. Steen	2	2				
Other (Maxium of -2 Points	s (Good Stuff)) Specify: Has been burned over, sits on the canve	-2	-1				
Final Points		Value	Points				
Overall Rating (RISK50)	Lowest = 1, Highest = 20, from Nearest FireSheds		7				
Overall BOG Rating	Lowest = -15, Highest = 30+ Add'l Rating Factors		24				
TOTAL POINTS			31				
		F	Rating				
Final Dating							
Final Rating	Moderate <24, High 24-29, Very High >29						
*Boots on Ground (BOG)							

WUI Community: Indian Peak Road

Map Tile 4,5

Community-Specific CWPP: N/A

Community Risk Rating: Very High (31.5)

COMMUNITY-SPECIFIC CWPP ACTION PLAN TEMPLATE								
Action	Coordinators	Timeframe	Resources and Notes	Priority	Status	Landscapes	Communities	Response
1.								
2.								
3.								
4.								
5.								
6.								
7.								
8.								
9.								
10.								
11.								
12.								

Indian Peak Road					
NOTE: Yellow rows are alread	dy calculated by No-HARM but values and points are provided in data	table for reference	e		
NOTE: No-HARM rating comp	prises 40% of the overall points (20 points), BOG* is 60% (30 points plue	s add'l factors)			
NOTE Green elements	to be filled in by field surveys				
Community Topographi	ic Position (Average Inside Comm. Boundary)	Value	Desc. (Points)		
Slope (%)	Lowest = -1 (Flat), Highest = 6 (>42%)		Low (0)		
Aspect	Lowest = -2 (NW to NE), Highest = 4 (SW to SE) (Others medium)		Moderate (2)		
Fire Behavior, Fuels, an	d Burn Probability (Average Within Nearest FireSheds)	Value	Desc. (Points)		
Flame Length (ft)	Lowest = 1, Highest = >50ft	16 feet			
Crown Fire Activity	Lowest = 0 points, Highest = 4 points		Moderate (2)		
Vegetation Cover (%)	Lowest = -3 (0%), Highest = 3 (>85%)		Moderate (0)		
Nonburnable (%)	Lowest = -5 (70%), Highest = 5 (>0%)		High (5)		
Frequency	Lowest = 1, Highest = 29	High (23)			
Construction and Infras	tructure (Inside Community Boundary)	Description	Points		
Root Type	Mostly Class A (-2) Mixed/Class B (2) Class C (4)	IVIIXED Mixed	2		
Siding/Deck Type	Non-combustible (-1) Mix (2) Combustible (4)	Nono	Z		
Utilitios	$\frac{1}{1000} = \frac{1}{1000} = \frac{1}{1000} = \frac{1}{1000} = \frac{1}{1000} = \frac{1}{1000} = \frac{1}{1000} = \frac{1}{10000} = \frac{1}{10000} = \frac{1}{100000} = \frac{1}{10000000000000000000000000000000000$		4		
Suppression Eactors (In	side Community Boundary)	Description	Points		
Ingross/Egross		Multiple	1 011113		
Road Slopes	(1) = (1) = (1)		-2		
Road Widths	<13% (0) >=13% (1)	<15%	0.5		
	>24it, with 2 of more raries (0) <=24it (3)	>24	3		
Adequate Turnarounds	Yes (0) Mixed (0.5) NO (1)		0.5		
Street Signs	4" Reflective (-2) Mixed (0.5) Not Present (1)	4" signs	-2		
Hydrants	Municipal hydrants available (-4) No water available (2)	none	2		
Dip/Draft Water	Lowest -3 (0mi), Highest = 0 (>5mi)		High (-1)		
Dist. to Imp. Road	Lowest -2 (0mi), Highest = 2 (>5mi)		Moderate (0)		
Dist. to Fire Station	Lowest 0 (0mi), Highest = 50 (> 5mi)		High (50)		
Non-Fuel Elements	Lowest = -10 points, Highest > 0 points		High (0)		
Additional Rating Factor	rs (Put Value in Points if Present)	Poss. Pts.	Points		
Frequent Lightning		1	0		
Close Railroads		1	0		
Mid-slope Homes		0.5	0.5		
Homes on Ridge Tops		0.5	0.5		
Homes in Saddles		0.5	0.5		
Ravines		0.5	0.5		
Chimneys		0.5	0.5		
Many Campfires		2	0		
Frequent Burning (Ag, De	ebris, Wood Stove etc.)	1	1		
Wood Fencing		2	0		
Non-vear-round Population	n	1	1		
Other (Maxium of 2 Points	(Bad Stuff)) Specify:Heavy fuel loading with a limited fire history	2	2		
Other (Maxium of -2 Points	s (Good Stuff)) Specify:	-2	0		
Final Points		Value	Points		
Overall Rating (RISK50)	Lowest = 1, Highest = 20, from Nearest FireSheds		13		
Overall BOG Rating	l owest = -15. Highest = 30+ Add'l Rating Factors		18.5		
TOTAL POINTS			31.5		
		F	Rating		
Final Rating	Moderate <24. High 24-29. Very High >29				
*Boots on Ground (BOG)					

WUI Community: Jerseydale

Map Tile 5,6

Community-Specific CWPP: Yes

Community Risk Rating: High (27.5)

COMMUNITY-SPECIFIC CWPP ACTION PLAN TEMPLATE								
Action	Coordinators	Timeframe	Resources and Notes	Priority	Status	Landscapes	Communities	Response
1.								
2.								
3.								
4.								
5.								
6.								
7.								
8.								
9.								
10.								
11.								
12.								

Jerseydale							
NOTE: Yellow rows are already calculated by No-HARM but values and points are provided in data table for reference							
NOTE: No-HARM rating comp	prises 40% of the overall points (20 points), BOG* is 60% (30 points plu	s add'l factors)					
NOTE Green elements	to be filled in by field surveys						
Community Topographi	ic Position (Average Inside Comm. Boundary)	Value	Desc. (Points)				
Slope (%)	Lowest = -1 (Flat), Highest = 6 (>42%)		Low(0)				
Aspect	Lowest = -2 (NW to NE), Highest = 4 (SW to SE) (Others medium)		Moderate (2)				
Fire Behavior, Fuels, an	d Burn Probability (Average Within Nearest FireSheds)	Value	Desc. (Points)				
Flame Length (ft)	Lowest = 1, Highest = >50ft	16 feet					
Crown Fire Activity	Lowest = 0 points, Highest = 4 points		Moderate (2)				
Vegetation Cover (%)	Lowest = -3 (0%), Highest = 3 (>85%)		Moderate (0)				
Nonburnable (%)	Lowest = -5 (70%), Highest = 5 (>0%)	Marlanata (40)	High (5)				
Frequency	Lowest = 1, Highest = 29	Noderate (19)	Deinte				
Construction and Infras	Mostly Close A (2) Mixed (Close B (2) Close C (4)	Description	Points				
Siding/Deck Type	Non-compustible (-1) Mix (2) Compustible (4)	Mixed	2				
Defensible Snace	Full (-2) Partial (2) None (4)	Full	-2				
Utilities	$\frac{1}{1} \ln (2) + \ln \ln (2) + \ln \ln (4)$	All above	2				
Suppression Factors (In	side Community Boundary)	Description	Points				
Ingress/Egress	Multiple Ways In/Out (-2) One Way In/Out (4)		1				
Road Slopes	<15% (0) >-15% (1)	<15%	4				
Road Widths	>24 ft with 2 or more lanes (0) <-24 ft (3)	<7.0%	0				
Adaquata Turnarounde	V_{22} (0) Mixed (0.5) No.(1)	<24 Mixed					
Auequate Turnarounus	(1) Poflective (2) Nived (0.5) Net Present (1)	Mixed	0.5				
Street Signs	4 Reflective (-2) Mixed (0.5) Not Present (1)		0.5				
	Municipal hydrants available (-4) No water available (2)	1.5"Stand pipe	0				
Dip/Draft water	Lowest -3 (Umi), Highest = 0 (>5mi)		LOW (-2)				
Dist. to Imp. Road	Lowest -2 (0mi), Highest = 2 (>5mi)		Moderate (0)				
Dist. to Fire Station	Lowest 0 (0mi), Highest = 50 (> 5mi)		Low (12)				
Non-Fuel Elements	Lowest = -10 points, Highest > 0 points		High (0)				
Additional Rating Factor	rs (Put Value in Points if Present)	Poss. Pts.	Points				
Frequent Lightning		1	1				
Close Railroads		1	0				
Mid-slope Homes		0.5	0.5				
Homes on Ridge Tops		0.5	0.5				
Homes in Saddles		0.5	0.5				
Ravines		0.5	0.5				
Chimneys		0.5	0.5				
Many Campfires		2	2				
Frequent Burning (Ag, De	ebris, Wood Stove etc.)	1	1				
Wood Fencing		2	0				
Non-year-round Population	n	1	1				
Other (Maxium of 2 Points	(Bad Stuff)) Specify:	2	0				
Other (Maxium of -2 Points	s (Good Stuff)) Specify:_80% of area have have done fuel reduc	-2	-2				
Final Points		Value	Points				
Overall Rating (RISK50)	Lowest = 1, Highest = 20, from Nearest FireSheds		10				
Overall BOG Rating	Lowest = -15, Highest = 30+ Add'l Rating Factors		17.5				
TOTAL POINTS			27.5				
		F	Rating				
Final Pating							
	Moderate <24, High 24-29, Very High >29						
*Boots on Ground (BOG)							

WUI Community: Kemble Road

Map Tile 7

Community-Specific CWPP: N/A

Community Risk Rating: Very High (32)

COMMUNITY-SPECIFIC CWPP ACTION PLAN TEMPLATE								
Action	Coordinators	Timeframe	Resources and Notes	Priority	Status	Landscapes	Communities	Response
1.								
2.								
3.								
4.								
5.								
6.								
7.								
8.								
9.								
10.								
11.								
12.								

Kemble Road								
NOTE: Yellow rows are alread	NOTE: Yellow rows are already calculated by No-HARM but values and points are provided in data table for reference							
NOTE: No-HARM rating comp	NOTE: No-HARM rating comprises 40% of the overall points (20 points), BOG* is 60% (30 points plus add'I factors)							
NOTE Green elements to be filled in by field surveys								
Community Topograph	ic Position (Average Inside Comm. Boundary)	Value	Desc. (Points)					
Slope (%)	Lowest = -1 (Flat), Highest = 6 (>42%)		Low (1)					
Aspect	Lowest = -2 (NW to NE), Highest = 4 (SW to SE) (Others medium)		Low (0)					
Fire Behavior, Fuels, an	d Burn Probability (Average Within Nearest FireSheds)	Value	Desc. (Points)					
Flame Length (ft)	Lowest = 1, Highest = >50ft	21 feet						
Crown Fire Activity	Lowest = 0 points, Highest = 4 points		High (3)					
Vegetation Cover (%)	Lowest = -3 (0%), Highest = 3 (>85%)		Moderate (0)					
Nonburnable (%)	Lowest = -5 (70%), Highest = 5 (>0%)	Mederate (16)	Hign (5)					
Frequency Construction and Infras	Lowest = 1, Hignest = 29	Noderate (16)	Pointo					
Roof Type	Mostly Class A (-2) Mixed/Class B (2) Class C (4)	Mixed	2					
Siding/Deck Type	Non-compustible (-1) Mix (2) Compustible (4)	Mixed	2					
Defensible Space	Full (-2) Partial (2) None (4)	none	4					
Utilities	Underground (0) Mix (1) All Above (2)	All above	2					
Suppression Factors (In	side Community Boundary)	Description	Points					
Ingress/Egress	Multiple Ways In/Out (-2) One Way In/Out (4)	Multiple	-2					
Road Slopes	<15% (0) >=15% (1)		2					
Road Widths	>24ft with 2 or more lanes (0) <=24ft (3)	< 24'	3					
Adequate Turnarounds	$V_{es}(0)$ Mixed (0.5) No (1)	No						
Street Signs	4" Reflective (-2) Mixed (0.5) Not Present (1)	Mixed	0.5					
Hydrants	Municipal hydrants available (-4) No water available (2)	None	0.0					
Din/Draft Water	1 owest -3 (0mi) Highest - 0 ($5 mi$)	None						
Dist to Imp Road	Lowest -2 ($(0mi)$), Highest - 2 ($(25mi)$)		Low (-1)					
Dist. to Fire Station	Lowest -2 (omi), Highest -2 (2011)		Low (-1)					
Non-Euel Elements	Lowest -10 points Highest > 0 points							
Additional Pating Factor	rs (But Value in Boints if Procent)	Poce Pte						
		F055. F15.	Politis					
			0					
Close Railroads		1	0					
Mid-slope Homes		0.5	0.5					
Homes on Ridge Tops		0.5	0					
Homes in Saddles		0.5	0					
Ravines		0.5	0.5					
Chimneys		0.5	0.5					
Many Campfires		2	0					
Frequent Burning (Ag, De	ebris, Wood Stove etc.)	1	1					
Wood Fencing		2	0					
Non-year-round Population	n	1	0					
Other (Maxium of 2 Points	(Bad Stuff)) Specify:_Located in steep canyon/ravine	2	2					
Other (Maxium of -2 Points	s (Good Stuff)) Specify:	-2	0					
Final Points		Value	Points					
Overall Rating (RISK50)	Lowest = 1, Highest = 20, from Nearest FireSheds		13					
Overall BOG Rating	Lowest = -15, Highest = 30+ Add'l Rating Factors		19					
TOTAL POINTS			32					
		F	Rating					
Final Rating	Moderate <24. High 24-29. Very High >29							
*Boots on Ground (BOG)								

WUI Community: Lushmeadows

Map Tile 5

Community-Specific CWPP: N/A

Community Risk Rating: Moderate (21.5)

COMMUNITY-SPECIFIC CWPP ACTION PLAN TEMPLATE								
Action	Coordinators	Timeframe	Resources and Notes	Priority	Status	Landscapes	Communities	Response
1.								
2.								
3.								
4.								
5.								
6.								
7.								
8.								
9.								
10.								
11.								
12.								

Lushmeadows							
NOTE: Yellow rows are alread	dy calculated by No-HARM but values and points are provided in data	table for reference	e				
NOTE: No-HARM rating comprises 40% of the overall points (20 points), BOG* is 60% (30 points plus add'l factors)							
NOTE Green elements to be filled in by field surveys							
Community Topographi	ic Position (Average Inside Comm. Boundary)	Value	Desc. (Points)				
Slope (%)	Lowest = -1 (Flat), Highest = 6 (>42%)		Low (0)				
Aspect	Lowest = -2 (NW to NE), Highest = 4 (SW to SE) (Others medium)		Low (0)				
Fire Behavior, Fuels, an	d Burn Probability (Average Within Nearest FireSheds)	Value	Desc. (Points)				
Flame Length (ft)	Lowest = 1, Highest = >50ft	15 feet					
Crown Fire Activity	Lowest = 0 points, Highest = 4 points		Moderate (2)				
Vegetation Cover (%)	Lowest = -3 (0%), Highest = 3 (>85%)		Moderate (0)				
Nonburnable (%)	Lowest = -5 (70%), Highest = 5 (>0%)		High (5)				
Frequency	Lowest = 1, Highest = 29	High (20)					
Construction and Infras	tructure (Inside Community Boundary)	Description	Points				
Root Type	Mostly Class A (-2) Mixed/Class B (2) Class C (4)	Mixed	2				
Siding/Deck Type	Non-compustible (-1) Mix (2) Compustible (4)	IVIIXed Dortiol	2				
Utilities	Full (-2) Partial (2) None (4)		2				
Suppression Easters (In	onderground (0) Mix (1) All Above (2)	All above	2 Deinte				
Suppression Factors (in	Nultiple Ways In (Out (2) One Way In (Out (4)	Description	Points				
Ingress/Egress		Multiple	-2				
Road Slopes	<15% (0) >=15% (1)	<15%	0				
Road Widths	>24ft, with 2 or more lanes (0) <=24ft (3)	Mixed roads	2				
Adequate Turnarounds	Yes (0) Mixed (0.5) No (1)	Mixed	0.5				
Street Signs	4" Reflective (-2) Mixed (0.5) Not Present (1)	Mixed	0.5				
Hydrants	Municipal hydrants available (-4) No water available (2)	Hydrants in su	-2				
Dip/Draft Water	Lowest -3 (0mi), Highest = 0 (>5mi)		Low (-2)				
Dist. to Imp. Road	Lowest -2 (0mi), Highest = 2 (>5mi)		Low (-1)				
Dist. to Fire Station	Lowest 0 (0mi), Highest = 50 (> 5mi)		Moderate (21)				
Non-Fuel Elements	Lowest = -10 points, Highest > 0 points		High (-1)				
Additional Rating Factor	rs (Put Value in Points if Present)	Poss. Pts.	Points				
Frequent Lightning		1	1				
Close Railroads		1	0				
Mid-slope Homes		0.5	0.5				
Homes on Ridge Tops		0.5	0.5				
Homes in Saddles		0.5	0.5				
Ravines		0.5	0.5				
Chimneys		0.5	0.5				
Many Campfires		2	0				
Frequent Burning (Ag. De	ebris, Wood Stove etc.)	1	1				
Wood Fencing	····, ·····,	2	0				
Non-vear-round Population	n	1	1				
Other (Maxium of 2 Points	(Bad Stuff)) Specify:	2	0				
Other (Maxium of -2 Points	s (Good Stuff)) Specify: Euclidereak along west boundary	-2					
Final Points	s (Cood Oran)) opecity. I del break along west boundary	Value	Points				
Overall Rating (RISK50)	Lowest = 1 Highest = 20 from Nearest FireSheds		10				
	Lowest15 Highest - 20+ Add'l Dating Eastern		11.5				
			21.5				
			21.J				
Final Rating	Moderate <24, High 24-29, Very High >29						
*Boots on Ground (BOG)							

WUI Community: Mariposa

Map Tile 4

Community-Specific CWPP: N/A

Community Risk Rating: Moderate (18)

COMMUNITY-SPECIFIC CWPP ACTION PLAN TEMPLATE								
Action	Coordinators	Timeframe	Resources and Notes	Priority	Status	Landscapes	Communities	Response
1.								
2.								
3.								
4.								
5.								
6.								
7.								
8.								
9.								
10.								
11.								
12.								

Mariposa								
NOTE: Yellow rows are alread	NOTE: Yellow rows are already calculated by No-HARM but values and points are provided in data table for reference							
NOTE: No-HARM rating comprises 40% of the overall points (20 points), BOG* is 60% (30 points plus add'I factors)								
NOTE Green elements to be filled in by field surveys								
Community Topograph	ic Position (Average Inside Comm. Boundary)	Value	Desc. (Points)					
Slope (%)	Lowest = -1 (Flat), Highest = 6 (>42%)		Low(1)					
Aspect	Lowest = -2 (NW to NE), Highest = 4 (SW to SE) (Others medium)		Moderate (1)					
Fire Behavior, Fuels, an	d Burn Probability (Average Within Nearest FireSheds)	Value	Desc. (Points)					
Flame Length (ft)	Lowest = 1, Highest = >50ft	11 feet						
Crown Fire Activity	Lowest = 0 points, Highest = 4 points		Moderate (2)					
Vegetation Cover (%)	Lowest = -3 (0%), Highest = 3 (>85%)		LOW (-1)					
Frequency	Lowest = -5 (70%), Highest = 5 ($>0\%$)	High (21)	High (5)					
Construction and Infras	Lowest = 1, Highest = 29	Description	Points					
Roof Type	Mostly Class A (-2) Mixed/Class B (2) Class C (4)	Mixed	2					
Siding/Deck Type	Non-compustible (-1) Mix (2) Compustible (4)	Mixed	2					
Defensible Space	Full (-2) Partial (2) None (4)	Partial	2					
Utilities	Underground (0) Mix (1) All Above (2)	All above	2					
Suppression Factors (In	side Community Boundary)	Description	Points					
Ingress/Egress	Multiple Ways In/Out (-2) One Way In/Out (4)	Multiple	-2					
Road Slopes	<15% (0) >=15% (1)	<15%	0					
Road Widths	>24ft, with 2 or more lanes (0) <=24ft (3)	<24'	3					
Adequate Turnarounds	Yes (0) Mixed (0.5) No (1)	Mixed	05					
Street Signs	4" Reflective (-2) Mixed (0.5) Not Present (1)							
Hydrants	Municipal hydrants available (-4) No water available (2)	Hydrants	-2					
Dip/Draft Water	Lowest -3 (0mi) Highest = 0 (>5mi)	riyaranto	High (-1)					
Dist. to Imp. Road	Lowest -2 (0mi), Highest = 2 (>5mi)		Low (-1)					
Dist to Fire Station	Lowest 0 (0mi) Highest = 50 (> 5mi)		Low (15)					
Non-Euel Elements	Lowest -10 points. Highest > 0 points		High (0)					
Additional Rating Factor	rs (Put Value in Points if Present)	Poss Pts	Points					
Frequent Lightning		1	0					
		1	0					
Mid along a llonge		0.5	0					
Nid-slope Homes		0.5	0.5					
Homes on Ridge Tops		0.5	0					
Homes in Saddles		0.5	0.5					
Ravines		0.5	0.5					
Chimneys		0.5	0					
Many Campfires		2	1					
Frequent Burning (Ag, De	ebris, Wood Stove etc.)	1	1					
Wood Fencing		2	2					
Non-year-round Population	n	1	1					
Other (Maxium of 2 Points	(Bad Stuff)) Specify:_Homeless population campfires.Tightly pa	2	2					
Other (Maxium of -2 Points	s (Good Stuff)) Specify:Local fire dept with quick response time	-2	-2					
Final Points		Value	Points					
Overall Rating (RISK50)	Lowest = 1, Highest = 20, from Nearest FireSheds		8					
Overall BOG Rating	Lowest = -15, Highest = 30+ Add'l Rating Factors		10					
TOTAL POINTS			18					
		F	Rating					
Final Rating	Moderate <24, High 24-29, Very High >29							
*Boots on Ground (BOG)								

WUI Community: Midpines

Map Tile 4,5

Community-Specific CWPP: Yes

Community Risk Rating: Very High (31)

COMMUNITY-SPECIFIC CWPP ACTION PLAN TEMPLATE								
Action	Coordinators	Timeframe	Resources and Notes	Priority	Status	Landscapes	Communities	Response
1.								
2.								
3.								
4.								
5.								
6.								
7.								
8.								
9.								
10.								
11.								
12.								

Midpines								
NOTE: Yellow rows are already calculated by No-HARM but values and points are provided in data table for reference								
NOTE: No-HARM rating comp	NOTE: No-HARM rating comprises 40% of the overall points (20 points), BOG* is 60% (30 points plus add'l factors)							
NOTE Green elements to be filled in by field surveys								
Community Topographi	ic Position (Average Inside Comm. Boundary)	Value	Desc. (Points)					
Slope (%)	Lowest = -1 (Flat), Highest = 6 (>42%)		Low(1)					
Aspect	Lowest = -2 (NW to NE), Highest = 4 (SW to SE) (Others medium)		Moderate (0)					
Fire Behavior, Fuels, an	d Burn Probability (Average Within Nearest FireSheds)	Value	Desc. (Points)					
Flame Length (ft)	Lowest = 1, Highest = >50ft	17 feet						
Crown Fire Activity	Lowest = 0 points, Highest = 4 points		Moderate (2)					
Vegetation Cover (%)	Lowest = -3 (0%), Highest = 3 (>85%)		Moderate (0)					
Nonburnable (%)	Lowest = -5 (70%), Highest = 5 (>0%)		High (5)					
Frequency	Lowest = 1, Highest = 29	Moderate (19)	D.1.4					
Construction and Infras	tructure (Inside Community Boundary)	Description	Points					
Siding/Dock Type	Nostly Class A (-2) Mixed/Class B (2) Class C (4)	Mixed	2					
Defensible Space	Full (-2) Partial (2) None (4)	Partial	2					
Utilities	$\frac{1}{1} \ln \left(\frac{-2}{2}\right) + \ln \left(\frac{1}{2}\right) + \ln \left$		2					
Suppression Factors (In	side Community Boundary)	Description	Points					
Ingress/Egress	Multiple Ways \ln/Ω (1-2) One Way \ln/Ω (4)	Multiplo	2					
Poad Slopes	<pre>>15% (0) >=15% (1)</pre>		-2					
Road Widths	$(1)^{(0)} (0)^{(1)} = 10^{(0)} (1)^{(1)}$	>10%	1					
	>24it, with 2 of more raries (0) <=24it (3)	<24	3					
Adequate Turnarounds	Yes (0) Mixed (0.5) NO (1)	NO	1					
Street Signs	4" Reflective (-2) Mixed (0.5) Not Present (1)	Mixed	0.5					
Hydrants	Municipal hydrants available (-4) No water available (2)	None	2					
Dip/Draft Water	Lowest -3 (0mi), Highest = 0 (>5mi)		Low (-2)					
Dist. to Imp. Road	Lowest -2 (0mi), Highest = 2 (>5mi)		Low (-1)					
Dist. to Fire Station	Lowest 0 (0mi), Highest = 50 (> 5mi)		High (38)					
Non-Fuel Elements	Lowest = -10 points, Highest > 0 points		High (-2)					
Additional Rating Factor	rs (Put Value in Points if Present)	Poss. Pts.	Points					
Frequent Lightning		1	1					
Close Railroads		1	0					
Mid-slope Homes		0.5	0.5					
Homes on Ridge Tops		0.5	0.5					
Homes in Saddles		0.5	0.5					
Ravines		0.5	0.5					
Chimneys		0.5	0.5					
Many Campfires		2	1					
Frequent Burning (Ag, De	ebris, Wood Stove etc.)	1	1					
Wood Fencing	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	2	0					
Non-year-round Population	n	1	1					
Other (Maxium of 2 Points	(Bad Stuff)) Specify:Heavy fuel loading in unit. Many dirt roads/	2	2					
Other (Maxium of -2 Points	s (Good Stuff)) Specify: Recent fires 2005, 2017, 2019 have re	-2	-2					
Final Points		Value	Points					
Overall Rating (RISK50)	Lowest = 1, Highest = 20, from Nearest FireSheds		11					
Overall BOG Rating	Lowest = -15. Highest = 30+ Add'l Rating Factors		20					
TOTAL POINTS			31					
			Rating					
Final Rating	Moderate <24, High 24-29, Very High >29							
*Boots on Ground (BOG)								

WUI Community: Mormon Bar

Map Tile 4

Community-Specific CWPP: N/A

Community Risk Rating: Very High (34.5)

COMMUNITY-SPECIFIC CWPP ACTION PLAN TEMPLATE								
Action	Coordinators	Timeframe	Resources and Notes	Priority	Status	Landscapes	Communities	Response
1.								
2.								
3.								
4.								
5.								
6.								
7.								
8.								
9.								
10.								
11.								
12.								

Mormon Bar							
NOTE: Yellow rows are alrea	NOTE: Yellow rows are already calculated by No-HARM but values and points are provided in data table for reference						
NOTE: No-HARM rating comprises 40% of the overall points (20 points), BOG* is 60% (30 points plus add'I factors)							
NOTE Green elements to be filled in by field surveys							
Community Topographi	c Position (Average Inside Comm. Boundary)	Value	Desc. (Points)				
Slope (%)	Lowest = -1 (Flat), Highest = 6 (>42%)		Low (-1)				
Aspect	Lowest = -2 (NW to NE), Highest = 4 (SW to SE) (Others medium)		Moderate (1)				
Fire Behavior, Fuels, an	d Burn Probability (Average Within Nearest FireSheds)	Value	Desc. (Points)				
Flame Length (ft)	Lowest = 1, Highest = >50ft	15 feet					
Crown Fire Activity	Lowest = 0 points, Highest = 4 points		Moderate (2)				
Vegetation Cover (%)	Lowest = -3 (0%), Highest = 3 (>85%)		Moderate (-1)				
Nonburnable (%)	Lowest = -5 (70%), Highest = 5 (>0%)		High (4)				
Frequency	Lowest = 1, Highest = 29	High (23)					
Construction and Infrast	tructure (Inside Community Boundary)	Description	Points				
Roof Type	Nostly Class A (-2) Mixed/Class B (2) Class C (4)	Mixed	<u> </u>				
Siding/Deck Type	Full (2) Partial (2) None (4)	Nono	2				
Litilitios	$\frac{1}{1} = \frac{1}{1} = \frac{1}$	All above	4				
Suppression Eactors (In	side Community Boundary)	Description	Points				
Ingross/Egross			T OILLS				
Road Slopes	<pre>// // // // // // // // // // // // //</pre>		4				
Road Widths	< 15% (0) >= 15% (1)	<10%	0				
Adaguata Turnaraunda	V_{22411} , with 2 of more larges (0) <=2411 (3)	<24	3				
	Yes (0) Mixed (0.5) No (1) 4!! Deflecting (0) Mixed (0.5) Net Decent (4)	NO	1				
Street Signs	4" Reflective (-2) Mixed (0.5) Not Present (1)	Mixed	0.5				
Hydrants	Municipal hydrants available (-4) No water available (2)	None	2				
Dip/Draft Water	Lowest -3 (0mi), Highest = 0 (>5mi)		Low (-2)				
Dist. to Imp. Road	Lowest -2 (0mi), Highest = 2 (>5mi)		Low (1)				
Dist. to Fire Station	Lowest 0 (0mi), Highest = 50 (> 5mi)		Low (10)				
Non-Fuel Elements	Lowest = -10 points, Highest > 0 points		High (0)				
Additional Rating Factor	rs (Put Value in Points if Present)	Poss. Pts.	Points				
Frequent Lightning		1	0				
Close Railroads		1	0				
Mid-slope Homes		0.5	0.5				
Homes on Ridge Tops		0.5	0				
Homes in Saddles		0.5	0.5				
Ravines		0.5	0				
Chimneys		0.5	0				
Many Campfires		2	0				
Frequent Burning (Ag, De	bris, Wood Stove etc.)	1	1				
Wood Fencing		2	0				
Non-year-round Population	1	1	0				
Other (Maxium of 2 Points	(Bad Stuff)) Specify:Steep narrow gravel roads	2	1				
Other (Maxium of -2 Points	s (Good Stuff)) Specify:	-2	0				
Final Points		Value	Points				
Overall Rating (RISK50)	Lowest = 1, Highest = 20, from Nearest FireSheds		11				
Overall BOG Rating	Lowest = -15. Highest = 30+ Add'l Rating Factors		23.5				
TOTAL POINTS	-, ,		34.5				
			Rating				
Final Rating	Moderate <24, High 24-29, Very High >29						
WUI Community: Mt. Bullion

Map Tile 3,4

Community-Specific CWPP: N/A

Community Risk Rating: Moderate (22.5)

COMMUNITY-SPECIFIC CWPP ACTION PLAN TEMPLATE								
Action	Coordinators	Timeframe	Resources and Notes	Priority	Status	Landscapes	Communities	Response
1.								
2.								
3.								
4.								
5.								
6.								
7.								
8.								
9.								
10.								
11.								
12.								

Mt. Bullion								
NOTE: Yellow rows are alread	dy calculated by No-HARM but values and points are provided in data	table for reference	9					
NOTE: No-HARM rating comp	NOTE: No-HARM rating comprises 40% of the overall points (20 points), BOG* is 60% (30 points plus add'I factors)							
NOTE Green elements	to be filled in by field surveys							
Community Topographi	ic Position (Average Inside Comm. Boundary)	Value	Desc. (Points)					
Slope (%)	Lowest = -1 (Flat), Highest = 6 (>42%)		Low (0)					
Aspect	Lowest = -2 (NW to NE), Highest = 4 (SW to SE) (Others medium)		Low (0)					
Fire Behavior, Fuels, an	d Burn Probability (Average Within Nearest FireSheds)	Value	Desc. (Points)					
Flame Length (ft)	Lowest = 1, Highest = >50ft	13 feet						
Crown Fire Activity	Lowest = 0 points, Highest = 4 points		Moderate (2)					
Vegetation Cover (%)	Lowest = -3 (0%), Highest = 3 (>85%)		Moderate (-1)					
Nonburnable (%)	Lowest = -5 (70%), Highest = 5 (>0%)		High (3)					
Frequency	Lowest = 1, Highest = 29	High (22)	D.1.4					
Construction and Infras	tructure (Inside Community Boundary)	Description	Points					
Siding/Dock Type	Nostry Class A (-2) Mixed/Class B (2) Class C (4)	Mixed	2					
Defensible Space	Full (-2) Partial (2) None (4)	None	3					
Utilities	$\frac{1}{1} \ln \left(\frac{-2}{2}\right) + \ln \left(\frac{1}{2}\right) + \ln \left$							
Suppression Factors (In	side Community Boundary)	Description	Points					
Ingress/Egress	Multiple Ways In/Out (-2) One Way In/Out (4)	Multiple	-2					
Road Slopes	<pre>>15% (0) >=15% (1)</pre>		-2					
Road Widths	(1) = (1)	<1370	0					
Adagusto Turnaroundo	$V_{00}(0) \text{ Mixed } (0.5) \text{ No} (1)$	<24	3					
Auequate Turnarounus	(III) Deflective (2) Mixed (0.5) Net Dresent (1)		0.5					
Street Signs	4 Reflective (-2) Mixed (0.5) Not Present (1)	4" signs	-2					
		None	2					
Dip/Draft Water	Lowest -3 (0mi), Highest = 0 (>5mi)		Low (-2)					
Dist. to Imp. Road	Lowest -2 (0mi), Highest = 2 (>5mi)		Low (-2)					
Dist. to Fire Station	Lowest 0 (0mi), Highest = 50 (> 5mi)		High (34)					
Non-Fuel Elements	Lowest = -10 points, Highest > 0 points		High (0)					
Additional Rating Factor	rs (Put Value in Points if Present)	Poss. Pts.	Points					
Frequent Lightning		1	0					
Close Railroads		1	0					
Mid-slope Homes		0.5	0.5					
Homes on Ridge Tops		0.5	0.5					
Homes in Saddles		0.5	0					
Ravines		0.5	0					
Chimneys		0.5	0					
Many Campfires		2	0					
Frequent Burning (Ag, De	ebris, Wood Stove etc.)	1	1					
Wood Fencing		2	1					
Non-year-round Population	n	1	0					
Other (Maxium of 2 Points	(Bad Stuff)) Specify:Structures tightly spaced	2	1					
Other (Maxium of -2 Points	s (Good Stuff)) Specify: Detwiler fire 2017 has reduced the feul	-2	-2					
Final Points		Value	Points					
Overall Rating (RISK50)	Lowest = 1, Highest = 20, from Nearest FireSheds		8					
Overall BOG Rating	Lowest = -15, Highest = 30+ Add'l Rating Factors		14.5					
TOTAL POINTS			22.5					
			Rating					
Final Rating	Moderate <24. High 24-29. Very High >29							
*Boots on Ground (BOG)								

WUI Community: Ponderosa Basin

Map Tile 7

Community-Specific CWPP: N/A

Community Risk Rating: Moderate (16.5)

COMMUNITY-SPECIFIC CWPP ACTION PLAN TEMPLATE								
Action	Coordinators	Timeframe	Resources and Notes	Priority	Status	Landscapes	Communities	Response
1.								
2.								
3.								
4.								
5.								
6.								
7.								
8.								
9.								
10.								
11.								
12.								

Ponderosa Basin					
NOTE: Yellow rows are alread	dy calculated by No-HARM but values and points are provided in data	table for reference	9		
NOTE: No-HARM rating comp	prises 40% of the overall points (20 points), BOG* is 60% (30 points plu	us add'l factors)			
NOTE Green elements	to be filled in by field surveys				
Community Topographi	ic Position (Average Inside Comm. Boundary)	Value	Desc. (Points)		
Slope (%)	Lowest = -1 (Flat), Highest = 6 (>42%)		Low (1)		
Aspect	Lowest = -2 (NW to NE), Highest = 4 (SW to SE) (Others medium)		Moderate (2)		
Fire Behavior, Fuels, an	d Burn Probability (Average Within Nearest FireSheds)	Value	Desc. (Points)		
Flame Length (ft)	Lowest = 1, Highest = >50ft	12 feet			
Crown Fire Activity	Lowest = 0 points, Highest = 4 points		Moderate (2)		
Vegetation Cover (%)	Lowest = -3 (0%), Highest = 3 (>85%)		Moderate (0)		
Nonburnable (%)	Lowest = -5 (70%), Highest = 5 (>0%)		High (5)		
Frequency	Lowest = 1, Highest = 29	Moderate (18)			
Construction and Infras	tructure (Inside Community Boundary)	Description	Points		
Roof Type	Mostly Class A (-2) Mixed/Class B (2) Class C (4)	Mixed	2		
Siding/Deck Type	Non-combustible (-1) Mix (2) Combustible (4)	Mixed	2		
Defensible Space	Full (-2) Partial (2) None (4)	Partial	2		
Othinties	Underground (0) Mix (1) All Above (2)		2		
Suppression Factors (In	side Community Boundary)	Description	Points		
Ingress/Egress	Multiple Ways In/Out (-2) One Way In/Out (4)	Multiple	-2		
Road Slopes	<15% (0) >=15% (1)	<15%	0		
Road Widths	>24ft, with 2 or more lanes (0) <=24ft (3)	<24'	3		
Adequate Turnarounds	Yes (0) Mixed (0.5) No (1)	Yes	0		
Street Signs	4" Reflective (-2) Mixed (0.5) Not Present (1)	4" signs	-2		
Hydrants	Municipal hydrants available (-4) No water available (2)	2.5" hydrants	-4		
Dip/Draft Water	Lowest -3 (0mi), Highest = 0 (>5mi)		High (-1)		
Dist. to Imp. Road	Lowest -2 (0mi), Highest = 2 (>5mi)		Moderate (0)		
Dist. to Fire Station	Lowest 0 (0mi), Highest = 50 (> 5mi)		Low (6)		
Non-Fuel Elements	Lowest = -10 points, Highest > 0 points		Moderate (-4)		
Additional Rating Factor	rs (Put Value in Points if Present)	Poss. Pts.	Points		
Frequent Lightning		1	1		
Close Railroads		1	0		
Mid-slope Homes		0.5	0.5		
Homes on Ridge Tops		0.5	0.5		
Homes in Saddles		0.5	0.5		
Ravines		0.5	0.5		
Chimneys		0.5	0.5		
Many Compfirm		2	0.0		
Frequent Purping (Ag. Do	hrin Wood Stave etc.)	1	0		
Mood Fancing		2	1		
Non-voor round Donulation		2	0		
Non-year-round Population			1		
Other (Maxium of 2 Points	(Bad Stuff)) Specify:Approximately 30% of homes have not a		1		
Other (Maxium of -2 Points	s (Good Stuff)) Specify:_Wildland fires and a fuel breaks have	<u>q -2</u>	-1		
Final Points		value	Points		
Overall Rating (RISK50)	Lowest = 1, Highest = 20, from Nearest FireSheds		8		
Overall BOG Rating	Lowest = -15, Highest = 30+ Add'l Rating Factors		8.5		
TOTAL POINTS			16.5		
		F	Rating		
Final Rating	Moderate <24, High 24-29, Very High >29				
*Boots on Ground (BOG)					

WUI Community: Stumpfield Road

Map Tile 5

Community-Specific CWPP: N/A

Community Risk Rating: Very High (35)

COMMUNITY-SPECIFIC CWPP ACTION PLAN TEMPLATE								
Action	Coordinators	Timeframe	Resources and Notes	Priority	Status	Landscapes	Communities	Response
1.								
2.								
3.								
4.								
5.								
6.								
7.								
8.								
9.								
10.								
11.								
12.								

Stumpfield Road					
NOTE: Yellow rows are alread	dy calculated by No-HARM but values and points are provided in data	table for reference	e		
NOTE: No-HARM rating comp	prises 40% of the overall points (20 points), BOG* is 60% (30 points plu	s add'l factors)			
NOTE Green elements	to be filled in by field surveys				
Community Topograph	ic Position (Average Inside Comm. Boundary)	Value	Desc. (Points)		
Slope (%)	Lowest = -1 (Flat), Highest = 6 (>42%)		Low (0)		
Aspect	Lowest = -2 (NW to NE), Highest = 4 (SW to SE) (Others medium)		Low (0)		
Fire Behavior, Fuels, an	d Burn Probability (Average Within Nearest FireSheds)	Value	Desc. (Points)		
Flame Length (ft)	Lowest = 1, Highest = >50ft	17 feet			
Crown Fire Activity	Lowest = 0 points, Highest = 4 points		Moderate (2)		
Vegetation Cover (%)	Lowest = -3 (0%), Highest = 3 (>85%)		Moderate (0)		
Frequency	Lowest = -5 (70%), Highest = 5 ($>0\%$)	High (20)	High (5)		
Construction and Infras	tructure (Inside Community Boundary)	Description	Points		
Roof Type	Mostly Class A (-2) Mixed/Class B (2) Class C (4)	Mixed	2		
Siding/Deck Type	Non-combustible (-1) Mix (2) Combustible (4)	Mixed	2		
Defensible Space	Full (-2) Partial (2) None (4)	None	4		
Utilities	Underground (0) Mix (1) All Above (2)	All above	2		
Suppression Factors (In	side Community Boundary)	Description	Points		
Ingress/Egress	Multiple Ways In/Out (-2) One Way In/Out (4)	Multiple	0		
Road Slopes	<15% (0) >=15% (1)	<15%	0		
Road Widths	>24ft, with 2 or more lanes (0) <=24ft (3)	<24'	3		
Adequate Turnarounds	Yes (0) Mixed (0.5) No (1)	No	1		
Street Signs	4" Reflective (-2) Mixed (0.5) Not Present (1)	Mixed	0.5		
Hydrants	Municipal hydrants available (-4) No water available (2)	None	2		
Dip/Draft Water	Lowest -3 (0mi), Highest = 0 (>5mi)		Low (-2)		
Dist. to Imp. Road	Lowest -2 (0mi), Highest = 2 (>5mi)		Low (-1)		
Dist. to Fire Station	Lowest 0 (0mi), Highest = 50 (> 5mi)		Moderate (17)		
Non-Fuel Elements	Lowest = -10 points, Highest > 0 points		High (0)		
Additional Rating Facto	rs (Put Value in Points if Present)	Poss. Pts.	Points		
Frequent Lightning		1	1		
Close Railroads		1	0		
Mid-slope Homes		0.5	0.5		
Homes on Ridge Tops		0.5	0.5		
Homes in Saddles		0.5	0.5		
Ravines		0.5	0.5		
Chimneys		0.5	0.5		
Many Campfires		2	0		
Frequent Burning (Ag, De	ebris, Wood Stove etc.)	1	1		
Wood Fencing		2	0		
Non-vear-round Population	n	1	1		
Other (Maxium of 2 Points	(Bad Stuff)) Specify: Heavy fuel loading, narrow, overgrown,	2	2		
Other (Maxium of -2 Points	s (Good Stuff)) Specify:	-2	0		
Final Points		Value	Points		
Overall Rating (RISK50)	Lowest = 1, Highest = 20, from Nearest FireSheds		11		
Overall BOG Rating	Lowest = -15, Highest = 30+ Add'l Rating Factors		24		
TOTAL POINTS			35		
			Rating		
Final Rating	Moderate <24. High 24-29. Very High >29				
*Boots on Ground (BOG)					

WUI Community: Tip Top Road

Map Tile 5

Community-Specific CWPP: N/A

Community Risk Rating: High (27)

COMMUNITY-SPECIFIC CWPP ACTION PLAN TEMPLATE								
Action	Coordinators	Timeframe	Resources and Notes	Priority	Status	Landscapes	Communities	Response
1.								
2.								
3.								
4.								
5.								
6.								
7.								
8.								
9.								
10.								
11.								
12.								

Tip Top Road					
NOTE: Yellow rows are alread	dy calculated by No-HARM but values and points are provided in data	table for reference	e		
NOTE: No-HARM rating comp	prises 40% of the overall points (20 points), BOG* is 60% (30 points plu	s add'l factors)			
NOTE Green elements	to be filled in by field surveys				
Community Topograph	ic Position (Average Inside Comm. Boundary)	Value	Desc. (Points)		
Slope (%)	Lowest = -1 (Flat), Highest = 6 (>42%)		Low (0)		
Aspect	Lowest = -2 (NW to NE), Highest = 4 (SW to SE) (Others medium)		Low (0)		
Fire Behavior, Fuels, an	d Burn Probability (Average Within Nearest FireSheds)	Value	Desc. (Points)		
Flame Length (ft)	Lowest = 1, Highest = >50ft	15 feet			
Crown Fire Activity	Lowest = 0 points, Highest = 4 points		Moderate (2)		
Vegetation Cover (%)	Lowest = -3 (0%), Highest = 3 (>85%)		Moderate (0)		
Nonburnable (%)	Lowest = -5 (70%), Highest = 5 (>0%)	High(20)	Hign (4)		
Construction and Infras	Lowest = 1, Highest = 29	Hign (20)	Pointo		
Roof Type	Mostly Class A (-2) Mixed/Class B (2) Class C (4)	Mixed	2		
Siding/Deck Type	Non-compustible (-1) Mix (2) Compustible (4)	Mixed	2		
Defensible Space	Full (-2) Partial (2) None (4)	Partial	2		
Utilities	Underground (0) Mix (1) All Above (2)	All above	2		
Suppression Factors (In	side Community Boundary)	Description	Points		
Ingress/Egress	Multiple Ways In/Out (-2) One Way In/Out (4)	Multiple	-2		
Road Slopes	<15% (0) >=15% (1)	<15%	2		
Road Widths	>24ft with 2 or more lanes (0) <=24ft (3)	<70%	3		
	Ves (0) Mixed (0.5) No (1)	Nived			
Street Signs	4" Reflective (-2) Mixed (0.5) Not Present (1)	Mixed	0.5		
Hydrants	Municipal hydrants available (-4) No water available (2)	None	0.0		
Din/Draft Water	1000000000000000000000000000000000000	None			
Dist to Imp Road	Lowest -2 (0mi), Highest $= 2$ ($>5mi$)		Low (-2)		
Dist. to Fire Station	Lowest -2 (omi), Highest $-2(-5mi)$		Modorato (22)		
Non-Euel Elements	Lowest -10 points. Highest > 0 points		$\frac{1000erate (32)}{1000erate (32)}$		
Additional Pating Facto	rc (Put Value in Points if Present)	Bass Bto	Roints		
		F055. F15.	Politis		
		1	0		
Close Railroads		1	0		
Mid-slope Homes		0.5	0.5		
Homes on Ridge Tops		0.5	0		
Homes in Saddles		0.5	0		
Ravines		0.5	0.5		
Chimneys		0.5	0		
Many Campfires		2	0		
Frequent Burning (Ag, De	ebris, Wood Stove etc.)	1	1		
Wood Fencing		2	0		
Non-year-round Populatio	n	1	1		
Other (Maxium of 2 Points	(Bad Stuff)) Specify:Narrow dirt roads, dead ends	2	1		
Other (Maxium of -2 Points	s (Good Stuff)) Specify:_A fuel break and numerous EQUIP pro	-2	2		
Final Points		Value	Points		
Overall Rating (RISK50)	Lowest = 1, Highest = 20, from Nearest FireSheds		9		
Overall BOG Rating	Lowest = -15, Highest = 30+ Add'l Rating Factors		18		
TOTAL POINTS			27		
		F	Rating		
Final Rating	Moderate <24, High 24-29, Very High >29				

WUI Community: Triangle Road - WEST

Map Tile 4,5

Community-Specific CWPP: N/A

Community Risk Rating: High (26)

COMMUNITY-SPECIFIC CWPP ACTION PLAN TEMPLATE								
Action	Coordinators	Timeframe	Resources and Notes	Priority	Status	Landscapes	Communities	Response
1.								
2.								
3.								
4.								
5.								
6.								
7.								
8.								
9.								
10.								
11.								
12.								

Triangle Road - WEST							
NOTE: Yellow rows are alread	NOTE: Yellow rows are already calculated by No-HARM but values and points are provided in data table for reference						
NOTE: No-HARM rating comp	prises 40% of the overall points (20 points), BOG* is 60% (30 points pl	us add'l factors)					
NOTE Green elements	to be filled in by field surveys						
Community Topographi	ic Position (Average Inside Comm. Boundary)	Value	Desc. (Points)				
Slope (%)	Lowest = -1 (Flat), Highest = 6 (>42%)		Low (1)				
Aspect	Lowest = -2 (NW to NE), Highest = 4 (SW to SE) (Others medium)		Moderate (2)				
Fire Behavior, Fuels, an	d Burn Probability (Average Within Nearest FireSheds)	Value	Desc. (Points)				
Flame Length (ft)	Lowest = 1, Highest = >50ft	15 feet					
Crown Fire Activity	Lowest = 0 points, Highest = 4 points		Moderate (2)				
Vegetation Cover (%)	Lowest = -3 (0%), Highest = 3 (>85%)		Moderate (0)				
Nonburnable (%)	Lowest = -5 (70%), Highest = 5 (>0%)	Lligh (20)	High (4)				
Construction and Infras	Lowest = 1, Hignest = 29	High (20)	Pointe				
Roof Type	Mostly Class A (-2) Mixed/Class B (2) Class C (4)	Mixed	2				
Siding/Deck Type	Non-compustible (-1) Mix (2) Compustible (4)	Mixed	2				
Defensible Space	Full (-2) Partial (2) None (4)	Partial	0				
Utilities	Underground (0) Mix (1) All Above (2)	All above	2				
Suppression Factors (In	side Community Boundary)	Description	Points				
Ingress/Egress	Multiple Ways In/Out (-2) One Way In/Out (4)	Multiple	-2				
Road Slopes	<15% (0) >=15% (1)		0				
Road Widths	>24ft with 2 or more lanes (0) <=24ft (3)	<24'	3				
Adequate Turnarounds	$V_{es}(0)$ Mixed (0.5) No (1)	Mixed	0.5				
Street Signs	4" Reflective (-2) Mixed (0.5) Not Present (1)	Mixed	0.5				
Hydrants	Municipal hydrants available (-4) No water available (2)	None	0.0				
Din/Draft Water	1 owest -3 (0mi) Highest - 0 (>5mi)	None	2				
Dist to Imp Road	Lowest -2 ($(0\pi i)$) Highest - 2 ($(25\pi i)$)		Low (-2)				
Dist. to Fire Station	Lowest -2 (only) Highest -2 (2011)		Low (-2)				
Non-Eucl Elements	Lowest $= -10$ points. Highest > 0 points.						
Additional Pating Factor	re (But Value in Points if Procent)	Poce Dte	Roints				
		F055. F15.	Politis				
		1	1				
Close Railroads		1	0				
Mid-slope Homes		0.5	0.5				
Homes on Ridge Tops		0.5	0				
Homes in Saddles		0.5	0.5				
Ravines		0.5	0.5				
Chimneys		0.5	0.5				
Many Campfires		2	0				
Frequent Burning (Ag, De	ebris, Wood Stove etc.)	1	1				
Wood Fencing		2	0				
Non-year-round Population	n	1	0				
Other (Maxium of 2 Points	(Bad Stuff)) Specify:	2	0				
Other (Maxium of -2 Points	s (Good Stuff)) Specify:	-2	0				
Final Points		Value	Points				
Overall Rating (RISK50)	Lowest = 1, Highest = 20, from Nearest FireSheds		12				
Overall BOG Rating	Lowest = -15, Highest = 30+ Add'l Rating Factors		14				
TOTAL POINTS			26				
		F	Rating				
Final Rating	Moderate <24, High 24-29, Very High >29						
*Boots on Ground (BOG)							

WUI Community: Usona Road

Map Tile 5

Community-Specific CWPP: N/A

Community Risk Rating: High (25.5)

COMMUNITY-SPECIFIC CWPP ACTION PLAN TEMPLATE								
Action	Coordinators	Timeframe	Resources and Notes	Priority	Status	Landscapes	Communities	Response
1.								
2.								
3.								
4.								
5.								
6.								
7.								
8.								
9.								
10.								
11.								
12.								

Usona Road							
NOTE: Yellow rows are alread	dy calculated by No-HARM but values and points are provided in data	table for reference	9				
NOTE: No-HARM rating comprises 40% of the overall points (20 points), BOG* is 60% (30 points plus add'l factors)							
NOTE Green elements	to be filled in by field surveys						
Community Topographi	c Position (Average Inside Comm. Boundary)	Value	Desc. (Points)				
Slope (%)	Lowest = -1 (Flat), Highest = 6 (>42%)		Low (1)				
Aspect	Lowest = -2 (NW to NE), Highest = 4 (SW to SE) (Others medium)		Moderate (1)				
Fire Behavior, Fuels, an	d Burn Probability (Average Within Nearest FireSheds)	Value	Desc. (Points)				
Flame Length (ft)	Lowest = 1, Highest = >50ft	17 feet					
Crown Fire Activity	Lowest = 0 points, Highest = 4 points		Moderate (2)				
Vegetation Cover (%)	Lowest = -3 (0%), Highest = 3 (>85%)		Moderate (0)				
Nonburnable (%)	Lowest = $-5(70\%)$, Highest = $5(50\%)$	High (22)	High (5)				
Construction and Infras	tructure (Inside Community Boundary)	Description	Points				
Roof Type	Mostly Class A (-2) Mixed/Class B (2) Class C (4)	Mixed	-2				
Sidina/Deck Type	Non-combustible (-1) Mix (2) Combustible (4)	Mixed	2				
Defensible Space	Full (-2) Partial (2) None (4)	None	4				
Utilities	Underground (0) Mix (1) All Above (2)	All above					
Suppression Factors (In	side Community Boundary)	Description	Points				
Ingress/Egress	Multiple Ways In/Out (-2) One Way In/Out (4)	Multiple	-2				
Road Slopes	<15% (0) >=15% (1)	<15%	0				
Road Widths	>24ft, with 2 or more lanes (0) <=24ft (3)	<24'	0				
Adequate Turnarounds	Yes (0) Mixed (0.5) No (1)	Mixed	0.5				
Street Signs	4" Reflective (-2) Mixed (0.5) Not Present (1)	Mixed	0.5				
Hydrants	Municipal hydrants available (-4) No water available (2)	None	2				
Dip/Draft Water	Lowest -3 (0mi), Highest = 0 (>5mi)		High (-1)				
Dist. to Imp. Road	Lowest -2 (0mi), Highest = 2 (>5mi)		Low (-1)				
Dist. to Fire Station	Lowest 0 (0mi), Highest = 50 (> 5mi)		High (42)				
Non-Fuel Elements	Lowest = -10 points, Highest > 0 points		High (0)				
Additional Rating Factor	rs (Put Value in Points if Present)	Poss. Pts.	Points				
Frequent Lightning		1	0				
Close Railroads		1	0				
Mid-slope Homes		0.5	0.5				
Homes on Ridge Tops		0.5	0.5				
Homes in Saddles		0.5	0.5				
Ravines		0.5	0.5				
Chimneys		0.5	0.5				
Many Campfires		2	0.0				
Frequent Burning (Ag. De	whis Wood Stove etc.)	- 1	0				
Wood Fencing		2	0				
Non-vear-round Population		- 1	0				
Other (Maxium of 2 Points	(Bad Stuff)) Specify: Heavy fuel loading. No recent fire history.	2	2				
Other (Maxium of -2 Points	(Good Stuff)) Specify:	-2	0				
Final Points		Value	Points				
Overall Rating (RISK50)	Lowest = 1, Highest = 20, from Nearest FireSheds		14				
Overall BOG Rating	Lowest = -15. Highest = 30+ Add'l Rating Factors		11.5				
TOTAL POINTS			25.5				
			Rating				
Final Rating	Moderate <24, High 24-29, Very High >29						
*Boots on Ground (BOG)							

WUI Community: Wawona

Map Tile 7

Community-Specific CWPP: N/A

Community Risk Rating: Very High (36.5)

COMMUNITY-SPECIFIC CWPP ACTION PLAN TEMPLATE								
Action	Coordinators	Timeframe	Resources and Notes	Priority	Status	Landscapes	Communities	Response
1.								
2.								
3.								
4.								
5.								
6.								
7.								
8.								
9.								
10.								
11.								
12.								

Wawona								
NOTE: Yellow rows are alrea	ady calculated by No-HARM but values and points are provided in data	table for reference	9					
NOTE: No-HARM rating comp	NOTE: No-HARM rating comprises 40% of the overall points (20 points), BOG* is 60% (30 points plus add'l factors)							
NOTE Green elements	to be filled in by field surveys							
Community Topograph	ic Position (Average Inside Comm. Boundary)	Value	Desc. (Points)					
Slope (%)	Lowest = -1 (Flat), Highest = 6 (>42%)		Low (0)					
Aspect	Lowest = -2 (NW to NE), Highest = 4 (SW to SE) (Others medium)		High (3)					
Fire Behavior, Fuels, an	d Burn Probability (Average Within Nearest FireSheds)	Value	Desc. (Points)					
Flame Length (ft)	Lowest = 1, Highest = >50ft	21 feet						
Crown Fire Activity	Lowest = 0 points, Highest = 4 points		Moderate (2)					
	Lowest = -5 (0%), Highest = 5 ($>$ 65%)		LOW (-1) High (5)					
Frequency	Lowest = $-3(70\%)$, highest = $3(70\%)$	Moderate (19)	riigii (3)					
Construction and Infras	tructure (Inside Community Boundary)	Description	Points					
Roof Type	Mostly Class A (-2) Mixed/Class B (2) Class C (4)	Mixed	2					
Siding/Deck Type	Non-combustible (-1) Mix (2) Combustible (4)	Mixed	2					
Defensible Space	Full (-2) Partial (2) None (4)	None	4					
Utilities	Underground (0) Mix (1) All Above (2)	All above	2					
Suppression Factors (In	nside Community Boundary)	Description	Points					
Ingress/Egress	Multiple Ways In/Out (-2) One Way In/Out (4)	Multiple/mix	0					
Road Slopes	<15% (0) >=15% (1)	<15%	0					
Road Widths	>24ft, with 2 or more lanes (0) <=24ft (3)	<24'	3					
Adequate Turnarounds	Yes (0) Mixed (0.5) No (1)	Mixed	0.5					
Street Signs	4" Reflective (-2) Mixed (0.5) Not Present (1)	Mixed	0.5					
Hydrants	Municipal hydrants available (-4) No water available (2)	None	2					
Dip/Draft Water	Lowest -3 (0mi), Highest = 0 (>5mi)		High (-1)					
Dist. to Imp. Road	Lowest -2 (0mi), Highest = 2 (>5mi)		Low (-1)					
Dist. to Fire Station	Lowest 0 (0mi), Highest = 50 (> 5mi)		Low (4)					
Non-Fuel Elements	Lowest = -10 points, Highest > 0 points		High (0)					
Additional Rating Facto	rs (Put Value in Points if Present)	Poss. Pts.	Points					
Frequent Lightning		1	0					
Close Railroads		1	0					
Mid-slope Homes		0.5	0.5					
Homes on Ridge Tops		0.5	0.5					
Homes in Saddles		0.5	0.5					
Ravines		0.5	0.5					
Chimnevs		0.5	0.5					
Many Campfires		2	0					
Frequent Burning (Ag. De	ebris. Wood Stove etc.)	1	1					
Wood Fencing		2	1					
Non-vear-round Population	n	1	1					
Other (Maxium of 2 Points	(Bad Stuff)) Specify: No recent fire history/heavy fuel loading	2	2					
Other (Maxium of -2 Points	s (Good Stuff)) Specify:	-2	0					
Final Points		Value	Points					
Overall Rating (RISK50)	Lowest = 1, Highest = 20, from Nearest FireSheds		13					
Overall BOG Rating	Lowest = -15. Highest = 30+ Add'l Rating Factors		23.5					
			36.5					
			Rating					
Final Rating	Moderate <24. High 24-29. Very High >29							
*Boots on Ground (BOG)								

WUI Community: Woodland Drive

Map Tile 5

Community-Specific CWPP: N/A

Community Risk Rating: Very High (32)

COMMUNITY-SPECIFIC CWPP ACTION PLAN TEMPLATE								
Action	Coordinators	Timeframe	Resources and Notes	Priority	Status	Landscapes	Communities	Response
1.								
2.								
3.								
4.								
5.								
6.								
7.								
8.								
9.								
10.								
11.								
12.								

Woodland Drive							
NOTE: Yellow rows are alread	NOTE: Yellow rows are already calculated by No-HARM but values and points are provided in data table for reference						
NOTE: No-HARM rating comprises 40% of the overall points (20 points), BOG* is 60% (30 points plus add'l factors)							
NOTE Green elements	to be filled in by field surveys						
Community Topograph	ic Position (Average Inside Comm. Boundary)	Value	Desc. (Points)				
Slope (%)	Lowest = -1 (Flat), Highest = 6 (>42%)		Low (0)				
Aspect	Lowest = -2 (NW to NE), Highest = 4 (SW to SE) (Others medium)		Low (0)				
Fire Behavior, Fuels, an	d Burn Probability (Average Within Nearest FireSheds)	Value	Desc. (Points)				
Flame Length (ft)	Lowest = 1, Highest = >50ft	17 feet					
Crown Fire Activity	Lowest = 0 points, Highest = 4 points		Moderate (2)				
Vegetation Cover (%)	Lowest = -3 (0%), Highest = 3 (>85%)		Moderate (0)				
Nonburnable (%)	Lowest = -5 (70%), Highest = 5 (>0%)		High (5)				
Frequency	Lowest = 1, Highest = 29	High (21)					
Construction and Infras	tructure (Inside Community Boundary)	Description	Points				
Roof Type	Mostly Class A (-2) Mixed/Class B (2) Class C (4)	Nixed	2				
Defensible Space	Full (-2) Partial (2) None (4)	None	2				
Utilities	$\frac{1}{1} \ln \left(\frac{-2}{2}\right) + \ln \left(\frac{1}{2}\right) + \ln \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)$	all above					
Suppression Factors (In	side Community Boundary)	Description	Points				
Ingress/Egress	Multiple Ways In/Out (-2) One Way In/Out (4)		1 01113				
Road Slones	<pre>>15% (0) >=15% (1)</pre>		4				
Road Widths	$(1)^{(1)}(0)^{(2)} = 10^{(1)}(1)^{(2)}$	< 10%	0				
Adagusta Turparaunda	22411, with 2 of more ranges (0) <=2411 (3)	<+24	3				
			0.5				
Street Signs	4" Reflective (-2) Mixed (0.5) Not Present (1)	4" signs	-2				
Hydrants	Municipal hydrants available (-4) No water available (2)	none	2				
Dip/Draft Water	Lowest -3 (0mi), Highest = 0 (>5mi)		Low (-2)				
Dist. to Imp. Road	Lowest -2 (0mi), Highest = 2 (>5mi)		Low (-1)				
Dist. to Fire Station	Lowest 0 (0mi), Highest = 50 (> 5mi)		Moderate (28)				
Non-Fuel Elements	Lowest = -10 points, Highest > 0 points		High (0)				
Additional Rating Facto	rs (Put Value in Points if Present)	Poss. Pts.	Points				
Frequent Lightning		1	0				
Close Railroads		1					
Mid-slope Homes		0.5	0.5				
Homes on Ridge Tops		0.5	0				
Homes in Saddles		0.5	0				
Ravines		0.5	0				
Chimneys		0.5	0				
Many Campfires		2	0				
Frequent Burning (Ag, De	ebris, Wood Stove etc.)	1	1				
Wood Fencing		2	0				
Non-vear-round Population			0				
Other (Maxium of 2 Points	(Bad Stuff)) Specify: Narrow roads with brush encroaching on	2	1				
Other (Maxium of -2 Point	s (Good Stuff)) Specify:	-2					
Final Points		Value	Points				
Overall Rating (RISK50)	Lowest = 1, Highest = 20, from Nearest FireSheds		12				
Overall BOG Rating	Lowest = -15. Highest = 30+ Add'l Rating Factors		20				
TOTAL POINTS			32				
			Rating				
Final Rating	Moderate <24, High 24-29, Very High >29						

WUI Community: Worman Road

Map Tile 7

Community-Specific CWPP: N/A

Community Risk Rating: Very High (34)

COMMUNITY-SPECIFIC CWPP ACTION PLAN TEMPLATE								
Action	Coordinators	Timeframe	Resources and Notes	Priority	Status	Landscapes	Communities	Response
1.								
2.								
3.								
4.								
5.								
6.								
7.								
8.								
9.								
10.								
11.								
12.								

	Worman Road						
NOTE: Yellow rows are alrea	dy calculated by No-HARM but values and points are provided in data	table for reference	e				
NOTE: No-HARM rating comprises 40% of the overall points (20 points), BOG* is 60% (30 points plus add'I factors)							
NOTE Green elements	to be filled in by field surveys						
Community Topographi	ic Position (Average Inside Comm. Boundary)	Value	Desc. (Points)				
Slope (%)	Lowest = -1 (Flat), Highest = 6 (>42%)		Low (1)				
Aspect	Lowest = -2 (NW to NE), Highest = 4 (SW to SE) (Others medium)		Moderate (2)				
Fire Behavior, Fuels, an	d Burn Probability (Average Within Nearest FireSheds)	Value	Desc. (Points)				
Flame Length (ft)	Lowest = 1, Highest = >50ft	19 feet					
Crown Fire Activity	Lowest = 0 points, Highest = 4 points		High (3)				
Vegetation Cover (%)	Lowest = -3 (0%), Highest = 3 (>85%)		Moderate (0)				
Nonburnable (%)	Lowest = -5 (70%), Highest = 5 (>0%)		High (5)				
Frequency	Lowest = 1, Highest = 29	Moderate (19)					
Construction and Infras	tructure (Inside Community Boundary)	Description	Points				
Root Type	Mostly Class A (-2) Mixed/Class B (2) Class C (4)	Mixed	2				
Siding/Deck Type	Non-compustible (-1) Mix (2) Compustible (4)	Nana	Z				
Detensible Space	Full (-2) Partial (2) None (4)		4				
Suppression Easters (In	Conderground (0) Mix (1) All Above (2)	All Above	2 Points				
Suppression Factors (in	Nultiple Ways In Out (2) One Way In Out (4)	Description	Points				
Ingress/Egress		Multiple	-2				
Road Slopes	<15% (0) >=15% (1)	<15%	0				
Road Widths	>24ft, with 2 or more lanes (0) \leq =24ft (3)	<=24'	3				
Adequate Turnarounds	Yes (0) Mixed (0.5) No (1)	Mixed	0.5				
Street Signs	4" Reflective (-2) Mixed (0.5) Not Present (1)	Mixed	0.5				
Hydrants	Municipal hydrants available (-4) No water available (2)	None	2				
Dip/Draft Water	Lowest -3 (0mi), Highest = 0 (>5mi)		High (-1)				
Dist. to Imp. Road	Lowest -2 (0mi), Highest = 2 (>5mi)		Low (-1)				
Dist. to Fire Station	Lowest 0 (0mi), Highest = 50 (> 5mi)		High (44)				
Non-Fuel Elements	Lowest = -10 points, Highest > 0 points		High (0)				
Additional Rating Factor	rs (Put Value in Points if Present)	Poss. Pts.	Points				
Frequent Lightning		1	1				
Close Railroads		1	0				
Mid-slope Homes		0.5	0.5				
Homes on Ridge Tops		0.5	0.5				
Homes in Saddles		0.5	0.5				
Ravines		0.5	0				
Chimnevs		0.5	0.5				
Many Campfires		2	0				
Frequent Burning (Ag. De	ebris, Wood Stove etc.)	1	1				
Wood Fencing	,	2	0				
Non-vear-round Population	Ŋ	1	0				
Other (Maxium of 2 Points	(Bad Stuff)) Specify: Less than 50% Home defensible space co	2	2				
Other (Maxium of -2 Points	s (Good Stuff)) Specify:	-2	0				
Final Points		Value	Points				
Overall Rating (RISK50)	Lowest = 1, Highest = 20, from Nearest FireSheds		14				
Overall BOG Rating	$I_{\text{owest}} = -15$ Highest = 30+ Add'L Rating Factors		20				
			3/				
			Rating				
Final Rating	Moderate <24 High 24-29 Very High >29						
*Boots on Ground (BOG)	Modorate SET, fight ET 25, fory flight 225						

WUI Community: Yosemite West

Map Tile 6

Community-Specific CWPP: Yes (2005)

Community Risk Rating: High (26)

COMMUNITY-SPECIFIC CWPP ACTION PLAN TEMPLATE								
Action	Coordinators	Timeframe	Resources and Notes	Priority	Status	Landscapes	Communities	Response
1.								
2.								
3.								
4.								
5.								
6.								
7.								
8.								
9.								
10.								
11.								
12.								

Yosemite West							
NOTE: Yellow rows are already calculated by No-HARM but values and points are provided in data table for reference							
NOTE: No-HARM rating comprises 40% of the overall points (20 points), BOG* is 60% (30 points plus add'l factors)							
NOTE Green elements	to be filled in by field surveys						
Community Topograph	ic Position (Average Inside Comm. Boundary)	Value	Desc. (Points)				
Slope (%)	Lowest = -1 (Flat), Highest = 6 (>42%)		Moderate (3)				
Aspect	Lowest = -2 (NW to NE), Highest = 4 (SW to SE) (Others medium)		Moderate (1)				
Fire Behavior, Fuels, an	d Burn Probability (Average Within Nearest FireSheds)	Value	Desc. (Points)				
Flame Length (ft)	Lowest = 1, Highest = >50ft	9 feet					
Crown Fire Activity	Lowest = 0 points, Highest = 4 points		Moderate (2)				
Vegetation Cover (%)	Lowest = -3 (0%), Highest = 3 (>85%)		Moderate (0)				
Nonburnable (%)	Lowest = -5 (70%), Highest = 5 (>0%)		High (5)				
Frequency	Lowest = 1, Highest = 29	Moderate (13)					
Construction and Infras	tructure (Inside Community Boundary)	Description	Points				
Roof Type	Mostly Class A (-2) Mixed/Class B (2) Class C (4)	Mixed	2				
Siding/Deck Type	Non-compustible (-1) Mix (2) Compustible (4)	Nixed	2				
Defensible Space	Full (-2) Partial (2) None (4)		2				
Suppression Easters (In	onderground (0) Mix (1) All Above (2)	All above	Points				
Suppression Factors (in	Nultiple Ways In Out (2) One Way In Out (4)	Description	Points				
Ingress/Egress		One way in/out	4				
Road Slopes	<15% (0) >=15% (1)	<15%	0				
Road Widths	>24ft, with 2 or more lanes (0) <=24ft (3)	<=24'	4				
Adequate Turnarounds	Yes (0) Mixed (0.5) No (1)	Yes	0.5				
Street Signs	4" Reflective (-2) Mixed (0.5) Not Present (1)	4" signs	-2				
Hydrants	Municipal hydrants available (-4) No water available (2)	Hydrants	-4				
Dip/Draft Water	Lowest -3 (0mi), Highest = 0 (>5mi)		High (0)				
Dist. to Imp. Road	Lowest -2 (0mi), Highest = 2 (>5mi)		Low (-1)				
Dist. to Fire Station	Lowest 0 (0mi), Highest = 50 (> 5mi)		High (50)				
Non-Fuel Elements	Lowest = -10 points, Highest > 0 points		High (0)				
Additional Rating Facto	rs (Put Value in Points if Present)	Poss. Pts.	Points				
Frequent Lightning		1	1				
Close Railroads		1	0				
Mid-slope Homes		0.5	0.5				
Homes on Ridge Tops		0.5	0				
Homes in Saddles		0.5	0				
Ravines		0.5	0.5				
Chimneys		0.5	0.5				
Many Campfires		2	0.0				
Frequent Burning (Ag. De	abris Wood Stove etc.)	1	1				
Wood Foncing		2					
Non yoar round Populatio		1	0				
Other (Maxium of 2 Deinte	(Ded Ctuff)) Creetful) (and steep reads and tenegraphy) Laurah	2	1				
Other (Maxium of 2 Points	(Cased Otuff)) Specify:_very steep roads and topography. Largely	2	Z				
Other (Maxium of -2 Point	s (Good Stuff)) Specify:_Ferguesen fire 2019 removed much of	-2 Volue	- Deinte				
	Lowest 1 Highest 20 from Nearest Fire Chade	Value	Points				
			10				
Overall BOG Rating	Lowest = -15, Highest = 30+ Add'l Rating Factors		16				
TOTAL POINTS			26				
		R	ating				
Final Rating	Moderate <24, High 24-29, Very High >29						
*Boots on Ground (BOG)							