

Yuba County Resource Conservation District YCWHRP Ranking

YCRCD Yuba County Wildfire Hazard Reduction Program Ranking Criteria	Points
Property is part of a multi-property project (landowner collaborating with neighbors)	
Yes	10
No	0
Property shares boundary with existing fuel treatment area	
Yes	2
No	0
Landowner resides on property and property is located in Yuba County	
Yes	15
No	0
Does not reside on property but lives in Yuba County	3
Property is part of a recognized Firewise Community	
Yes	5
No	0
Level of detail in proposed work maintenance plan	
Well-thought out, including reasonable treatments performed by landowner. Displays knowledge and preference of native species. Open to prescribed fire. Landowner shows passion for land management.	10
Mentions prescribed burn, herbicide, grazing or other non-mechanical work to cut regrowth.	3
Relies on other programs to perform maintenance	2
One-word answers	1
No answers	0
Income Level	
\$9,000 - \$16,000	6
\$16,001 - \$27,000	5
\$27,001 - \$43,000	4
\$59,001 - \$70,000	3
\$70,001 - \$130,000	2
Property Size	
More than 40 Ac	1
Less than 40 Ac	2
Less than 20 Ac	3

YCRCD Yuba County Wildfire Hazard Reduction Program Ranking Criteria	Points
Less than 10 Ac	4
5 Ac or less	5

YCRCD Yuba County Landowner Assistance Program Ranking Criteria	Points
Need as determined by field visit	
Severe - Landowner lives on property and home is in danger due to current conditions	15
High - Landowner lives on property and property contains hazards from tree fall and/or fire	10
Moderate - Landowner does not live on property but property is strategically located / Need for mechanical treatment is high.	10
Moderate - Current state of vegetation is preventing landowner from returning or rebuilding. Log decks count.	5
Moderate - Landowner lives on property but need for management is low.	5
Low - Landowner does not reside on property, no stated plans to return. Managing for habitat, need for management is low.	2
Need not apparent	0
Feasibility of work (property does not have to meet every detail within category) determined in field	
Good access, mechanical work OK, moderate material loading, prescribed fire opportunities	10
Moderate access, little to no mechanical work/hand work only, high material loading, pile burning OK	5
Poor access, all hand work with high material loading	2
Work not feasible with this program	0
Is the property a good fit for PBA?	
Yes	10
No	0
Is project a good fit for other cost-sharing programs requiring a FMP?	
Yes	5
No	0
Are there special circumstances preventing applicant from state-funded work?	
Yes	-50
No	0
Total Points	