

Please use the language below as a starting point, but make it your own—choose the issue or issues that matter most to you and add your personal experience.

Email: publiccomments@bof.ca.gov

Dear Members of the Board of Forestry:

I am writing to urge the full Board not to simply ratify the Advisory Committee's proposed Zone 0 regulations. Before imposing a statewide mandate with enormous consequences for existing homes and landscapes, the Board should take a hard look at the unresolved scientific and implementation questions.

I am particularly concerned about the following:

One size does not fit California. The same prescriptive vegetation rules cannot reasonably address both rural properties and dense urban neighborhoods where homes may be only feet apart.

Where is the evidence? The Board has not demonstrated that removing healthy, hydrated and well-maintained vegetation within five feet provides the claimed benefit in a dense, wind-driven urban fire.

Removing plants does not address the biggest vulnerabilities. Post-fire research points to structure characteristics, ember intrusion, and the density and spacing of homes as major factors in structure loss—risks that removing healthy vegetation does not solve.

The consequences have not been adequately considered. These regulations could dramatically affect established landscapes, tree canopy, biodiversity, heat, privacy, erosion and homeowners' costs without sufficient consideration of those impacts.

Is "local flexibility" really local? Local alternatives must still produce "substantially similar practical effects" to the state's requirements. Local fire authorities should have meaningful authority to determine how best to achieve equal or greater fire protection based on local conditions—not simply find another way to reproduce the state's prescribed result.

[PLEASE ADD YOUR OWN THOUGHTS HERE. Choose any of the issues above that matter to you and explain how the proposed regulations could affect your home, property or neighborhood.]

These concerns have been raised throughout this process, yet the proposed regulations remain based on the same underlying assumptions. Being heard is not the same as being listened to.

I support strong, science-based measures to prevent home ignition. But the proposed regulations do not meet that standard. I urge the full Board to take a hard look at the science, the consequences and the need for meaningful local authority before voting.

The goal should not be uniform landscaping. The goal should be preventing homes from igniting.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Sincerely,

[NAME]

[CITY/COMMUNITY]