

Wildfire Program Advisory Council

December 2, 2022

Public Comments received

Bob Hart
Consulting LLC
Land Use Planning and Development

November 28, 2022

Wildfire Programs Advisory Council
Mark Bennett, Chair

RE DLCD Report on SB 762

Dear Chair Bennett and Council Members,

I have reviewed the DLCD report and the Council Addendum to critique the report for submittal to the Governor and Legislature. As a conclusion, the general nature of the recommendations leaves no specific direction other than there needs to be work on transportation systems to provide escape facilities in case of fires and that there needs to be changes to goals, policies, and land use regulations to address wildfire. The DLCD report should have been postponed until the Wildfire experts of Fire Marshal, State Forestry and Building Codes Division have revised their programs. I understand that SB762 required a review for Land Use. Now that we are in the middle of the program, it is time to re-examine the need for more state level land use program expansion to address Wildfire.

I have spoken to County Commissioners in Jackson County and they are not supportive of the DLCD position of more changes to policies and goals in the Comprehensive Plan and new land use codes. I have attached the County letter that addresses the DLCD recommendations. The Department of Land Conservation and Development states they need more staff and money to address the concerns by creating model ordinances and technical support to local agencies. It would appear that the Department is proposing to expand into Wildfire Review that they have no history of experience. This does not appear needed as the State Fire Marshall, Building Codes Division and Department of Forestry have the back ground and experience to address Wildfire in Oregon. The current Natural Hazards Goal 7 already required that Counties and Cities address Wildfire as illustrated below.

The current Natural Hazards Goal 7 that identifies floods (coastal and riverine), landslides, earthquakes and related hazards, tsunamis, coastal erosion, and wildfires as natural hazards. The provisions and the focus of implementation for the Natural Hazards Goal is to task the local governments for the Planning and Implementation with guidance from the State Goal in the areas that should be considered. The emphasis is with the term "should" as articulated in the Goal. While there will undoubtedly be some direction from the State, the maximum flexibility of local ordinances needs to be retained by Local Governments. Local jurisdictions are closest to the issue, and have the ability to best address local concerns. The report and recommendations from DLCD do not appear to continue the "should" attitude but will become more requirements by administrative rulemaking. DLCD's role, as required by the Goal is to evaluate needs for changes when a new inventory is available. There is not a completed inventory so any position by DLCD is premature.

A part of the SB 762 roll out, required that letters be sent to all property owners that would be classified as High or Extreme Risk on the Wildfire Risk Map. A series of regional public meetings were held throughout the state by ODF and the State Fire Marshal. The response to the Medford meeting was overwhelming. The initial ODF meeting in Grants Pass was cancelled at the last minute. The second meeting in Medford was changed to a zoom meeting instead of an in-person meeting, also at the last minute. At the second meeting, more than 1200 people signed up with more than 600 of those wanting to speak. Larger venues were needed for subsequent meetings. The objections voiced were so strong, the Map was withdrawn. In comparison, the DLCDC invited stakeholder meeting(s), and listening sessions for state wide comments didn't have the response that the single initial regional zoom meeting of the Forestry Department. Information on the makeup of the Departments outreach is listed in the Appendix of the draft report. Stakeholder involvement is not equivalent to Citizen Involvement as required by the state goal. The majority members of the Stakeholder groups are non-governmental organizations (NGO's), not average citizens. The Listening Sessions are overwhelmingly local government staff members and persons from NGO's. Again average citizens are not aware of the Department's development of the draft report. Regional in-person public meetings would invite a better understanding of the proposal and have a better response from the citizens of the state. The Citizen Involvement thus far is especially disturbing with State Goal 1 of public involvement being a cornerstone of the program. There should have been well publicized regional public meetings not just Zoom Meetings and Listening Sessions that attract mainly government agencies and organizations that have a specific focus. The general public is unaware of the work program the Department is conducting. Many people mistakenly think that the whole project has been stopped with the withdrawal of the map.

The DLCDC states that they will not be proposing individual lot requirements but will focus more on larger development such as subdivisions and transportation facilities. The Counties and Cities are the best agencies to set standards for such measures as there are aware of local conditions such as topography, vegetation, available emergency services and transportation systems. This is not something that can be done from Salem. Site review and development standards should be limited to local development and adoption.

To summarize my comments; 1) the DLCDC report should have been delayed until the Risk Map revisions were complete; the need for land use involvement in Wildfire Programs should be re-examined; if DLCDC is further required, regional meetings to confer with the general public should be done before a full program is proposed; Wildfire policies and regulations should be developed by local government and not from DLCDC. The recommendations as drafted will further develop a complex, top down regulatory system that was criticized more than a decade ago during the Big Look Task Force that reviewed the Land Use Program in Oregon. The recommendations for additional permanent staff for rulemaking or voluntary action, can be characterized as empire building. Counties and cities are highly variable and regional flexibility to adopt regulations must be a priority to support these jurisdictions. I am of the opinion that Wildfire policies should come from the State Forestry Department and Fire Marshal and local jurisdictions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Bob Hart". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

·Bob Hart, Planning Consultant
Bob Hart Consulting LLC
5126 W. Evans Creek Rd.
Rogue River, OR 97537



JACKSON COUNTY

Oregon

Board of Commissioners

Rick Dyer (541) 774-6118
Dave Dotterer (541) 774-6119
Colleen Roberts (541) 774-6117
Fax: (541) 774-6705

10 South Oakdale, Room 214
Medford, Oregon 97501

September 8, 2022

Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development
635 Capital Street Northeast, Suite 150
Salem OR 97301
dlcd.wildfire@dlcd.oregon.gov

RE: Comments on Wildfire Adapted Communities Recommendations Report – Public Review Draft

Dear Department of Land Conservation and Development:

We, the Jackson County Board of Commissioners, appreciate the opportunity to provide comment on the Public Review Draft of the Wildfire Adapted Communities Recommendations Report (Report). As the community that suffered the most destructive wildfires in the history of Oregon in 2020, with over 3,000 housing units destroyed and tens of thousands of residents impacted, we believe Jackson County has a unique perspective and experience to bring to this matter.

Initially, we have some concerns and questions regarding how the membership of the Wildfire Adapted Communities Stakeholder Group was determined. In reviewing the membership roster, the only individuals identified as having a connection to Jackson County do not have any connection to a local government charged with adopting and implementing land use regulations within our County. The membership includes an individual responsible for fighting wildfires, and individuals who advocate for land use regulations. However, the Group does not include an individual who is actually responsible for land use regulations within our County, at either the city or County level of government. In looking at the membership roster, there are only two Elected Officials, or employees of local public entities, who are charged with adopting and implementing local land use regulations. As such, we believe the membership of this Group, as a whole, is not reflective of the individuals who have actual knowledge of adopting and implementing local land use regulations and, especially so, have no representation of the one county entity, Jackson, that was most impacted by the recent wildfires. To say we are disappointed in this oversight of appointing anyone representing a local government who actually experienced and worked through a catastrophic wildfire to this Group, especially someone representing Jackson County, would be an understatement.

Turning to the substance of the Recommendations, Jackson County has comments on five of the six recommendations put forward in the Public Review Draft of the Report. Our comments reflect our lived experiences in dealing with the devastating Almeda and South Obenchain Fires, as well as adopting and implementing local land use regulations in our community. We sincerely hope that the Group and the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) takes into serious consideration these comments.

As to Recommendation No. 1, Jackson County does not understand the recommendation to create another system of community information and engagement related to planning efforts directed specifically at wildfire adapted communities or, for that matter, a need for any specialty system for community involvement and

participation on a single topic. Currently, Jackson County has a robust system of community information and involvement for all planning actions and efforts under Goal 1. We assume that all local governments in Oregon have similar robust systems for community involvement and planning efforts in their jurisdictions likewise under Goal 1. The Report lacks any information or evidence that these generally applicable community involvement systems are somehow lacking or falling short as it relates to community involvement in planning efforts related to wildfire adapted communities. Creating an additional layer of regulation, through mandating specialty community involvement efforts by local governments, needlessly adds additional cost and the expenditure of limited resources to the public entities charged with adopting and implementing local land use regulations in the State. Perhaps, if there was any evidence that the current system of community involvement was not sufficient to address planning efforts related to wildfire adapted communities, Jackson County could understand the need to revise the current systems to address what is lacking. But, as the Report does not appear to provide any specifics as to why the current systems are lacking, Jackson County is unable to provide substantive comment on how to remedy whatever has been determined to be insufficient.

As to Recommendation No. 2, again, Jackson County does not understand the need to create another requirement for cities and counties to review their Transportation System Plans (TSP) for a specific element. For example, Jackson County is currently in the process of reviewing its TSP in order to comply with the deadlines and requirements of the Climate-Friendly and Equitable Communities regulations. Such a review is very costly and resource intensive. Jackson County, simply put, does not have the staffing resources or funding to be continually reviewing and amending its TSP every time the State of Oregon, or one of its agencies, decides that another review must be completed within a defined deadline. If the State decides that a TSP should consider elements related to Wildfire Adapted Communities, Jackson County's strong recommendation is that no deadlines be set, and to let each community add such to the criteria of review for the next time the community intends to review and amend its TSP as a whole.

As to Recommendation No. 3, once again, Jackson County does not understand the need for requiring yet another review and amendment of our Land Use Ordinance for the specific factor of "prioritizing street connectivity" and "driveway access standards." Currently, Jackson County, along with what we would assume are all other local governments, requires new development to comply with robust standards to ensure public safety and emergency access, including the 2019 Oregon State Fire Code. Thus, requiring local governments to review their local land development ordinances to consider compliance with yet another specialty standard, already incorporated and considered into the ordinances, seems like an inefficient use of local entities' time and resources.

As to Recommendation No. 4, Jackson County has several issues of concern. First, the term "greatest wildfire risk" does not appear to address a specific wildfire risk classification, and the DLCDC is waiting for the new mapping before addressing the risk classifications. Second, with regard to clustering of structures, spacing of structures, and density requirements, the Report lacks any specifics on which Jackson County can provide comment. We would request the opportunity to provide comment as to any specifics on these, or other requirements, before inclusion in the final Report. Furthermore, as referenced in the Report, the standards for clustering, spacing, and density appear that they are being considered without regard to mitigation efforts for wildfires on particular parcels or in particular communities. Any standard by which a landowner or developer cannot receive relief for mitigation would appear to significantly limit development with no relief. Third, with regard to ensuring adequate water supplies, this appears to be a recommendation already covered by the Oregon State Fire Code and, in our opinion, goes beyond the scope of a local governments authority as it relates to comprehensive planning or local zoning. Fourth, the statement limiting essential facilities in areas designated as susceptible to wildfires would deny these services to rural communities, who are in most desperate need of easy access to these services. Such a limitation on essential facilities would significantly restrict any development in areas of Oregon outside of the northwestern portion of the State.

As to Recommendation No. 6, Jackson County supports the DLCD providing assistance to local governments in increasing the effectiveness of hazards planning. However, without specifics as to the form or extent of the assistance, Jackson County is unable to provide detailed comment on the Recommendation in the Report.

In summary, we believe the Stakeholder Group who developed the Report lacked the inclusion of local government land use professionals and representatives in its development. This shows in many of the Recommendations, as noted above, that do not consider existing systems and requirements already used by local governments and seek to create additional burdens, without substantial benefits, on entities who already have limited time and resources. While we appreciate that the DLCD is required to submit its report on or before October 1, 2022, we strongly encourage that the Report recommend the reconvening of the Group and includes the absolutely necessary perspectives which were excluded from this iteration of the Group. Additionally, as above, we strongly encourage removing any additional regulatory burdens or tasks from the Report. And, for those portions of the Report which were too vague to provide comment, we would recommend providing more details in the Report and an additional opportunity to provide comment by impacted cities and counties, other entities, and the general public.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment.

Sincerely,

JACKSON COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS



Dave Dotterrer, Chair



Colleen Roberts, Commissioner



Rick Dyer, Commissioner

:jb/kk

By: Email Only

Donna Torres

Dear Sir/Madam,

My name is Donna Torres.

My concerns with this council are:

\$\$ Impacts, Rules, Codes & Fines placed upon WUI Property Owners

If you watch “Fire in Paradise” on Netflix, you will not only find it terrifying, but you will realize that no matter how much money we put into our homes doing fuels reduction, building code hardening, taxes or levies for “fire protections”, when you’ve got a monster fire coming at you from government mismanaged lands, your fuels reduction or land use restrictions isn’t going to save our home or our life.

SB 762 requires ODF to develop a statewide map classifying property owners in a Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) of wildfire risk levels. Reading SB 762, it appears that these risk classifications will be used to restrict land use, create building, zoning and defensible space codes to existing properties. Am I correct? What I do not see, however, where SB 762 mitigates the real problem in these wildlands laden with heavy fuels, but intentionally places burdens on existing private property owners.

The last map you sent out to the people depicted a “WUI” Wildland-Urban Interface which included almost all of the rural properties in this State thus categorizing properties with “hazard risk levels”. Is there a current map that depicts the WUI so people know if you are talking about them when you have these meetings now? If so, where can we see this Wildland Urban Interface map?

As I am reading the impacts of SB 762, the new defensible space rules and regulations along with the taxes and levies for “fire protections”, they effect every property in this interface, regardless of risk. Is this correct?

Most all of Douglas County residents state, they never received any letter from you at all which in the last map, appeared to effect all of Douglas County property owners. Most ALL of this will come as a complete surprise to property owners in this county, unless they know to watch for these meetings and public comment periods. Do you plan to communicate with the property owners in the WUI so they know they will be effected by these codes, rules, regulations, taxes, levies for fire protection and defensible space?

ORS 477.270 states the cost for “providing protection for privately owned forestland shall be a lien upon such property.” ORS 477.060 was stricken which spells out considerations in determining cost of protection for ODF which may “include the special or additional cost of fire protection for property owners within a forestland-urban interface classification, including the special or unique costs of assessment processing and administration.” Additionally, these “special or additional costs may not exceed \$25 annual for each real property lot.” Why was the ceiling for these costs stricken? Is it the intention of this bill to impose and price the landowners from their properties with unlimited fees and taxes for “fire protections”? If not, do the right

thing and re-implement the ceiling. Many property owners will not be able to afford more taxes or levies.

As I read all of this, there is a plan on implementing new building and zoning codes on existing properties at certain hazard levels in which if a home repairing more than 50% of their roof would require a whole roof replacement with very expensive and hard to find materials, there will be new code compliances for new room additions, remodels, as well as adding balconies, porches, decks for existing homes. In other words, existing homes must comply with these new codes and building materials. Is this correct? If so, the cost to rebuild a home if a fire were to occur would cause homeowner insurance rates to increase as well. Do you understand the impact to fixed income folks who currently own these properties?

SB 762 also directs DLCD to determine updates needed to statewide land use planning programs and zoning codes, limiting development considerations in the wildland urban interface and most properties bordering Oregon wildlands which pretty much is the majority of Douglas County. I view all of this as an attack on the existing property owners that choose to live near Federal or Government owned properties. SB 762 appears to do nothing to solve the real problem which is allowing these wildlands to remain unmitigated. In other words, a property owner would now face new land-use restrictions if they need to develop?

What I am NOT reading or hearing from this committee, is what this bill will require of Federal and Government owned properties to mitigate “defensible space” for ALL property owners near these wildlands. These lands are far greater in size than that of most homeowner/property owners. IF you want to put good use to our tax dollars, I implore you to address what these lands can do to protect the homeowner by placing rules and restrictions on these lands and not the other way around. A lot of these lands do not have appropriate road systems to allow firefighters to access a fire if one were to occur. Some of the rural fire departments need newer equipment and the ability to call air support directly. A lot of these lands have burned in the past and never were cleaned up which means they will burn hotter the next time. Why are we not making these lands mitigate these issues? How many times will a forest burn before it’s permanently damaged and habitat destroyed? Homeowners are not the problem here and as homeowners, we cannot fix the problem with these lands, but you can. Mitigation of the fuels in these lands is a start.

Although I am pro fuels reduction, I am NOT for state imposed fuel reduction that will bankrupt many of us. Are you aware that California requires homeowners to pay for “Defensible Space Inspections”? According to AB 38, “On and after July 1, 2021 when you sell your property, you’ll need documentation of a compliant Defensible Space Inspection”. The fees must be paid before the inspection is completed. Is this what’s in store for us? Will there be “fines” imposed on homeowners who appear to the “inspector” as “non-compliant”? Will a person be able to sell their home or property without these inspections? Will you be charging for these inspections? Are you following some international code in Oregon? If so, shouldn’t the people in this State be privy to that international code you are following?

Although, we all want to do so much more on my property, most of my neighborhood are over 60 and can't do this type of work ourselves. We plug along a little by little as we have the funds

to pay for the work we want done. IF you want to help property owners in this state, I implore you to address state and federal government who own these lands and hold them responsible for THEIR part in this fire season nightmare.

To use our tax money to help homeowners create defensible spaces is one thing, but creating fines or fees for non-compliance, taxing us more for fire protections because we live near to these lands or implementing building/zoning code regulations impairs our ability to improve our properties and restricts our land usage. It does not solve the real problem of addressing unmitigated forest land that surround most of this state. Forcing property owners to use very expensive and hard to find materials to remodel, rebuild, or repair is not the answer to mitigating the fuels in the lands that surround us.

Best regards,

Donna Torres

Robin Lee, Medford, OR

I write to express some of the many reasons I consider SB 762 poorly conceived, heavy-handed, and possibly unlawful.

My primary objection is that so much of the “work” of this bill has taken place behind closed doors, and handled by people not qualified to submit data or form conclusions. One illustration: students reviewing GIS or Google Maps to determine where fire risks may be.

- My impacted property (Old Ferry Rd., Shady Cove) has 330 feet of Rogue River frontage and a well. Suppression easier than in woodlands. In the 33 years I’ve owned it, there’ve been no fires. Nor have my neighbors had fires. We border BLM. We interact with them regularly. I dispute your labeling our risk as ‘extreme’. Your evaluation should have been made in light of actual history, rather than darts thrown at maps.
- Neighbors, and others I have met, recount discrepancies in ratings of adjoining properties. One cited that in her cul-de-sac, only hers was ‘extreme’. Neighbors weren’t even ‘high’.

Another objection is that these arbitrary assignments will raise the rates of contracted protection from our Fire Districts with no proof they are accurate assignments. Property insurance rates will also increase, again with no proof that the risk assessment is accurate

- If Fire Districts raise fees and impose them as taxes, there must be a vote by the people, not the legislature. I feel this entire matter should go before the people in a vote.

For the 34 years I have lived in southern Oregon, fire protection has been the purview of the state and feds. Our local county officials (Jackson County) have had significant success in getting BLM and ODF’s commitment to collaborate, not just cooperate, in fire suppression. The State has done a poor job of suppression. This bill seems nothing more than the State’s attempt to completely abrogate its responsibility to protect us, the citizens.

- Government's job is protection!
- 90% of acreage burned by wildfire has historically been on Federal land. Shifting the burden to property owners is patently unfair.
- Mitigation of risk, including 'defensible spaces', should begin where the historical risks are known, not guessed at.
- Code changes should be recommended at local levels, and with multiple opportunities for public input.

Other issues have been voiced at meetings I've attended, such as

- Power companies needing to upgrade their systems to mitigate risks from aging lines, etc.
- Mandatory inspections of properties without warrants, i.e. trespass!
- Creation of so-called Urban Interface zones wherein new construction or improvements are restricted. Some think the power-hungry among the elite would like rural landowners to give up their property rights and accept their "Stack and Pack" vision for the future.
- A severe lack of transparency at all phases. Hand-picked input from too few constituents.
- DLCD has mandated changes that could deprive landowners of the freedom to develop their properties. That's tantamount to "taking" a property without just compensation. Theft. Unlawful. Unconstitutional.

Scrap SB 762 and put it back before the next legislature. Then to the people on a ballot!

Sincerely,

Robin Lee
residing at 415 Sunrise Ave., Medford, OR 97504

Janay Tribble, Glide OR

No fire map please! This is another line to draw that no one should cross that is keeping "safe from fire" them, their neighbors or the state. It is our land and we take care of it. We do not need our property rights stomped on and then a threat of higher insurance rates for property insurance or be dropped is ridiculous. No one wants this and we want government to stay out of it!

Sincerely,

Janay Trimble
Glide Oregon

DeAnne Hayes

Dear Ms. Carlisle,

I am very much opposed to SB 762 and very shocked that something of this nature has been pushed through without a vote. The people affected should be able to vote on whether or not

their homes and property should be searched, their insurance raised, their ability to rebuild after a fire compromised, and their property taken by the government if they don't comply.

I am opposed to mandatory inspection of my property without warrant or probable cause (this is against my constitutional rights).

Increased taxes for fire protection without a vote of two-thirds of the legislature is not legal.

Ninety percent of fires are on FEDERAL land, that has not been maintained! As a private property owner I should not be held responsible for government mismanagement.

This bill is unconstitutional and should not be allowed to stand. It should not be modified, it should be overturned completely.

Thank you for your time.

DeAnne Hayes
Josephine County

Joyce Nicholson

I understand there is a zoom mtg today regarding the wild fire risks.

Please be advised to reconsider the equity and ramifications of this bill.

I live in the neighborhood of the 2020 southern Oregon fire and experienced watching the billows of smoke being pushed rapidly down the I-5 corridor destroying thousands of residents in a matter of hrs. This is an area excluded from the penalties of non compliance to SB 762 legislations. Not fair! How do they rate this exemption? Wind and fire mixed make for unstoppable destruction and that can happen anywhere.

Anyone who has lived in S Oregon 40 yrs knows we have had unprecedented, environmentally destructive smoke only in recent years. The major part of this is due to huge fires in unmanaged government lands ...not from the rural farms and residences. This should be addressed before accusing homeowners of wildfire risks.

There are more point of discrimination in this bill but I will leave it at these two points for now.

Hope you consider the voice of the public and make information input timely and accessible. Hope I reached the correct location for comments. If not please forward this on for consideration. Please update me on decisions being made.

Thank you,
Joyce Nicholson

William and Christine Miller

Dear Doug,

I am attaching a letter expressing our concerns about SB 762 and the Wildfire map we sent out in September to our Senators and Representatives. The letter is also included below.

SB762 is bad legislation and we are hoping it will soon be overturned.

A sincere thank you for your service.

Respectfully,

William & Christine Miller

September 18, 2022

To Whom it May Concern, an Appeal to SB762 and the Oregon Wildfire Map, The Oregon Wildfire Legislation and Map were obviously rushed through during the international crisis of Covid19. Our government offices in Salem were locked down and there was not the advertising needed to inform the citizens of Oregon for a law that would affect everyone in the entire state. My husband and I were personally unaware of this new law and preceding map until we received the letter at the end of July. After examining the law and the map we have some serious concerns about such legislation. The map addressing Oregon's Wildfire Response does not take into consideration irrigated land, wetlands and roadways that all act as 'defensible space'. Nor does it take into consideration that most people do not want their homes and properties to be lost in a fire and take every step to mitigate that possibility. We live in a neighborhood surrounded by roads, wetlands, irrigated pasture lands, carefully managed irrigated lawns & vegetation and yet we have been given a 'high' rating. There is absolutely no way to have a 50 foot space around 'structures' when our homes are often not that far apart. Our home has fire resistant cement siding and roofing as most of the homes in our neighborhood do. Our electrical lines are underground and we have a fire hydrant directly across the street. This map is making assumptions and laying them out as though they are true & accurate and they are not. This map is a nightmare for Oregonians. It gives permission for the state to develop and apply fees or taxes on properties for non-compliance and then place liens on their properties if the owners cannot pay. It can and will raise insurance on homes and properties to unforeseeable amounts and possibly put them in the bracket of 'un-insurable'. These fees and taxes and raised insurance rates would be impossible for the elderly & those on a fixed income & many others. Oregon's home & property owners could possibly & wrongfully have their lands taken by the state if they cannot pay. This kind of legislation and extreme government overreach and control should not be tolerated by law abiding citizens. We wholeheartedly agree with the letters written by Senator Lynn Findley (R-Vale) and Representative Mark Owens (R- Crane) on the oregon.gov website. *see link below for the complete letters written on the oregon.gov website, under SB 762 Wildfire. "The map as it stands has no credibility. It serves as an ill-informed, unreviewed, and dangerous and divisive product pitting homeowners against the state of Oregon." Sen. Findley & Rep. Owens.

William and Christine Miller
266 Echo Way
Eagle Point OR 97524

<https://www.oregonlegislature.gov/owens/Documents/Findley.%20Owens%20call%20on%20Oregon%20Department%20of%20Forestry%20to%20immediately%20roll%20back%20harmful%20WildBre%20Risk%20Map.pdf>

Erin Dumont

I am very much opposed to this bill for so many reasons.

Erin Dumont

Nancy North

I do not like the new rules and regulations made by several states!!!

Daryl and Katherine Dickerson

Mr. Doug Grafe

As property owners in Southern Oregon, we are reaching out to you to voice our objection to the impending rules being developed by multiple state agencies in SB762. These rules would be a hardship on us.

Respectfully,

Daryl and Katherine Dickerson
475 Tenney Drive
Rogue River, OR 97537

Renee Striplin

It has come to my attention that the council will be meeting this week in regards to SB762. We Oregonians are stretched to the LIMITS with regulations, expenses taxes etc. and can't take any more raising of costs. Raising of what you might ask. How about the extreme hike in property insurance that will go into affect IF we can even keep home owners insurance. It is NOT prudent to label entire areas as high risk. Many people mitigate risk to their property by taking all the safety measures and vegetation management measures possible so why in the world should we be punished for properly taking care of our property?? In fact it will create an issue where people are already being punished by extremely higher insurance costs so why bother spending money effort and time on maintenance?? I will tell you I have spoken to many people and they are holding on by a tattered thread to stay in this state. This will absolutely break that thread and force MANY TAX PAYERS out of this state. Please reconsider how you are deciding who is in high risk area (should be on an individual basis NOT a blanket label) or IF THATS EVEN

YOUR JOB (which it's not). That should be up to individual insurance companies to decide that NOT state government.

Dayna Denmark-Halliday

Dear sir,

I am in rural homeowner in Josephine County. I am coming up on 20 years in this same residence. Back then a great selling point was owning a home surrounded by BLM lands, full of trees and nature. My husband and I paid top dollar for a home that offered this type of lifestyle.

Now, twenty years later, all the perks of living among nature have become a detriment. With SB762 I struggle to understand how, in a state this size, so very few are required to do so much, while the rest of the state does nothing. I am pro fuels reduction. It's an ongoing thing if you live rural. I have no issue with that. But 92-93% of the acres burned in the last three decades is essentially government land. But you are not requiring the state and feds to do their part. Why? Logic should tell you that when you have a monster fire coming at you from government lands your fuels reduction isn't going to save your home or your life.

There is nothing in the bill that would have prevented nor addressed the fires in the cities Phoenix and Talent. These areas are shown as moderate or low risk (original map) and as such nothing is required to be done to these properties.

I think every person living in the state of Oregon should carry the same responsibilities for keeping wildfire risks down. Realistically the entire west coast is at risk, and each year the fuels on public lands keep growing. There needs to be balance in SB762 as this truly should not be a rural homeowners burden.

Thank you for reading,

DAYNA DENMARK-HALLIDAY

James Yates

Hello

I live in rural Jackson county and have always taken an active role in reducing the fuel load on my property. However I live very near BLM lands where nothing has been done to reduce the dead trees or brush which would lead to an out of control wild fire. I oppose this bill because it places the burden of fire fuel reduction on the private property owner without requiring the government lands being cleared as well. Also by listing my property as extreme fire risk by simply drawing a map without examining the property is simply wrong. My property was examined personally by a professional District 3 firefighter last year and was given an excellent rating.

Jim Yates
17155 Antioch Rd
White City Oregon

Shannon McGee

Dear Mr Grafe,

This bill is an absolute disaster. It's going to cost homeowners so much while leavening the Federal Government free to continue their dangerous forest policies. My home is on 5 flat, mowed acres with no dead trees, no wild lands anywhere near us and the nearest fire department is 2 miles away. We are next to Hwy 234, on a paved road. My neighbors have mowed fields. The erroneous map concocted by OSU has us listed as "high". We should be going after the top offenders in wild land fires, where most of these catastrophic fires originate, not those of us who could be taxed right out of our property.

Please, Please, please don't put SB762 thru.

Sincerely,

Shannon McGee
2720 Dodge Rd
Eagle Point, OR 97524

Mike W. Jantzer

Dear Sir,

I had a potential buyer back out of a purchase of some development land, I have in Medford Oregon. He stated that he was too concerned over the bill that he would not be able to develop the land in the future, which is designated SFR4.

Regards

Mike W Jantzer

Cole Tidwell

I strongly object to this bill. It is not well-thought-out.

Cole Tidwell

Weston Inkrote

Mr. Grafe,

I'm no expert on legal matters or on wildfires, but I know enough to recognize when something isn't right. In regards to SB 762, something definitely is not right. The fire risk level of my property is my own risk bare. The state has absolutely no business in how I manage my own private property. Especially seeing how poorly the state manages its own land. If the state wants

to see change in how private property is managed in OR it can educate or incentivize but punishment and regulation just isn't acceptable. I could go on and on about the ridiculous assessment process, the massive over reach, or many other topics but instead I'll keep this as simple as I can. I am a born and raised Oregonian, I pay an obscene amount of taxes to this state, and SB 762 does not represent my wishes as a tax paying resident of this state. I don't know your exact position, but I encourage you and those around you to take a moment to remember who it is you work for.

Thank you
- Weston