

The WA Building Code Council care of Bumbalov, Stoyan (DES) ,

222 people have signed a petition on Action Network telling you to Tree Loss Equals more Forest Fires.

Here is the petition they signed:

To: The Washington State Building Code Council
From the Undersigned:

The passage of SB 6109 in 2018 requires the use of ignition-resistant building construction with no reference to defensible space around residences. We were unaware until recently the impact the Wildlife Urban Interface code will have on our communities. Similarly, the 2020 Wildlife Urban Interface map referenced in the WWUIC was intended by the Washington Department of Natural Resources to be used for guiding home-hardening, not to create defensible space.

It is our strong belief the WWUIC code will interfere with the following state laws and mandates:

Besides conflicting with local jurisdictions' codes for tree preservation and re-planting, stormwater retention, and slope stabilization, the defensible space part of the WWUIC conflicts with the following state-level codes or regulations:

- WA State Urban Forest Management Plan (RCW 76.15.005)
- WA State Climate Commitment Act's carbon sequestration goals
- WA State Growth Management Act, Chapter 365-190, which requires counties to protect habitat, including wetlands and critical areas, and to prepare for climate change.
- WA Critical Area Regulations
- WA Shoreline Regulations
- WA Stormwater Regulations
- WA State DNR's Small Forest Landowner Program

It is our belief the code has many unintended consequences:

Climate change impacts, water impacts, an unacceptable amount of tree loss, loss of heating and cooling functions and other eco services trees provide, effects on housing costs, the development process and ironically, through increased emissions, the possibility of increased wildfires.

For the above reasons we ask the SBCC to leave defensible space out of this code cycle and use the next three years to work on a plan that does not create large and unacceptable consequences.

You can view each petition signer and the comments they left you below.

Thank you,

Friends of Trees

1. Abigail Schenken (ZIP code: 98229)

2. Alexandra Starr (ZIP code: 98225-7712)

3. Alan Mountjoy-Venning (ZIP code: 98502)

4. Annie Cubberly (ZIP code: 98502)

5. Iris Antman (ZIP code: 98118)

6. scott kuehner (ZIP code: 98115)

7. Anne Van Sweringen (ZIP code: 98506)

8. Justin Barras (ZIP code: 98229)

9. Dan Bell (ZIP code: 98368)

Trees are not the problem

10. BEVERLY BASSETT (ZIP code: 98506-4435)

One more giveaway to developers that will cost our planet BIG! Don't let this happen!!!

11. Bill Peregrine (ZIP code: 98422)

12. Barbara Fandrich (ZIP code: 98512-2016)

Take the time to redo this code so it does NOT require removal of trees and vegetation up to 100 feet around any structure.

13. June Brown (ZIP code: 98597)

14. Barbara Blair (ZIP code: 98225)

15. Robert Cecile (ZIP code: 98248)

16. bob stocco (ZIP code: 98229)

17. Sherry Buckner (ZIP code: 98512)

18. Bonnie Wood (ZIP code: 98501)

SPONSORED BY

Default_group_icon

FRIENDS OF TREES

Olympia, WA

To: The WA Building Code Council care of Bumbalov, Stoyan (DES)

From: [Your Name]

To: The Washington State Building Code Council

From the Undersigned:

The passage of SB 6109 in 2018 requires the use of ignition-resistant building construction with no reference to defensible space around residences. We were unaware until recently the impact the Wildlife Urban Interface code will have on our communities. Similarly, the 2020 Wildlife Urban Interface map referenced in the WWUIC was intended by the Washington Department of Natural Resources to be used for guiding home-hardening, not to create defensible space.

It is our strong belief the WWUIC code will interfere with the following state laws and mandates:

Besides conflicting with local jurisdictions' codes for tree preservation and re-planting, stormwater retention, and slope stabilization, the defensible space part of the WWUIC conflicts with the following state-level codes or regulations:

– WA State Urban Forest Management Plan (RCW 76.15.005)

– WA State Climate Commitment Act's carbon sequestration goals

- WA State Growth Management Act, Chapter 365-190, which requires counties to protect habitat, including wetlands and critical areas, and to prepare for climate change.

-WA Critical Area Regulations

-WA Shoreline Regulations

-WA Stormwater Regulations

-WA State DNR's Small Forest Landowner Program

It is our belief the code has many unintended consequences:

Climate change impacts, water impacts, an unacceptable amount of tree loss, loss of heating and cooling functions and other eco services trees provide, effects on housing costs, the development process and ironically, through increased emissions, the possibility of increased wildfires.

For the above reasons we ask the SBCC to leave defensible space out of this code cycle and use the next three years to work on a plan that does not create large and unacceptable consequences.

19. Andrew Yarrows (ZIP code: 98502)

20. Connie Campbell (ZIP code: 98512)

21. Carolyn Rodenberg (*ZIP code: 98119*)

22. Casey L. C. Paredes (*ZIP code: 98365*)

23. Cathy Spalding (*ZIP code: 98516*)

Many of the spaces in orange are nowhere near the possibility of a forest fire. House fires, etc., yes... but not forest fires. Denuding such a significant number of trees and vegetation will severely impact the effects from weather, erosion and storm water. It will obviously impact wildlife, emotional and mental health and so much more. Mud slides are already a serious problem. In fact, wildfire science does NOT even support this radical removal of our landscape. Trees are a vital piece in our overall survival. It is reported that MANY more need to be planted for the health of our planet - not to mention us. The PNW is not a desert and should not be made to become one. There are steps that can be taken but this is not a well thought out building code and will have an adverse impact on all living things. The long-term results are a very negative. Please, rethink this and consider less drastic measures.

24. Christina Stemley (*ZIP code: 98052*)

25. Christine Simmons (*ZIP code: 98229*)

26. Christine Cook (*ZIP code: 98502*)

27. Cindy Marzolf (*ZIP code: 98155*)

I moved here from a wildfire-prone area where countless trees were cut down. It didn't save structures. What did were fire-resistant materials. I do agree with that part of this proposal and am willing to pay for those materials (fortunately, my home is built with them). The impact to numerous species, to climate, to weather, to pollution, and to quality of life of losing countless trees is simply not acceptable.

28. Larry Dzieza (*ZIP code: 98501*)

29. Carl Benson (*ZIP code: 98516*)

30. c Robinson slouber (*ZIP code: 98229*)

31. CRAIG STEMLEY (*ZIP code: 98052*)

Codes don't cure stupid.

32. cheryl waitkevich (*ZIP code: 98506*)

33. Charissa Waters (*ZIP code: 98501*)

Please do all you can to save our trees!

34. Danielle Rowland (*ZIP code: 98007*)

This code seems extremely ill advised, and contains way too many unintended consequences. Rather

than trying to amend a clearly misguided WWUIC, it would be wiser to go back to the drawing board on this one, and do better due diligence consulting stakeholders outside the narrow set considered.

35. David Haskett (*ZIP code: 98237*)

Are all you on crack over there? We are in a climate crisis and your recommendation is to cut down potentially hundreds of thousands of trees that scrub the air that we breathe? And it's even more ridiculous east of the mountains. You do realize that in many parts of Eastern Washington farmland that people plant trees thickly around their homes to SAVE electricity on heating and cooling. Cause guess what. There are no trees for Miles around these homes and it's hot as hell in the summer and cold as the top of Stevens pass during winter with the wind chill. Which guess what, the bloody trees help cut the wind. God. Get a clue

36. Deane Rimerman (*ZIP code: 98502*)

37. Tyler DeBarthe (*ZIP code: 98332*)

38. Hope Shaffer (*ZIP code: 98332*)

39. Denis Langhans (*ZIP code: 98502-3737*)

40. Dionysus Lewis (*ZIP code: 98516*)

save the trees

41. Donna Lotton (*ZIP code: 98502*)

42. Jo Ann Young (*ZIP code: 98506*)

43. Richard Chrappa (*ZIP code: 98226*)

Please take into consideration the net benefit of trees in the landscape. Any efforts at removing large numbers of trees has unintended consequences which result in more danger to people and climate, not less.

44. Ed Rosenthal (*ZIP code: 98290*)

Totally against this preposterous code change.

45. Eleanor Israel (*ZIP code: 98576*)

We must protect trees everywhere. So important for the earth and all animals.

46. Austin flahaut (*ZIP code: 98503*)

47. Elli Harron (*ZIP code: 98229*)

Do not remove trees, as our climate continues to warm, we need more trees not less.

48. Elsie (*ZIP code: 98502*)

49. Emilia Snow (*ZIP code: 98501*)

50. Erik Tomlin (*ZIP code: 98125*)

51. Elizabeth Crain (*ZIP code: 98019*)

52. Deanna Vandiver (*ZIP code: 98110*)

Time to address the unintended consequences of this code. Thank you!

53. Freya Reiss (*ZIP code: 98225*)

54. Gail Wrede (*ZIP code: 98502*)

55. George Burazer (*ZIP code: 98503*)

This Building Code needs to be amended to provide for effects of when it comes to the extent of tree removal.

56. Gary Kavanagh (*ZIP code: 98365*)

The new rules are too restrictive. A better plan would be to keep flammable flashy fuels such as dry grass cut below 12" high for a distance of 30 feet or, to the property line whichever is closer, around structures. Trees near structures should be pruned so that branches are at least 10 feet away from roofs. Non ornamental trees within 30 feet of the structure should be limbed 20 feet off the ground but, no more than 50 percent of crown to height ratio of the tree, to remove the ladder fuels to prevent ground fires from moving to the canopy.

57. Glen Anderson (*ZIP code: 98503*)

THIS IS IMPORTANT!!!

I implore you to ACT RESPONSIBLY and follow through with this.

Thanks.

58. Greg Waters (*ZIP code: 98506*)

59. Greg Malcham (*ZIP code: 98040*)

60. Gordon Wheat (*ZIP code: 98506*)

It is critical in our county to not cut down trees that should remain, but rather to remove brush, grass and lower limbs while hardening the buildings for fire protection. Please make sure your advice is based on solid science.

61. Carol Hamilton (*ZIP code: 98502*)

62. Kathleen Harmon (*ZIP code: 98391*)

The idea of deforestation in new construction development is a direct contradiction to concerns over

climate change. Oh so buy carbon credits and everything is OK. I think not.

63. Heather Harris (*ZIP code: 98077*)

64. Holly Graham (*ZIP code: 98502*)

Our forests are not for sale or sacrifice! Stop your threats against the lungs of the town, the state, and the planet!!STOP!!

65. James Hoppie (*ZIP code: 98226*)

The defensible perimeter provisions in this policy foster more climate change, not less. We need more trees, not less. Less carbon capture will lead to more fire, not less.

66. Heather Pens (*ZIP code: 98506*)

67. Harry Branch (*ZIP code: 98502*)

68. Bob Jacobs (*ZIP code: 98501*)

69. Janet Wright (*ZIP code: 98512*)

70. Janet Jordan (*ZIP code: 98501*)

71. JC Davis (*ZIP code: 98502*)

72. Jessika Kearns (*ZIP code: 98362*)

73. Julie Ratner (*ZIP code: 98502*)

I beg you to stop this insanity and make decisions so that future generations can thrive! Julie

74. John Anderson (*ZIP code: 98225*)

The case for reconsidering this code is extremely strong. It should not go into effect.

We have a personal experience with wildfire. When we lived near Reno, a fire came through our neighborhood. We had hardened our house and removed ladder fuel. But we had 100' Ponderose Pines very close to the house that would have violated the proposed policy. As the fire moved through our neighborhood, it dropped from crown to ground as it reached our property, and our house survived. The firefighters really thanked us!

75. Janine Lindsey (*ZIP code: 98501*)

It is critically important that this code be reworked and revised to better align with known wildfire science, and to protect the incomparable mitigating action of our Washington trees & forests. When I think of a 'working forest'...this is its highest and greatest calling, doing exactly what it is meant to do: to KEEP STANDING in protection of air, water, land, habitat and life on earth.

76. Jenna Harris (*ZIP code: 98229*)

77. Julie Voiland (*ZIP code: 98026*)

78. James O'Barr (*ZIP code: 98507*)

We cannot afford to continue to think of trees as mere commodities, or planning problems, or decorations.

79. Joseph Joy (*ZIP code: 98502*)

I believe the code needs to be more geographically specific for areas that are fire prone at the fringe of wildlands where residential development encroaches.

80. John Bremer (*ZIP code: 98229*)

81. Joyce Biethan (*ZIP code: 98501*)

Please please please stop the action of this misguided and uninformed decision by the building code department.

82. Diane Barber (*ZIP code: 98512*)

Let's please stop cutting down healthy trees .

83. Judy LeBlanc (*ZIP code: 98107*)

please be guided by the tree science and current regulations which would have less space between the trees. We need to protect and increase trees to minimize the effects of climate change.

84. Janet Wheeler (*ZIP code: 98501*)

85. Kathleen Lennartson (*ZIP code: 98502*)

86. Katherine Chesick (*ZIP code: 98125*)

Please don't require defensible spaces in suburban areas. Further, it would be better to stop developing in urban areas than to require more of such areas to be clear-cut of trees to protect houses.

87. Kendra Crismier (*ZIP code: 98034*)

Western Washington is losing trees at an alarming rate. Come to Kirkland to see just how many in the past 6 months. Make it stop! This is a terrible new law. A better idea is to clear ground cover and stop approving new builds in fire prone areas.

88. JOANNE KELLY (*ZIP code: 98512*)

89. Kevin Nesbitt (*ZIP code: 98229*)

90. Richard Dlugo (*ZIP code: 98501*)

Listen to the science on this subject. Save all the trees you can.

91. Kristina Pierce (*ZIP code: 98506*)

92. Kim Stanley (*ZIP code: 98383*)

93. Kim Clarkin (*ZIP code: 98225*)

94. Laurie Schaetzel-Hill (*ZIP code: 98516*)

Keep the tree to keep Urban areas cooler. That prevents fires. Stripping living areas of trees does not. We need trees for their ability to cool as well as to uptake carbon!

95. Leann Schaetzel-Hawthorne (*ZIP code: 98506*)

96. Laurie Dils (*ZIP code: 98506-4035*)

97. Larkin Flora (*ZIP code: 98116*)

98. Livia Piccinini (*ZIP code: V6m4a3*)

There is land that does not require the removal of trees. Please plan carefully when creating developments.

99. Linda Ellsworth (*ZIP code: 98245*)

100. Lisa Ornstein (*ZIP code: 98501-3991*)

101. Janet Witt (*ZIP code: 98501*)

I have read and very much agree with this petition.

102. Linda Knudsen McAusland (*ZIP code: 98229*)

103. Lynn Fitz-Hugh (*ZIP code: 98501-2503*)

104. Lynne Bannerman (*ZIP code: 98502*)

This is not based on current science.

105. Madeline Solenberger (*ZIP code: 98508*)

106. Mahala Frye (*ZIP code: 98312*)

We need our trees! We can be smart and safe and green.

107. Beverly Taylor Hastings (*ZIP code: 98502*)

mandate roofing be of a fire proof material.

Building houses that are designed to be fire resistant should be a building code policy.

108. Kathy Mallalieu (*ZIP code: 98506*)

109. Sylvia Platt (*ZIP code: 98368*)

Hello people. I hope you're listening. And considering the actual climate damage that will be done by parts of this bill. Wildfire science does NOT support the immense scale of "landscape removal of most trees and vegetation in a "defensible space" up to 100 feet around any structure." Please amend the bill to reflect this!

110. Marian Mehegan (*ZIP code: 98502*)

111. Marianne Tompkins (*ZIP code: 98506-9773*)

We do not have three years for another code cycle to make changes. We need to make changes now to protect our trees. Washington is expected to have huge growth, and this will bring more housing/development. Please remove the defensible space now. Thank you!

112. Marianne McNabb (*ZIP code: 98502*)

This is the wrong direction to go-please look at what other communities are doing to address this issue!

113. Maria Horja (*ZIP code: 98225*)

114. Mark Kaufman (*ZIP code: 98502*)

115. Karen Martin (*ZIP code: 97870*)

Trees

By Joyce Kilmer

I think that I shall never see

A poem lovely as a tree.

A tree whose hungry mouth is prest

Against the earth's sweet flowing breast;

A tree that looks at God all day,

And lifts her leafy arms to pray;

A tree that may in Summer wear

A nest of robins in her hair;

Upon whose bosom snow has lain;

Who intimately lives with rain.

Poems are made by fools like me,

But only God can make a tree.

116. Mary Jolley (*ZIP code: Mary@jjolley.net*)

Thus is completely counterintuitive. The loss of trees in western Washington will add to urban and suburban heat gain, causing the increased use of a/c. You need to look at the statistics of fire west of the cascades and the # of homes lost- very few if you are honest. This proposal would have a bigger impact on the environment than climate change ever will.

117. Mason Taylor (*ZIP code: 98125*)

118. Maria Moreschi (*ZIP code: 98502*)

Save our old growth forests

119. Jeanette Beaulieu-Conklin (*ZIP code: 98329*)

We moved to Washington for the dense forests and the appreciation of nature! While I do think it's vitally important to fight wildfires, this is a bad solution! Trees are not the problem! They're the solution. I would urge you to reconsider these regulations. They have similar codes in California and it didn't do us any good fighting wildfire. The problem is global warming....we need long term, strong policy to cool out planet....part of that is increasing plant cover, not decreasing it. Take it from me, you don't want the suburban hell that is of Los Angeles county to come to Washington! Let's keep Washington green!

120. Krista Jarrard (*ZIP code: 95802*)

121. Mary Teesdale (*ZIP code: 98225*)

I need the shade from my big trees to keep cool. And the larger biomass is more area for condensation, keeping the land cooler. Removing trees will cause hotter temps, and more fires, not less.

122. Michael Feerer (*ZIP code: 98229*)

Stick to the buildings, SBCC! Building hardening has been proven to be the most effective step for wildfire resilience. The carbon and community tradeoffs of removing trees 30' or greater from a structure should be examined because its wildfire resilience benefits are minimal. And time must be given to develop an accurate, valid DNR map for that purpose.

123. Michelle McKinney (*ZIP code: 98115*)

This ordinance is insane. It's dangerous, and not based in science. Fewer trees=hotter temperatures=more fires. Less habitat for wildlife. You want to create a desert? This along with mandate for denser housing is going to destroy our canopy and ecosystem. And in the long run, where do you think the oxygen we breath comes from? Trees.

124. Melissa Edwards (*ZIP code: 98126*)

125. M. Canny (*ZIP code: 98516*)

126. Anne Ellis (*ZIP code: 98290*)

Destroying this amount of tree cover is detrimental to the carbon sink that trees provide here in Washington. Decimating the tree cover will adversely affect many native species of birds and insects that rely on a canopy for survival. As well, taking away the shade from trees will exponentially increase the amount of energy needed to cool these homes in the summer.

127. Nancy Partlow (*ZIP code: 98512*)

I have worked for decades to protect forests in Tumwater. The way the Urban Wildland Interface Code is currently written is wildly inappropriate, and will destroy huge numbers of trees, forests, greenbelts and wildlife corridors in my community. This code takes one metric, fire suppression, and eliminates all other equally worthy goals of preserving intact native forest canopies and understories for their countless benefits. This code is not progress, but regress, and a massive over-reaction to of the threat of wildfires in WA cities. The public outreach for comments on this highly impactful and

costly change has been nil. I ask that this code NOT be enacted, and that the legislature go back and take a second, more in-depth look at this issue, soliciting broad public comment before making any future decisions.

128. Kristina Teixeira (ZIP code: 98225)

129. Nelia Swayze (ZIP code: 98368)

130. Nancy Inui (ZIP code: 98501)

Removing trees is wrong. Presence of trees improves environment, including habitat, stormwater management, drought protection. Protecting property and lives in other ways is the way to go.

131. Nancy Curtiss (ZIP code: 98501)

This is a rather simplistic response to a most difficult situation. Please take time to consider the extensive effect the loss of this forest will have through the years.

132. Lee Riner (ZIP code: 98569)

I do not support this code. There are unintended consequences. Tree preservation must go forward. We must honor the local jurisdictions codes for tree preservation and replanting.

133. Wayne Olsen (ZIP code: 98503)

Increasing atmospheric concentration of CO2 is our enemy; healthy, mature forests are our allies to absorb that CO2. New, scrawny planted trees and shrubs don't match the capability of mature, large trees until decades later. As more of our Urban Growth Areas fill in, we lose more trees. Please try to keep that loss to a minimum, especially considering lot sizes will be getting smaller in the future. Thank you.

134. MICHAEL MOORE (ZIP code: 98508)

What is wrong with humanity? We need MORE trees not less! I've been a certified arborist for 30 years and have worked with many many people interested in building to live WITH trees not WITHOUT them and it is possible to do without increasing the risk of fires exploding around the buildings. It takes will to do so and likely some money to leave a new building Wirth more in so many way by working with trees. God help us all!

Michael H. Moore

135. Owen Bamford (ZIP code: 98229)

This code, if enforced, would require most owners building on smaller lots in treed areas to cut down their neighbors' trees. Are you serious?

136. Patricia Spetz (ZIP code: 98589)

137. Paula Allison (ZIP code: 98506)

Save our trees, keep the carbon in storage!

138. Margaret Gardner (ZIP code: 98226)

139. Peggy Graham (*ZIP code: 98512*)

140. Penelope Keep (*ZIP code: 98225*)

141. Penni Thorpe (*ZIP code: 98374*)

I understand the concern about fires, but we also need the trees to create oxygen... this is not well thought out

142. Troy Perry (*ZIP code: 98502*)

143. Paula Chu (*ZIP code: 98229*)

144. Peter Anderson (*ZIP code: V6M 4A3*)

145. Polly Taylor (*ZIP code: 98501*)

146. lee SMITHES (*ZIP code: 98569*)

SAVE THE TREES!

147. john newman (*ZIP code: 98569*)

I am not happy, the way the Urban Wildland Interface Code is currently written is wildly inappropriate, and will destroy huge numbers of trees, forests, greenbelts and wildlife corridors in my community. It is all wrong; this code takes one metric, fire suppression, and eliminates all other equally worthy goals of preserving intact native forest canopies and understories for their countless benefits This code is not progress, but regress, and a massive over-reaction to of the threat of wildfires in WA cities. This code should NOT be enacted, and that the legislature go back and take a second, more in-depth look at this issue, soliciting broad public comment before making any future decision

148. Leila Kuehner (*ZIP code: 98115*)

149. Quinn Crocheron (*ZIP code: 98229*)

150. Rebecca Wood (*ZIP code: 98366*)

Trees are extremely important for our mental and physical health, to reduce climate change and for wildlife.

151. RHIANNON KREAL (*ZIP code: 98008*)

152. Rick Longnecker (*ZIP code: 98532*)

153. Devin River (*ZIP code: 98502*)

The way the Urban Wildland Interface Code is currently written is wildly inappropriate, and will destroy huge numbers of trees, forests, greenbelts and wildlife corridors in my community. This code takes one metric, fire suppression, and eliminates all other equally worthy goals of preserving intact native

forest canopies and understories for their countless benefits This code is not progress, but regress, and a massive over-reaction to of the threat of wildfires in WA cities. The public outreach for comments on this highly impactful and costly change has been nil. I ask that this code NOT be enacted, and that the legislature go back and take a second, more in-depth look at this issue, soliciting broad public comment before making any future decisions.

154. Roberta Adams (*ZIP code: 98502-3625*)

155. Robyn Chance (*ZIP code: 98502*)

156. roxanne nelson (*ZIP code: 98229*)

I cannot believe the utter stupidity of this proposal. Destroy forests, create an ecological disaster, and it is not supported by any sort of study or science. In fact, it totally flies in the face of what we know about preventing fires. I hope that if this idiocy passes, everyone ignores it.

157. Richard Hodgjin (*ZIP code: 98125*)

158. Scott Bishop (*ZIP code: 98502*)

159. Sue Danver (*ZIP code: 98512*)

160. Sharon Herting (*ZIP code: 98502*)

161. Sharron Coontz (*ZIP code: 98512*)

162. Sherri Dysart (*ZIP code: 98584*)

163. Sheryl Ahlblad (*ZIP code: 98584*)

164. William Bailey (*ZIP code: 98199*)

165. Marilyn Pali Rinn (*ZIP code: 98264*)

166. Sheryl Greer (*ZIP code: 98382-9079*)

There has to be a more effective method, rather than cutting down trees. This is not a one-size-fits-all solution. Do the work and figure out a better strategy.

167. Elizabet Williams (*ZIP code: 98115-4614*)

168. Sandra Mitchell (*ZIP code: 98229*)

169. Meryl Bernstein (*ZIP code: 98589*)

170. Suki Aufhauser (*ZIP code: 98284*)

There are ways to remove combustible material that doesn't involve cutting down trees in close proximity to houses to prevent house fires.

This is not about cutting down trees; in fact, it is important to maintain tree cover for the cooling shade it provides. Defensible space is about reducing the most combustible material immediately adjacent to homes, especially dry grass, seedlings and shrubs, lower limbs (prune them to 6 feet above the ground), limbs that touch the house or deck (remove these, but not the tree), and dead leaves and pine needles on the ground.

171. Mak Keown (*ZIP code: 98026*)
SAVE WA TREES!!

172. Sally Pytel (*ZIP code: 98229*)

173. Amanda Sue Rudisill (*ZIP code: 98508*)

Having lost a home to a wildfire, I can tell you from firsthand experience that that the problem was not the trees, some of which stood next to our house and did not burn. The cause of the fire was the electric company's not clearing brush around their lines. So when one fell in 100 mph winds, and started the fire, our homes were lost. While each situation is different, healthy trees resist flames; dry brushes and grasses do not.

174. Tammy DOYLEY (*ZIP code: 98277*)

we need trees. wildlife needs trees. stop with the overreach

175. Stephanie Jones (*ZIP code: 98502*)

176. Nichole Lessard (*ZIP code: 98027*)

177. Jane Stone (*ZIP code: 98502*)

This makes absolutely no sense in an era of climate change. Trees are vital elements in controlling carbon - in fact, tree planting initiatives are an essential part of a global effort to prevent and mitigate the catastrophic impacts of global warming.

178. Suzanne McCudden (*ZIP code: 98042*)

179. Judith langhans (*ZIP code: 98502*)

Please consider the consequences of this WUIC code deluding a growing percentage of the landscape in virtually all communities in western Washington and is in conflict with other state and local policies.

180. Randy Tompkins (*ZIP code: 98506-9773*)

Please change the code to remove defensible space

181. Judith Akins (*ZIP code: 98229*)

If this proposal goes through we will endanger our city trees. We need many more trees in our cities for shade to keep our cities cool. They are also habitat for species such as birds and squirrels. It is

proven that trees reduce stress and allow people to connect to nature. There has to be a better way to protect homes in city and the country. We can protect houses by the way they use building materials etc. Please dont take away our trees because of fear of fire. Our planet depends on them.

182. Susan Bakke (ZIP code: 98501)

Climate change and it's devastating effects demands that we leave as many trees in place as possible. It is disconcerting that so many state codes and regulations will be disregarded if WWUIC goes into effect. More work needs to be done before negative unintended consequences take place.

183. Susan O'Connor (ZIP code: 98502)

184. Suzanna McCarthy (ZIP code: 98201)

Please take theses comments into account for the sake of safety of structures and the people they house, for the well being of the climate we live in.

185. Teresa Jennings (ZIP code: 98503)

186. Thom Lufkin (ZIP code: 98501)

187. Tialen Kelley (ZIP code: 98008)

188. Tim Buiten (ZIP code: 98042)

189. Helen Cavallaro (ZIP code: 98368)

190. David Toler (ZIP code: 98516)

In the midst of a climate crisis, you are trying to mandate less trees, less shade? Urban heat is now a public health issue- and your regulations will only exacerbate this crisis. Please move toward more reasonable regulations.

191. Tom Burgess (ZIP code: 98118)

192. Tom Holz (ZIP code: 98502)

193. Diane Brewster (ZIP code: 98178)

The defensible space provisions are in conflict with numerous other state and local policies, such as for climate action, urban tree canopy retention, stormwater and shoreline regulations, SEPA requirements for critical areas and wetlands, and more. The SBCC has adopted this code in a vacuum, State and local laws prohibit what they are proposing. Time for them to go back to the drawing board.

194. Valerie Reinke (ZIP code: 98110)

This is an example of good intentions gone very wrong. There is abundant research on the way that trees cool our region and actually protect us from the dry and parched conditions that lead to wildfires. Or look at the 2014 landslide in Oso; tree removal before development meant the land was

unstable; 43 people lost their lives. Clear-cutting to build new homes is an unacceptable practice if we are serious about reversing climate change and its real impacts on Washington state.

195. Valerie Krull (*ZIP code: 98502*)

196. Vicki Zarrell (*ZIP code: 98502*)

197. Steve Robinson (*ZIP code: 98501*)

198. Esther Kronenberg (*ZIP code: 98502*)

This provision for defensible space appears to benefit developers eager to avoid the inconvenience of trees on building sites. Such a blanket provision with little regard for each site's unique characteristics will do more damage to our already fragile water resources and ecosystems.

199. Wendi Tibbs (*ZIP code: 98512*)

200. Gary Wurtz (*ZIP code: 98284*)

There are ways to remove combustible material other than taking down trees near houses to prevent house fires.

"This is not about cutting down trees; in fact, it is important to maintain tree cover for the cooling shade it provides. Defensible space is about reducing the most combustible material immediately adjacent to homes, especially dry grass, seedlings and shrubs, lower limbs (prune them to 6 feet above the ground), limbs that touch the house or deck (remove these, but not the tree), and dead leaves and pine needles on the ground."

201. Julie Whitacre (*ZIP code: 98226*)

We need more, trees not fewer. Preferably intact forest habitat.

Protecting wetlands and managing precipitation for maximum retention and infiltration, including embracing beaver activity, will prevent our region from suffering the drying trends we are causing by draining and channeling stormwater to the bay as fast as possible.

202. Wendy Steffensen (*ZIP code: 98506*)

Trees are part of the answer to our current climate crisis. By cutting trees to help defend against fire risk, we will end up exacerbating the problem we are trying to fix. Please take a more thoughtful and measured approach to this.