

**From:** [Frederick Allebach](#)  
**To:** [CityCouncilListPublic](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] WUI public comment for 5/12/26 Santa Rosa city council meeting  
**Date:** Friday, May 8, 2026 6:40:59 PM

---

Fred Allebach 5/8/26

### **WUI public comment for 5/12/26 Santa Rosa city council meeting**

Members of the City Council,

My opinion is that requiring stricter mitigation actions in new WUI areas is a great idea.

City and County WUI maps are nearly identical to areas of the highest median home value and highest median household income (MHI), as well as higher levels of education and percent white. WUI areas are also near identical to TCAC (state Tax Credit Advisory Committee) highest and high resource opportunity areas.

Newly mapped WUI-area rules will show that foothills residents will be doing their needed part to prevent catastrophic fires from encroaching on the city. This is something concrete that WUI property owners should do, rather than many times show up at meetings and say dense infill in the city to build much-needed housing should not happen because it will impede their evacuation.

The new WUI rules are also good because they will allow more affordable housing to go in these WUI, high MHI, TCAC highest resource opportunity areas, according to state AFFH law. Non-profit developers can get breaks and incentive to build in TCAC highest and high resource opportunity areas, and now with collective WUI hazard and risk mitigation actions required, these areas will be safer overall and perhaps easier for the city to steer non-profit housing projects there.

That's my two cents. See the new WUI rules as a positive and leverage that positivity to put needed low-income housing infill in these same WUI, high MHI, TCAC highest resource opportunity areas.

Also, I live immediately on the east side of Brush Creek Rd. I would feel better if folks over on the hill west of Brush Creek Rd. were in a program to cut fuels, hazards, and risks down. These new rules will make everybody safer. Stick to your guns and enact them as proposed.

FYI, since I live in the same zip code as Fountain Grove, I can't get fire insurance and have to go with the FAIR Plan. There is no opting out of my zip code because my own property is not as risky. Just by being near that foothill ridge that extends along Brush Creek Rd, I am more vulnerable to ember cast. Anybody who lives in any sort of foothills has to be in that new WUI rules and regs bucket and not look for exceptions and ways out. All those trees and greenery on that ridge put everyone else at risk. It's a good idea to manage it with new WUI rules.

"We don't know where we're going but we have to stick together in case somebody gets there."  
Ken Kesey

**From:** [Rod Gross](#)  
**To:** [City Council Public Comments](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Higher Fire Risk  
**Date:** Saturday, May 9, 2026 3:21:09 PM

---

Santa Rosa,

I have lived west of Bennett Valley Road near Bethards Drive since 1955.

Even with the fires of 2017, 2019 and 2020, this area has NEVER burned and we are not in historic wildfire corridors.

Please do your own assessment of higher fire risk without taking the state's maps as accurate.

Rod

--

Rod Gross  
Live Action | VFX | Post | Graphics  
707.541.0111 Studio  
415.203.9005 Mobile  
<http://www.youtube.com/user/studio144tv>

**From:** [Tony.Martin.yahoo\\_pi](mailto:Tony.Martin.yahoo_pi)  
**To:** [City Council Public Comments](#)  
**Cc:** [CityCouncilListPublic](#); [Rogers, Natalie](#); [MacDonald, Dianna](#); [Alvarez, Eddie](#); [Fleming, Victoria](#); [Okrepkie, Jeff](#); [Banelos, Caroline](#); [Stapp, Mark](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Do not do an incorrect wildfire risk update for internal city street!  
**Date:** Sunday, May 10, 2026 1:51:35 PM

---

## **To the Santa Rosa City Council:**

I am writing to formally contest the proposed High Fire Hazard Severity designation for Creekside Road and to ask the Council to require a factual defense of the methodology that produced it. The physical evidence, the scientific literature, and the statistical record do not support this designation — and in a city facing a serious budget crisis, Santa Rosa cannot afford to allocate fire mitigation resources, staff attention, and regulatory burden based on a flawed threat map that inverts reality. Bad science has a fiscal cost. Misclassified neighborhoods drive misallocated spending. If the City is forced to prioritize and stretch every dollar — and it is — then getting the risk map right is not just a matter of fairness to residents. It is a matter of fiscal responsibility to all of them.

### **The riparian corridor is a fire buffer, not a fire hazard.**

Creekside Road runs alongside an active water tributary. Published fire science is unambiguous: riparian zones have higher soil moisture, cooler microclimates, and elevated live fuel moisture content compared to surrounding upland vegetation — the exact conditions that cause them to act as natural fire buffers. The vegetation is dense because it is well-watered. That is not a fire hazard. Treating a creek corridor the same as dry chaparral is not conservative — it is inaccurate.

### **The FHSZ model is structurally blind to the factors that protect this area.**

By the State Fire Marshal's own published definition, FHSZ maps evaluate "hazard" not "risk" — and explicitly exclude:

- Proximity to fire stations and suppression infrastructure
- Firefighting capabilities and response times
- Defensible space and fuel reduction efforts
- Urban encirclement and absence of wildland interface

Santa Rosa operates 10 fire stations across 42 square miles. Creekside Road sits within tight suppression radius of multiple stations. The model assigns that zero weight. It cannot distinguish a creek-buffered urban interior from a dry exposed hillside. That is a design limitation — and applying it without local adjustment produces designations that don't reflect actual risk.

### **The statistical record directly contradicts this designation.**

- Creekside Road has zero fire events in recorded history — a meaningful data point, especially when the physical conditions provide a clear explanation for

why

- Fountaingrove has burned catastrophically twice via the same Diablo Wind corridor: the 1964 Hanly Fire and the 2017 Tubbs Fire — a documented, repeating pattern of high-frequency, high-severity loss at the same location
- As early as 1908, a kerosene lamp fire at Fountaingrove's hilltop Commandery building nearly became a regional catastrophe — the Press Democrat reported at the time that only the north wind dying down prevented the flames from spreading, noting that embers from that ridge could have easily reached the county hospital a mile and a half away
- Coffey Park was officially outside the "very severe" hazard zone when the Tubbs Fire consumed it block by block in 2017; the Associated Press called it "Ground Zero for California fire devastation"
- A model that under-rates locations with multiple documented catastrophes while over-rating a location with zero events is producing outputs anti-correlated with observed reality

**The question this Council must ask:**

If this same model had been applied to Coffey Park before October 2017, it would have said: low risk, no special requirements. It was catastrophically wrong. What is the evidentiary basis for confidence that it is correct about Creekside Road?

I respectfully ask that the Fire Department be required to present the specific data inputs and scoring for Creekside Road in writing, and explain how that scoring accounts for riparian moisture, urban encirclement, suppression infrastructure, and a fire history of zero.

The residents of Creekside Road have the facts on their side. We ask that the City's process reflect them.

Respectfully, Anthony "Tony" Martin, Creekside Road, Santa Rosa

**From:** [Nada A Z Martin](#)  
**To:** [City Council Public Comments](#); [\\_CityCouncilListPublic](#); [Rogers, Natalie](#); [MacDonald, Dianna](#); [Alvarez, Eddie](#); [Fleming, Victoria](#); [Okrepkie, Jeff](#); [Banuelos, Caroline](#); [Stapp, Mark](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Implement a correct wildfire risk update for internal city street!  
**Date:** Sunday, May 10, 2026 2:44:59 PM

---

## **To the Santa Rosa City Council:**

I am writing to formally contest the proposed High Fire Hazard Severity designation for Creekside Road and to ask the Council to require a factual defense of the methodology that produced it. The physical evidence, the scientific literature, and the statistical record do not support this designation — and in a city facing a serious budget crisis, Santa Rosa cannot afford to allocate fire mitigation resources, staff attention, and regulatory burden based on a flawed threat map that inverts reality. Bad science has a fiscal cost. Misclassified neighborhoods drive misallocated spending. If the City is forced to prioritize and stretch every dollar — and it is — then getting the risk map right is not just a matter of fairness to residents. It is a matter of fiscal responsibility to all of them.

### **The riparian corridor is a fire buffer, not a fire hazard.**

Creekside Road runs alongside an active water tributary. Published fire science is unambiguous: riparian zones have higher soil moisture, cooler microclimates, and elevated live fuel moisture content compared to surrounding upland vegetation — the exact conditions that cause them to act as natural fire buffers. The vegetation is dense because it is well-watered. That is not a fire hazard. Treating a creek corridor the same as dry chaparral is not conservative — it is inaccurate.

### **The FHSZ model is structurally blind to the factors that protect this area.**

By the State Fire Marshal's own published definition, FHSZ maps evaluate "hazard" not "risk" — and explicitly exclude:

- Proximity to fire stations and suppression infrastructure
- Firefighting capabilities and response times
- Defensible space and fuel reduction efforts
- Urban encirclement and absence of wildland interface

Santa Rosa operates 10 fire stations across 42 square miles. Creekside Road sits within tight suppression radius of multiple stations. The model assigns that zero weight. It cannot distinguish a creek-buffered urban interior from a dry exposed hillside. That is a design limitation — and applying it without local adjustment produces designations that don't reflect actual risk.

### **The statistical record directly contradicts this designation.**

- Creekside Road has zero fire events in recorded history — a meaningful data point, especially when the physical conditions provide a clear explanation for why

- Fountaingrove has burned catastrophically twice via the same Diablo Wind corridor: the 1964 Hanly Fire and the 2017 Tubbs Fire — a documented, repeating pattern of high-frequency, high-severity loss at the same location
- As early as 1908, a kerosene lamp fire at Fountaingrove's hilltop Commandery building nearly became a regional catastrophe — the Press Democrat reported at the time that only the north wind dying down prevented the flames from spreading, noting that embers from that ridge could have easily reached the county hospital a mile and a half away
- Coffey Park was officially outside the "very severe" hazard zone when the Tubbs Fire consumed it block by block in 2017; the Associated Press called it "Ground Zero for California fire devastation"
- A model that under-rates locations with multiple documented catastrophes while over-rating a location with zero events is producing outputs anti-correlated with observed reality

**The question this Council must ask:**

If this same model had been applied to Coffey Park before October 2017, it would have said: low risk, no special requirements. It was catastrophically wrong. What is the evidentiary basis for confidence that it is correct about Creekside Road?

I respectfully ask that the Fire Department be required to present the specific data inputs and scoring for Creekside Road in writing, and explain how that scoring accounts for riparian moisture, urban encirclement, suppression infrastructure, and a fire history of zero.

The residents of Creekside Road have the facts on their side. We ask that the City's process reflect them.

Sincerely,  
Nada Martin

Nada A. Ziady Martin  
Creekside Road Santa Rosa CA  
nziady@yahoo.com  
707-636-4213

**From:** [Judy Lindberg](#)  
**To:** [City Council Public Comments](#); [Stapp, Mark](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Comment on Wildland Urban Interface Walnut Grove Estates  
**Date:** Sunday, May 10, 2026 5:36:17 PM

---

Hello,

I live on Evergreen Road in Walnut Grove Estates. I want the map boundaries of the Wildland Urban Interface to be considered by on the ground fire experts, not just accept something done by air or satellite images. The map boundaries as proposed make no sense whatsoever. The reclassification of my neighborhood should be abandoned! This needs more time for discussion, so the vote should be delayed. And importantly, the City should clean up the creek so it does not pose a fire hazard.

Thank you for considering these reasonable requests,

Judy Lindberg  
3634 Evergreen Road  
Santa Rosa, CA 95405

**From:** [Karin Anderson](#)  
**To:** [City Council Public Comments](#); [Stapp, Mark](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Wildland Urban Interface  
**Date:** Sunday, May 10, 2026 6:06:35 PM

---

Hello,

I live near the proposed new wildland urban interface boundaries which are not correct. There should be experts who review this before any changes are made. It appears the city has not done due diligence on these proposed boundaries. My insurance carrier will be raising our rates the closer we are to your poorly researched boundaries. We are in the suburbs, not near any wildland. You should not draw these maps as proposed! This matter has not been studied in a competent manner. You will be raising insurance rates up way too high for residents who are nowhere near wildland. At least do not vote on this yet and study the issue more thoroughly and allow the public more time to provide input. We are NOT in a high risk area, but your map is putting us very close to this new boundary.

Also, if being close to Matanzas Creek or other creeks causes additional fire risk, it is the City's job to maintain the creeks so they are not so overgrown.

Creeks near us are green and on flat land. They are not in hilly terrain. They are not at high risk to burn because they are green.

In summary, don't punish certain residents because the City is not doing its job correctly.

Thank you,

Karin Anderson

**From:** [LOREN RAYMOND](#)  
**To:** [CityCouncilListPublic](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Fire Zones  
**Date:** Monday, May 11, 2026 7:52:40 AM  
**Attachments:** [Memo of 5.10.26 to SR City Council.docx](#)

---

Dear Mr. Mark Stapp and Other Council Members:

As you are well aware and as I understand it, at your upcoming May 12, 2026 Council Meeting a major topic will be the newly proposed LRA Wildlands-Urban Interface Zone Map. As you also know, a segment of the Bennett Valley community is and I in particular am quite concerned with the proposed designation of parts of the area as a High Fire Hazard Severity Zone for several reasons. I plan to speak, but two minutes are not adequate for a presentation of the issues. To summarize the issues,

#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- The CAL Fire analysis on which the new WUI hazard zones map is based is scientifically flawed in significant ways.
- The new zones designated for parts of Santa Rosa, with wealthier areas such as Fountaingrove and east of Summerfield developments, which have a history of fire, being downgraded to lower levels of hazard than the Bennett Valley-Kawana Springs neighborhoods, which have no history of large wildfires, makes no logical sense. It also makes some wonder if money and influence affected CAL Fire decision-making.
- Santa Rosa Fire's Slide presentation on the new zones seems to conflict with CAL Fire's You Tube fire science presentation. The SR Fire presentation states that one of the implications for residents in the new WUI fire areas is that the City Vegetation Management Ordinance will apply "requiring defensible space on all properties in the City's WUI area." The CAL Fire presentation indicates that defensible space is only applicable to Very High LRA zones. Clarification is needed.
- The new WUI Hazard Zone designations will affect our home insurance (if we can keep it at all, and I will add that the California Insurance Commissioner, in spite of his assurances, cannot control companies raising rates or dropping insurance. Some folks in the greater Bennett Valley region already have had their insurance dropped). In addition, the new designations will adversely affect our property appearance and values in significant ways.
- The SR City Council should ask CAL Fire to re-assess the proposed zones and clearly explain in plain and logical language, the scientific basis and data on which the zones are based.

#### The Science.

As a scientist who thinks the new designations seem at odds with what I know, I read some CAL Fire information and watched the CAL Fire You Tube presentation of the scientific method used to produce their recently released maps. There are significant scientific problems and the Council, in my opinion, before adopting the new zones, should ask CAL Fire to re-evaluate the data and conclusions (i.e., re-evaluate the new fire hazard zones of the WUI for Santa Rosa).

What do we know that is at odds with the new zone designations?

1) First, the new WUI Zone in the Bennett Valley - Kawana Springs area is an arc that suggests that the new zone is based on winds coming from Taylor Mountain and sweeping north to spread embers (fire-brands) into Santa Rosa. Available online maps of major wildfires in Sonoma County between

1898 and 2020 and particularly between 1950 and 2025 show no major wildfires affecting the Taylor Mountain area. There were zero.

Now, CAL Fire attempts to predict how many embers will be produced and where embers (brands) will fall downwind of a fire. The process, however, begins with defining zones of "fire environments" based on slope and vegetation and then expanding on that to determine the burn probability based again on vegetation and slope, but also on "local climate" (in which winds must be a major factor) and fire history between 1991-2020. Problems here are that the fire history time-frame is too short, the importance and data sources on directions and magnitude of winds are not specified, and the "**estimates**" and data (which the You Tube presentation says do NOT take into account recent fire activity) are fed into a computer model. There is an old saying in computer modeling — "garbage in, garbage out." Models are constrained by data input and model structure, so inputting, for example, only data for fire history between 1991-2020, excludes important and relevant data from 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s fires. Now in particular, relevant data on fires in the Santa Rosa area are the following:

- the 1964 C. Hanley Fire that swept across what is now the Fountaingrove area was driven SW by winds that blew NE to SW.
- The 2017 Tubs, Nuns Canyon (late composite called Nuns Fire), and Pressley fires all burned from NE to SW under southwest directed winds.
- The 2019 Kincaide Fire burned from NE to SW.
- Additional less notable fires in the 70s and 80s also burned NE to SW. In the larger region, fires such as the 1965 Coleman Valley Fire burned NE to SW, directed by winds of that direction.

The CAL Fire Scientific method web site says that CAL Fire uses the worst 5% of fire weather observations (presumably including wind direction and velocity) to estimate the worst case scenario for hazard in any given area. Now given the major fire history over the past 61 years in the area in and around Santa Rosa, there are zero major fires that involved south to north winds that would result in high fire hazard in the Bennett Valley - Kawana Springs area. In contrast, 100% of the major fires involved NE to SW winds. Therefore, the worst 5% of fire events — precipitated and accompanied by fire weather — must involve NE to SW winds, not S to N winds (which are common in the winter). Now, CAL Fire is not using fire history itself for determining the worst 5% of fire weather observations, the web site says they use "observations." What is not clear in the online presentation from CAL Fire, however, is what specific methods are used to collect the data for "worst 5%" of fire weather observations. Are any ground observations from this area included or are all the data from satellite observations, which by their very nature are general observations not specific ones? Other data used in the method are estimated or calculated.

2) Second, in going through the CAL Fire methodology, there is a string of steps that involve repeated estimates of "data", modeled values of parameters, and probability estimates. These along with results from calculations early in the procedure are used for additional estimates that are subsequently fed into additional computer models. At one point an estimate is used, in a model, along with modeled flame rates, to make a model that creates an estimate of numbers of embers (brands) coming from Wildlands into non-Wildlands in order to create an estimate of the ember ("brand") load. At best, the result is highly speculative and at worst, just garbage. It is not good science, inasmuch as there are several estimates and calculations, some even based on models. One error or incorrect estimate in this convoluted chain of calculation and modeling renders any resulting zone highly questionable. The "method" itself appears to be based on many more estimates and computer model outputs than on actual measurements, such as data on fire weather wind directions and velocities.

### Upgrades and Downgrades

The new maps upgrade the Bennett Valley-Kawana Springs and some other areas to high fire danger, while downgrading the Fountaingrove area, the area east of Summerfield Rd., and the

Skyhawk area, to lower levels of hazard — in some cases to below the Moderate hazard zone. Inasmuch as all three of the areas mentioned as downgraded areas here suffered from fires in the last decade, one has to ask, why are they downgraded, while areas with no history of major fires in over 100 years are upgraded to High Hazard. It makes no sense. To be generous, it can best be explained by faulty data being fed into the many models used by CAL Fire to make the ultimate designation of zones. The less generous explanation is that politics played a role.

### Santa Rosa Requirements for High Hazard Home Owners

There is a difference between what Cal Fire shows on their web presentation with regard to requirements for High Hazard zones and what the SR Fire Department states to be the requirements. Most concerning in this matter is the discrepancy between CAL Fire's statement about Defensible Space and SR Fire's statement. Council needs to clarify definitively, that the standards set for the new fire zones will differ from state recommendations.

The January 2024 Vegetation Management Ordinance does not definitely explain what plants must be removed from within specified distances from a structure. At one place it says " The Ordinance requires the removal of Scotch Broom, French Broom, and some Bay ... within 100 feet of a structure." In Section 9. 30.060 (Fire hazard reduction guidelines) the text specifies only the above plants, but gives license to the Fire Chief or designee to arbitrarily demand that other plants be removed. As a homeowner, I want to know what plants in my landscaping the Fire Chief may stop in to tell me to remove and to be assured that such directives, legally, are neither arbitrary nor capricious.

The implementation of the new High Fire Hazard zone in the Bennett Valley area could result in serious damage to the appearance of residences in the area. Of course, that will significantly reduce property values. Unless there is strong scientific evidence supporting the application of the High Hazard Fire Zone, it should not be adopted without a stronger scientific case to support it.

### Insurance

As I indicated in the Summary points, since friends in the greater Bennett Valley area have had their home insurance dropped, we are concerned that the new High Fire Hazard designations are just what the insurance companies want as justification for dropping our insurance. Adopting these unscientifically chosen areas as High Hazard can have a huge financial impact on the residents of the area.

### CONCLUDING REMARKS

Since the adverse effects of imposing new WUI HAZARD zones on specific areas, such as the Bennett Valley area, are so profound for those who live there, I believe it incumbent on Council to make sure the zones are justified. Please ask CAL FIRE to clearly demonstrate the compelling scientific basis for the idea that fires will spread embers from Taylor Mountain into southern Santa Rosa. It will not be satisfactory for CAL Fire to just attribute the zones to their models. It is doubtful that convincing data exist to show that the Taylor Mountain area represents a top 5% worst case locale for fire hazard in Santa Rosa.

Sincerely,

Loren

*Loren A. Raymond, Ph.D.*

*• Coast Range Geologic Mapping Institute*

*Santa Rosa, California USA 95405, &*

*• Emeritus Professor of Geology & Sustainable Development*

*Appalachian State University,*

*Boone, NC 28608*

PS - Safari Put in the Double spacing under Santa Rosa Requirements and I can't seem to get that removed. A version in Word is attached.

Dear Mr. Mark Stapp and Other Council Members:

As you are well aware and as I understand it, at your upcoming May 12, 2026 Council Meeting a major topic will be the newly proposed LRA Wildlands-Urban Interface Zone Map. As you also know, a segment of the Bennett Valley community is and I in particular am quite concerned with the proposed designation of parts of the area as a High Fire Hazard Severity Zone for several reasons. I plan to speak, but two minutes are not adequate for a presentation of the issues. To summarize the issues,

#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- The CAL Fire analysis on which the new WUI hazard zones map is based is scientifically flawed in significant ways.
- The new zones designated for parts of Santa Rosa, with wealthier areas such as Fountaingrove and east of Summerfield developments, which have a history of fire, being downgraded to lower levels of hazard than the Bennett Valley-Kawana Springs neighborhoods, which have no history of large wildfires, makes no logical sense. It also makes some wonder if money and influence affected CAL Fire decision-making.
- Santa Rosa Fire's Slide presentation on the new zones seems to conflict with CAL Fire's You Tube fire science presentation. The SR Fire presentation states that one of the implications for residents in the new WUI fire areas is that the City Vegetation Management Ordinance will apply "requiring defensible space on all properties in the City's WUI area." The CAL Fire presentation indicates that defensible space is only applicable to Very High LRA zones. Clarification is needed.
- The new WUI Hazard Zone designations will affect our home insurance (if we can keep it at all, and I will add that the California Insurance Commissioner, in spite of his assurances, cannot control companies raising rates or dropping insurance. Some folks in the greater Bennett Valley region already have had their insurance dropped). In addition, the new designations will adversely affect our property appearance and values in significant ways.
- The SR City Council should ask CAL Fire to re-assess the proposed zones and clearly explain in plain and logical language, the scientific basis and data on which the zones are based.

#### The Science.

As a scientist who thinks the new designations seem at odds with what I know, I read some CAL Fire information and watched the CAL Fire You Tube presentation of the scientific method used to produce their recently released maps. There are significant scientific problems and the Council, in my opinion, before adopting the new zones, should ask CAL Fire to re-evaluate the data and conclusions (i.e., re-evaluate the new fire hazard zones of the WUI for Santa Rosa).

What do we know that is at odds with the new zone designations?

1) First, the new WUI Zone in the Bennett Valley - Kawana Springs area is an arc that suggests that the new zone is based on winds coming from Taylor Mountain and sweeping north to spread embers (fire-brands) into Santa Rosa. Available online maps of major wildfires in Sonoma County between 1898 and 2020 and particularly between 1950 and 2025 show no major wildfires affecting the Taylor Mountain area. There were zero.

Now, CAL Fire attempts to predict how many embers will be produced and where embers (brands) will fall downwind of a fire. The process, however, begins with defining zones of "fire environments" based on slope and vegetation and then expanding on that to determine the burn probability based again on vegetation and slope, but also on "local climate" (in which winds must be a major factor) and fire history

between 1991-2020. Problems here are that the fire history time-frame is too short, the importance and data sources on directions and magnitude of winds are not specified, and the "estimates" and data (which the You Tube presentation says do NOT take into account recent fire activity) are fed into a computer model. There is an old saying in computer modeling — "garbage in, garbage out." Models are constrained by data input and model structure, so inputting, for example, only data for fire history between 1991-2020, excludes important and relevant data from 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s fires. Now in particular, relevant data on fires in the Santa Rosa area are the following:

- the 1964 C. Hanley Fire that swept across what is now the Fountaingrove area was driven SW by winds that blew NE to SW.
- The 2017 Tubs, Nuns Canyon (late composite called Nuns Fire), and Pressley fires all burned from NE to SW under southwest directed winds.
- The 2019 Kincaide Fire burned from NE to SW.
- Additional less notable fires in the 70s and 80s also burned NE to SW. In the larger region, fires such as the 1965 Coleman Valley Fire burned NE to SW, directed by winds of that direction.

The CAL Fire Scientific method web site says that CAL Fire uses the worst 5% of fire weather observations (presumably including wind direction and velocity) to estimate the worst case scenario for hazard in any given area. Now given the major fire history over the past 61 years in the area in and around Santa Rosa, there are zero major fires that involved south to north winds that would result in high fire hazard in the Bennett Valley - Kawana Springs area. In contrast, 100% of the major fires involved NE to SW winds. Therefore, the worst 5% of fire events — precipitated and accompanied by fire weather — must involve NE to SW winds, not S to N winds (which are common in the winter). Now, CAL Fire is not using fire history itself for determining the worst 5% of fire weather observations, the web site says they use "observations." What is not clear in the online presentation from CAL Fire, however, is what specific methods are used to collect the data for "worst 5%" of fire weather observations. Are any ground observations from this area included or are all the data from satellite observations, which by their very nature are general observations not specific ones? Other data used in the method are estimated or calculated.

2) Second, in going through the CAL Fire methodology, there is a string of steps that involve repeated estimates of "data", modeled values of parameters, and probability estimates. These along with results from calculations early in the procedure are used for additional estimates that are subsequently fed into additional computer models. At one point an estimate is used, in a model, along with modeled flame rates, to make a model that creates an estimate of numbers of embers (brands) coming from Wildlands into non-Wildlands in order to create an estimate of the ember ("brand") load. At best, the result is highly speculative and at worst, just garbage. It is not good science, inasmuch as there are several estimates and calculations, some even based on models. One error or incorrect estimate in this convoluted chain of calculation and modeling renders any resulting zone highly questionable. The "method" itself appears to be based on many more estimates and computer model outputs than on actual measurements, such as data on fire weather wind directions and velocities.

### Upgrades and Downgrades

The new maps upgrade the Bennett Valley-Kawana Springs and some other areas to high fire danger, while downgrading the Fountaingrove area, the area east of Summerfield Rd., and the Skyhawk area, to lower levels of hazard — in some cases to below the Moderate hazard zone. Inasmuch as all three of the areas mentioned as downgraded areas here suffered from fires in the last decade, one has to ask, why are they downgraded, while areas with no history of major fires in over 100 years are upgraded to High Hazard. It makes no sense. To be generous, it can best be explained by faulty data being fed into the many models used by CAL Fire to make the ultimate designation of zones. The less generous explanation is that politics played a role.

## Santa Rosa Requirements for High Hazard Home Owners

There is a difference between what Cal Fire shows on their web presentation with regard to requirements for High Hazard zones and what the SR Fire Department states to be the requirements. Most concerning in this matter is the discrepancy between CAL Fire's statement about Defensible Space and SR Fire's statement. Council needs to clarify definitively, that the standards set for the new fire zones will differ from state recommendations.

The January 2024 Vegetation Management Ordinance does not definitely explain what plants must be removed from within specified distances from a structure. At one place it says " The Ordinance requires the removal of Scotch Broom, French Broom, and some Bay ... within 100 feet of a structure." In Section 9.30.060 (Fire hazard reduction guidelines) the text specifies only the above plants, but gives license to the Fire Chief or designee to arbitrarily demand that other plants be removed. As a homeowner, I want to know what plants in my landscaping the Fire Chief may stop in to tell me to remove and to be assured that such directives, legally, are neither arbitrary nor capricious.

The implementation of the new High Fire Hazard zone in the Bennett Valley area could result in serious damage to the appearance of residences in the area. Of course, that will significantly reduce property values. Unless there is strong scientific evidence supporting the application of the High Hazard Fire Zone, it should not be adopted without a stronger scientific case to support it.

## Insurance

As I indicated in the Summary points, since friends in the greater Bennett Valley area have had their home insurance dropped, we are concerned that the new High Fire Hazard designations are just what the insurance companies want as justification for dropping our insurance. Adopting these unscientifically chosen areas as High Hazard can have a huge financial impact on the residents of the area.

## CONCLUDING REMARKS

Since the adverse effects of imposing new WUI HAZARD zones on specific areas, such as the Bennett Valley area, are so profound for those who live there, I believe it incumbent on Council to make sure the zones are justified. Please ask CAL FIRE to clearly demonstrate the compelling scientific basis for the idea that fires will spread embers from Taylor Mountain into southern Santa Rosa. It will not be satisfactory for CAL Fire to just attribute the zones to their models. It is doubtful that convincing data exist to show that the Taylor Mountain area represents a top 5% worst case locale for fire hazard in Santa Rosa. Garbage in, garbage out.

**From:** [roger@biery-bullock.net](mailto:roger@biery-bullock.net)  
**To:** [City Council Public Comments](#)  
**Cc:** [Iris Harrell](#); [Christel Antone](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Proposed WUIFA Designation  
**Date:** Monday, May 11, 2026 9:30:05 AM

---

Dear City Council Members:

I am a member of the Firewise Task Force at Oakmont Village and am writing to encourage you to adopt the new, expanded WUI.

I have read some of the comments from those wanting to stall the adoption based on arguments that sound reasonable but are ultimately a distraction, such as the “need” for time-consuming on-ground inspections by local authorities. Or the impact it might have on homeowner’s insurance, where the law prohibits companies from using WUI or Fire Hazard Severity Zone designations in their underwriting.

There are other such arguments, but the defensible space requirements imposed on properties added to the WUI are quite reasonable. And I would add that those requirements are the minimum needed to give our firefighters a fighting chance during the next wildfire.

Please vote in support of this prudent step to help prevent another Coffey Park or Fountaingrove disaster in Santa Rosa.

Thank you for considering my input to this important issue.

Sincerely,  
Roger Biery

**From:** [Martin & Brenda Johns](#)  
**To:** [City Council Public Comments](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Fire Department proposal for  
**Date:** Monday, May 11, 2026 10:18:54 AM

---

Dear Santa Rosa City Council,

re Comments on City Fire Hazard Areas / WUI

1. The Press Democrat says there is a council meeting at 5pm but doesn't say which day. I have this urgent comment.

At a meeting I attended a month or two ago the city FD said they are compelled to include in their Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) all areas deemed by the state to be in a Very High or High Fire Hazard Zone. But everything I have read says the state only requires it in the Very High zones. For example this quote from the new zone zero rules proposed by the Forestry Dept.

The proposed regulations would apply to homes in the [State Responsibility Area \(SRA\) and Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones](#) in Local Responsibility Areas (LRA).

2. The state boundaries have changed and I could see why the FD would want to include more areas than that in their WUI, but they are not compelled to go to the High Hazard boundary, only the Very High one.

3. Where I live in south east Oakmont their attempting to do so has resulted in trying to follow the pixelated weird boundaries of the state zone, and then adding more areas so small HOA's are in totality in the same zone. The result is a needless and erratic WUI boundary. The existing SRFD WUI boundary follows a natural boundary - Oakmont Drive - and including odd areas to the north or west of that is quite unnecessary and confusing. Any boots on the ground inspection would show the threat from Annadel naturally reduced beyond Oakmont drive, as is recognised in the current WUI boundary.

4. Why is this a concern? I don't particularly disagree with actions proposed for areas in the WUI. But it is concerning given the current difficulties in homeowners insurance. While the insurance companies are not allowed by law to consider the state Fire Hazard Zones in their decisions regarding risk, (note "hazard" is not the same as "risk") I understand there is no law preventing them from using a city's WUI. Insurance is a very serious issue, and I hope you will not agree to the proposal to change the WUI in south east Oakmont, which is arbitrary and unnecessary, and potentially impactful negatively when it comes to insurance availability.

**Please require the Fire Department to present evidence of a state requirement that the SRFD WUI needs to encompass High Risk Zones as well as Very High Risk Fire Hazard Zones before agreeing to this part of the changes in Oakmont.**

Thank you, Martin Johns - 386 Miramonte Place, Oakmont.

**From:** [Raymond Ronchelli](#)  
**To:** [City Council Public Comments](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] WUI zone changes  
**Date:** Monday, May 11, 2026 10:21:50 AM

---

To Whom It May Concern,

As residents of Cypress Way in the inner Bennett Valley area for 38 years, we are writing to express our concern regarding the recent redrawing of the fire severity zones.

We find this aggressive change surprising, as none of the fires in recent years have impacted this specific area in a way that would support such a reclassification. We ask that you reconsider this adjustment based on the historical data of our neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Raymond Ronchelli  
Cristimarie Ronchelli

**From:** [B.C](#)  
**To:** [City Council Public Comments](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Item 16.1 Public Hearing Amend Code WUI Area  
**Date:** Monday, May 11, 2026 11:39:44 AM

---

Mayor Stapp & City Council members,

The proposed update to the existing designated wildland urban interface area will have a profound impact on your residents, homeowners and citizens. Please oppose this recommendation from Cal Fire as it is not consistent with the known history of burn patterns and risks in Southeast Santa Rosa.

During the 2017 wildfires, Yulupa Ave was identified to be a natural fire break. The creekside/cypress neighborhoods west of Yulupa were not evacuated nor did they come near a burn zone. However, they are now going to be considered a "high risk" fire area? This does not seem reasonable and will put a long lasting burden on homeowners.

Montgomery High School will now be considered a "high risk" fire area, too, although it has never come near a wildfire or been evacuated. With all the concerns facing Santa Rosa City Schools, increased liability and barriers to construction and policy will make operations increasingly more difficult. Is this the impact Council wants to have?

We know this Council is committed to transparency, careful and informed decision making, and driving the economy of Santa Rosa. Blindly adopting Cal Fire's map would directly oppose these principles by implementing arbitrary boundaries that have far-reaching, negative impacts. Future homeowners and developers will not want to invest in Santa Rosa due to unrealistic regulations imposed on citizens.

Santa Rosa is struggling as it is - our roads our bad, our housing market is stagnant, businesses are struggling to stay open. Please use your common sense and do not layer on one more blanket of hardship to homeowners who live and work in this City.

**From:** [Kathryn Thompson](#)  
**To:** [City Council Public Comments](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Fire map changes  
**Date:** Monday, May 11, 2026 3:01:46 PM

---

Dear Sirs, I live in Bennett Valley on Mimosa St. I read in the paper about the fire map being changed and I don't think it's fair at all for our street to be changed to a high fire danger. We are in a normal neighborhood with small lots and no open fields around that could cause a fire danger. This is very disturbing to be in a new category. I think local fire officials need to check out our area first before taking a vote on changing the maps. The paper said it wouldn't change insurance rates but I don't believe that. I have friends in skyhawk who lost insurance or had it greatly increased. Please take this all into consideration. Thank you, Kathryn Thompson

**From:** [Sue Wheeler](#)  
**To:** [City Council Public Comments](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Proposed WUI Zones  
**Date:** Monday, May 11, 2026 3:28:33 PM

---

The email below was sent to the city manager on May 6th.

I am writing on behalf of my mother, Edna Gaddie, who owns and lives in her home at 1847 Elm Drive; the last home on Elm Drive impacted by the proposed new WUI Zone.

If one reads through the email below, I've notes two failures, asked three questions and shared our support for the Formal Petition and Notice of Legal Opposition served to the mayor, city manager, fire chief and other city officials.

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Sue Wheeler <suemw@sbcglobal.net>  
**Date:** May 6, 2026 at 2:26:17 PM PDT  
**To:** mstapp@srcity.org  
**Subject: Proposed WUI Zones**

I am writing on behalf of my mother who owns and lives in her home at 1847 Elm Drive.

We found out about this proposal, and the prior community meetings (3/4/26 and 3/12/26), when a standard size flyer was hand delivered to my mother's home on 4/26 by a neighbor who caught wind of this proposal and had taken it upon herself to alert impacted residents.

My mother, and her children, are concerned she did not receive the postcard type notification in the mail.

Please know she responsibly reviews all mail and sets mail aside for her children to review if a piece is something she would like assistance understanding. At almost 90, she is pretty dang sharp and would not have thrown away the mailer the City claims to have sent to all impacted residents.

Since the majority of residents at the 5/2/26 neighborhood meeting at 1919 Creekside Rd did not receive the postcard mailer, the City failed miserably in it's attempt to properly notify impacted residents of this pending proposal. We were expecting your Assistant Fire Chief at the neighborhood meeting and his absence and lack of follow up with the meeting organizer was a second failure and truly disturbing considering the absurd level of taxes we pay at the state, county, and city levels as well as our property taxes and various 'special' taxes itemized on sales receipts. All residents deserve better.

I've since learned a small subset of impacted residents attended the two community meetings; 18 on 3/4 and 20 on 3/12. Did anyone question the low

turnout and consider the effectiveness of the awareness postcard supposedly sent to all impacted residents? Perhaps the low turnout was seen as a blessing by the Fire Department and the City? Is the City and Fire Department moving so quickly through a check the box exercise, as a CYA, there remains no room to apply critical thinking skills?

My mother, a resident of Walnut Grove Estates, supports the Formal Petition and Notice of Legal Opposition reviewed during the neighborhood meeting on 5/2/26 and has signed said Petition.

She, and her children, will be attending the 5/12/26 city meeting.

Sent from my iPhone

**From:** [Iris Harrell](#)  
**To:** [roger@biery-bullock.net](mailto:roger@biery-bullock.net)  
**Cc:** [City Council Public Comments](#); [Antone Christel](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] Re: Proposed WUIFA Designation-Please adopt without hesitation!  
**Date:** Monday, May 11, 2026 4:21:13 PM

---

Dear City Council Members,

As Chair of the Firewise Task Force at Oakmont Village, I concur with Roger Biery below that Santa Rosa needs to adopt these new firewise regulations for the expanded WUI as soon as possible.

Residents resisting seem to be focussing on the wrong issue....yes, their insurance may go up, but much worse than that these homeowners need to know there is an existential threat to our communities with wildfire almost year round.  
Their house and community around them could burn down just like Coffey Park.

These new regulations are less strict than IBHS (Institute for Business and Home Safety) which is what most insurance companies are moving toward to reduce the potential catastrophes like we have been having in Santa Rosa. If we don't take enough firewise mitigation steps, not only are we in constant danger, home insurance companies will not even offer us home insurance policies in the future.

We live in a new century with a warming global climate and we need to adjust quickly as if our lives depended on it.

Iris F. Harrell  
Firewise Task Force Chair, Oakmont  
"Mind measures by the good that is unfolded."  
Mary Baker Eddy

On May 11, 2026, at 9:29 AM, [roger@biery-bullock.net](mailto:roger@biery-bullock.net) wrote:

Dear City Council Members:

I am a member of the Firewise Task Force at Oakmont Village and am writing to encourage you to adopt the new, expanded WUI.

I have read some of the comments from those wanting to stall the adoption based on arguments that sound reasonable but are ultimately a distraction, such as the "need" for time-consuming on-ground inspections by local authorities. Or the impact it might

have on homeowner's insurance, where the law prohibits companies from using WUI or Fire Hazard Severity Zone designations in their underwriting.

There are other such arguments, but the defensible space requirements imposed on properties added to the WUI are quite reasonable. And I would add that those requirements are the minimum needed to give our firefighters a fighting chance during the next wildfire.

Please vote in support of this prudent step to help prevent another Coffey Park or Fountaingrove disaster in Santa Rosa.

Thank you for considering my input to this important issue.

Sincerely,  
Roger Biery