



# THE ZONE 0 PUBLIC INPUT SURVEY

SURVEY 172763


# RESULTS

Number of records in this query	510
Total records in survey	510
<b>Percentage of total</b>	<b>100.00%</b>

## SUMMARY FOR G01Q03

# Question 1: Do you live in the County of Los Angeles?


Answer	Count	Percentage
Yes (A001)	439	86.08%
No (A002)	6	1.18%
No Answer	3	0.59%
Not completed or Not displayed	62	12.16%



## SUMMARY FOR G02Q05

# Do you understand what Zone 0 is?


Answer	Count	Percentage
Yes (A001)	376	73.73%
No (A002)	19	3.73%
No Answer	1	0.20%
Not completed or Not displayed	114	22.35%



## SUMMARY FOR G01Q07

# Do you agree that Zone 0 should apply to your home?


Answer	Count	Percentage
Yes (A001)	68	13.33%
No (A002)	261	51.18%
Uncertain (A003)	47	9.22%
No Answer	0	0.00%
Not completed or Not displayed	134	26.27%



## SUMMARY FOR G02Q08

Great news! We're delighted you see the value in creating an ember resistant zone around your home and adjoining structures. Please let us know a bit more. Please check all the appropriate boxes.


Answer	Count	Percentage
I have already complied with Zone 0 clearance around my home (SQ001)	14	2.75%
I am in the process of completing the creation of Zone 0 at my home (SQ002)	34	6.67%
I know it's important, but I haven't done it yet (SQ003)	22	4.31%
Not completed or Not displayed	442	86.67%



## SUMMARY FOR G02Q09

You're not alone. A lot of people are concerned about clearing the five-foot zone around their home and adjoining structures. We'd like to know a bit more about your reasoning related to not approving of Zone 0 applying to your home. Please check all of the appropriate boxes.

Answer	Count	Percentage
It will ruin the look of my home, and its appearance is very important to me (SQ001)	136	26.67%
I believe it will be very expensive (SQ002)	80	15.69%
I cannot afford to create an ember resistant zone around my home (SQ003)	67	13.14%
I don't believe Zone 0 will reduce ignitability of a home in a wildfire (SQ004)	239	46.86%
I just don't want to do it. Period. (SQ005)	50	9.80%
Other (SQ006)	106	20.78%
Not completed or Not displayed	202	39.61%



## SUMMARY FOR G02Q10

# List of other reason concerns

ID	Response
5	It reduces security - removal of thorned bushes in front of windows .
11	I collect exotic and in some cases endangered species. They are too large to be moved without killing the plant.
16	<p>I am an architect and lost use of my home to smoke damage. The home was directly on a hillside in Palisades fire. I believe fire hardening our properties is very necessary. I am unsure how anyone will enforce laws limiting the constant growth of the natural environment. Most won't afford the time or the stress. There are already so many codes! And in many situations it can be nearly impossible to force a neighbor to trim, especially where views and privacy are concerned. I am just starting to investigate MySafe:LA website. I would hope to see more investment in the actual building upgrades. Perhaps even in some cases rezoning to reduce or even remove a home. Now is a great time for the city to acquire a few lots in hillside areas and create parks. Neighbors will welcome this as there are no parks up in dense hillside areas that were poorly planned by developers. These parks could serve as water reservoirs with below grade tanks cross connected to fresh water for mosquito vector control. Who would argue? They could also be staging areas for fire fighters. Call them fire parks. Emergency vehicles should be on scene during high winds and neighbors will have the comfort of knowing firefighters are ready to go.</p>
31	Need planting to prevent hillside erosion/mudslides.
47	<p>I want to prevent as much as possible, but my neighbor built a cap trap patio enclosure within 1 foot of my patio fence (without telling me her plans) and refuses to remove her camelia bushes but insists i remove my succulents and agree to have the loquat tree cut (not bcs the loquat tree is flammable, but bcs she doesnt want to rake the leaves). i have a sinking feeling she will give me a difficult time re my zone zero efforts. she would rather hire a private fire fighting company before letting her neighbors know of an evacuation warning/order. now she would rather overwater the eucalyptus tree, than cut itvto the stump. its almost like i have to build my world around her, instead of protecting the people and homes in our neighborhood.</p>



## List of other reason concerns

ID	Response
66	<p>Disasters like the Palisades Fire on January 7, 2025, will continue to occur if the root cause is not addressed. While only 30 fire trucks were dispatched earlier in the morning at 10:30 AM, no fire trucks or firefighters responded to the scene when the fire actively threatened homes. This disaster could have been prevented and contained. It will happen again if responsibility continues to be placed on fire victims instead of ensuring competent leadership and holding the LAFD accountable for fulfilling their duties.</p> <p>The weather and winds were not "unprecedented," as falsely claimed. Historical weather records for Los Angeles, dating back to 1947, show that each year has had at least four days with winds equal to or exceeding those recorded on January 7, 2025. In total, there have been more than 455 such days, some with wind speeds at least double those of January 7, 2025. The lack of rainfall before the wind is also not a valid excuse, as historical records show multiple instances of high winds following months of dry conditions.</p> <p>Between 11:00 AM and 3:00 PM that day, Los Angeles Residential Waste Management collected all three trash bin types (Green, Blue, and Black) in Pacific Palisades on Via De La Paz, south of Sunset Boulevard. During this same period, and afterward, no LAPD or LAFD vehicles or personnel were seen in the area. Additionally, residents were told not to evacuate. Evacuation maps provided by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) and the Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD) instructed residents to remain in place until after their homes were destroyed. These maps were also outdated by 12 to 24 hours, with multiple areas marked as safe despite having already burned down at least 12 hours earlier.</p> <p>Regarding the misleading demands for Defensible Space and Hardening, the home at 742 Via De La Paz had a fire hydrant directly across the street, within 20 feet of the property. Built in 2006, the home complied with all modern fire-hardening regulations. At 3:30 PM, retired firefighters sprayed all surrounding vegetation with fire retardant. These professionals assured that the home would not burn, as it exceeded fire-hardening standards. Yet, at 5:55 PM, the home lost power and was completely destroyed within the hour.</p> <p>On January 8, 2025, at 8:00 AM, LAFD Fire Chief Anthony Marrone deliberately misled the public through media outlets like KNX (1070AM / 97.1FM) by falsely claiming that only a few "dozen" homes were destroyed in the Palisades, despite being fully aware that thousands of homes had been lost.</p> <p>This fire was not an inevitable natural disaster, it was a preventable failure. Without accountability and a competent emergency response, tragedies like this will continue to occur, putting lives and homes at unnecessary risk. The time for excuses is over; decisive action and leadership are needed to prevent future catastrophes.</p>

## SUMMARY FOR G02Q10

### List of other reason concerns

ID	Response
75	I do not believe that eliminating irrigated low groundcovers and turf in zone 0 will create safer conditions.
87	We are in a 24-unit, 3-building condo complex relatively far from fire hazard. We would like to first see how the program works with more vulnerable single-family homes.
89	Preserving trees and planting area. Do NOT expand zone zero beyond five feet. Do NOT allow insurance to require larger zones o requirements not backed in environmental / fire science. Urban heat island effect is best addressed by plants. We need a green city or the death toll from urban heat will grow each year, affecting most those in dense areas lacking green space.
91	I do not believe that the current draft is reasonable in terms of healthy, well-maintained vegetation. They Board has not recognized the benefits of healthy vegetation in resisting embers and has not substantiated their claims of the benefits of complete elimination of vegetation.
96	House is stucco with new tile roof, new windows and 1/8 screen in attic vents. Very minimal plants in Zone 0. I am far more concerned that other critical issues such as Brush clearance, Firefighting resources, and WATER AVAILABILITY be tackled before forcing Zone 0 on homeowners. The City and State isn't doing nearly enough and looking to put the burden on the homeowner.
107	Will reduce climate, habitat, and air quality benefits of urban forest; will cause hillsides to fail; will allow flammable invasive plants to replace fire-resistant natives (especially oaks); urban fires aren't spread by well-maintained & hydrated native landscaping; science doesn't support proposition that denuded landscape prevents spread of urban wildfires (a CEQA environmental study is required); extreme clearance requirements are an over-reaction to the tragic circumstances (drought, high winds, utility failure) that led to our most recent fires; the size of most properties will mean they will not have any old growth or remedial landscaping to protect from worsening climate conditions and to provide beauty and privacy to residences as well as communal spaces; a few spindly potted plants won't make a house a home.

## SUMMARY FOR G02Q10

### List of other reason concerns

ID	Response
108	<p>"Creating an "ember-resistant zone"—a five-foot perimeter around structures free of combustible materials—can significantly reduce the risk of home ignition during wildfires." This statement is false and an oversimplification. Hydrated native plants are ember CATCHERS. Eliminating hydrated plants from Zone 0 increases temps and wind movement of embers. I am a certified native plant landscaper and certified wildfire defense landscaper and instructor. This initiative is going to produce the opposite result from what you want. The lack of home hardening caused the Palisades and Eaton fires--not the landscaping. Efforts should be focused on hardening structures and sealing them tight--THAT'S more important. Our native fire-adapted, ember-catching plants should be allowed in Zone 0.</p>
109	<p>i live in a neighborhood with small lot sizes (5000 sq ft or under). for me to create a zone 0 i would have to remove all of the trees and shrubs that make my home an urban oasis. and more importantly the science doesn't say that removing all the greenery would spare our structure in the event of a fire. all it would be guaranteed to do is turn our cool, green, native plant sanctuary into an urban heat island, which is the opposite of what is needed</p>
111	<p>This is a really bad, non-systemic, way to address this issue while destroying biodiversity, increasing heat island effect and increasing our already bad air quality. Do better!</p>
113	<p>You are misrepresenting Zone 0 requirements. A five foot gap is fine ... but it is the 30 foot restriction that is utterly unreasonable especially in the crucial role that trees play in disrupting laminar flow. Also look at the devastation in Altadena where the houses are all gone and trees are still there: the primary combustible material in a city fire are the houses. ... not the trees!</p>
115	<p>Makes NO sense whatsoever to destroy what little free space, green areas, wildlife habitat, and beauty a neighborhood has for foolish non-science backed demands written by pencil pushers who haven't touched grass since the Carter administration!</p>
116	<p>The science is not clear that zone 0 will prevent fires, especially wind driven fires in urban areas like the 2025 fires in LA. The uncertain benefit is not worth high cost of this measure in cities, not only financial but the impact on emissions and heat island effects and human health and well being from loss of green space. CALFIRE's own guidelines say healthy tree canopy can be fire protective and yet people are scared and misinformed and removing vegetation and trees all over the city. The policy should be flexible to adapt to the emerging science and different geography and urbanization levels.</p>
123	<p>More fraud on the part of California Democrat Politicians. We need to take care of them, not them trying to take care of us. More tax and waste Democrat ideology, zero actual positive results. Terrible officials and policies.</p>

## SUMMARY FOR G02Q10

# List of other reason concerns

ID	Response
125	<p>No science behind this as the cause. Vegetation belongs here, was here first. Housing materials must be fire hardened and power under grounded and please note that 90% of trees in Eaton canyon survived. Trees create safety in wildfire, disrupt wind blown embers.</p>
126	<p>Vegetation keeps things cooler and provides habitat fo animals.</p>
128	<p>Construction materials and roof condition are far more important. And we should do more to combat climate change.</p>
129	<p>Real safety doesn't come from scorched-earth policies, loss of privacy, safety or rights. It comes from evidence-based action that respects both the risk and the resilience of the places we call home.</p> <p>The dominant fuel in an urban fire is not plants. In the urban environment, it's the homes themselves that are the fire's fuel—the wood siding, the attic vents, the eaves, the debris in gutters. In urban fires, flames leap from rooftop to rooftop, structure to structure, driven by wind and embers. This is not a theory—it's the conclusion of multiple peer-reviewed studies conducted across Southern California.</p> <p>It's easy for policymakers to imagine defensible space as a tidy ring around a sprawling rural estate—but that's not the reality in places like Los Angeles. For many Los Angeles homeowners, 30 feet from the house is the whole yard or most of it. The Zone 0 rules could lead to the widespread removal of shade trees, mature hedges, and protected species—plants that block wind-driven embers, offer cooling, privacy, safety, wildlife habitat, and slope stability.</p> <p>The justification for this landscape mandate relies heavily on white papers and internal reports from the Insurance Institute that are not peer-reviewed and not grounded in real-world fire science. But the mandate does not distinguish between a neglected lot and a carefully designed, well-watered native garden with oak trees. It treats all plants as hazards.</p> <p>What we need is ecological literacy, not this vegetation apocalypse. Home hardening incentives, not draconian landscape mandates. Peer-reviewed science, not insurance industry white papers. Regional nuance, not a prescriptive mandate. When the next fire comes—and it will—how many homes will burn, not because a lemon tree stood too close to the side of the house, but because we focused on the lemon tree instead of urban planning and ignition sources.</p> <p>--excerpted from City Watch article by Diana Nicole, an accredited ecological horticulture professional and tree expert.</p>

## SUMMARY FOR G02Q10

### List of other reason concerns

ID	Response
132	Trees give us shade cool our homes and purify our air. Eliminating shade or lush greenery will make my home and thousands of others - hot bubbles, ugly. The cost does not justify the ecological disaster this regulation calls for. I will probably leave LA. It will turn us into a desert.
135	Zone 0 will encourage invasive grasses. And will reduce habitat quality and prevent safe wildlife passage.
138	Protected trees and properly maintained native plants should be allowed to remain in the 0-5 zone. We must harden our structures and remove invasives.
142	The plan also calls for cutting down trees within 30 feet of structures. That is ecologically irresponsible and simplistic. It is deceptive of you to only ask about the 5 foot perimeter , which is reasonable.
143	I don't support fascists
154	Government stay out of my garden
155	I believe that flying embers are the real problem in our hillsides when wildfires strike and if we focus on hardening our homes and educating people about having a well maintained and watered landscape, Zone 0 would not be an issue. Furthermore, removing all vegetation within 5' of structures within our urban hillsides would remove so much of our valuable native landscape - especially in areas where there are smaller properties. We are already in a crisis situation in the Santa Monica Mountains. We are losing critical land daily due to development and clearing all of this additional land of vegetation will add to the loss of our biodiversity, and hurt our wildlife.
156	Zone 0 is defensive space overkill and it will not fireproof homes. Trees and plants absorb carbon dioxide, give us oxygen and clean the air. Fire ecologist Jon Keeley says that once the fire gets into the urban environment, the structures are the fire's fuel and the plants don't matter so much. Scientific research shows that well maintained, hydrated vegetation, especially native plants, protect homes from wildfires.
157	Trees help shade homes, cooling them in hot months without need for power and they often provide protection from falling embers from nearby fires

## SUMMARY FOR G02Q10

### List of other reason concerns

ID	Response
159	I have dwarf fruit trees on the downwind side of my home that cannot be relocated elsewhere. I can have a safe perimeter for the rest.
161	Vegetation reduces AC costs. If vegetation is lost, co2 emissions increase as well as dry terrain, adding fuel to more fires.
174	Zone 0 is reasonable, but you also want us to cut down all the trees within thirty feet of the house. And that's unacceptable. Trees are necessary for habitat, AS YOU KNOW.
183	I am willing to do as much as i can but refuse to remove everything
184	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. i know that native plants and trees are fire resistant and they do not promote wildfire, in fact it is homes that burn not oaks and other adapted plants like toyons— the fire keeps traveling when it meets those plants.</li><li>2. my yard space is a small patio and it is very important to my mental health and quality of life and the biodiversity of my neighborhood to grow potted plants in close proximity to my home, as it is the only space i have.</li><li>3. fire safety comes from proper land management of native plants— clearing invasive species, planting, restoring and taking care of native species, shifting water management practices, and holding energy companies accountable for power lines, which should be strictly regulated in a timely manner . punishing people who need to grow plants with the space they have, or cutting down trees that provide crucial shade is not the solution.</li></ol>
187	i wonder if there are acceptions to rules where arborists and other plant experts who are familiar with native ecology may have tips that conflict with this...like native succulents within zone zero that are full of water may actually be beneficial to slowing fire.
198	Homes in our area are built close together
199	Protected trees should be exempt

## SUMMARY FOR G02Q10

# List of other reason concerns

ID	Response
200	<p>Another attempt by our criminal California politicians and their cronies to take away American citizens rights and steal more money. They know these "Noble Cause" proposals never work. The more money thrown at them leads to no results and often more damage to all parties concerned. Where was Mayor Karen Bass when the fires started? She should be fired and deported back to Ghana. Just do what California politicians can't do. Use common sense on a case by case basis for each property to determine the best fire defense. "One size fits all" legislation will never work to save homes from fires.</p>
202	<p>I live in the Eaton Fire burn zone. My house has survived three Altadena wildfires in the past 35-years, including the Eaton Fire. I water and maintain my yard (including "Zone 0") as do my neighbors. I found embers in my yard on January 8 (the morning-after) but they didn't ignite anything because of the garden's high moisture content. I also observed the yards of homes that DID burn and those homes were invariably unkempt, unmaintained, and messy (or were located adjacent to and/or downwind from a home that was sloppy). It's not the yard -- it's the house. Vegetation next to the house adds beauty and is not a critical parameter for fire safety if the cladding is non-wood; the important parameter is denying embers access to the interior of the house. My observations indicate that most homes burned from the "inside out". The embers got inside the house and ignited flammable materials therein. The homeoccupants (or landlord) were not attentive to their home's condition.</p> <p>Removing garden plants for distance of 5' from the house will destroy its attractiveness. My house's exterior walls are stucco and brick and are fire-resistant. The house will not become more fire-proof by removing adjacent vegetation. My experience over 35-years and 3-fires gives me confidence in asserting this opinion.</p>
208	<p>uncertain of how to do it when homes are close together and need more info on fire resistant and non-toxic alternatives that will work in my particular situation</p>
211	<p>In the recent fires, trees native trees near homes actually protected embers from reaching fires. Clearing native trees will only make climate change worse. Much of the canopy in urban areas is located on private property. The Zone 0 will make our already hot neighborhoods hotter and will make climate change worse. You need to rethink this.</p>
215	<p>Mature trees provide shade and significantly reduce greenhouse gas emissions related to home cooling, leading to increased wildfire danger, not less. The issue in the Palisades and Eaton Fires was not flammable plants, it was blowing embers from house-to-house going into unprotected attic spaces. Drive around a burn area, the houses are gone and the trees are fine!</p>
217	<p>Planting natives which are drought and fire resistant, and maintaining them will help in the event of a fire. I also know that the fuel for the recent fires were the houses not the area around the homes.</p>

## SUMMARY FOR G02Q10

### List of other reason concerns

ID	Response
218	It will likely have the opposite effect. Fires in Alta Dena and the Palisades spread from structure to structure. There are ways to protect houses in more effective ways.
227	I worry about habitat loss for native plants and animals.
239	Permaculture landscaping and use of native plants has been proven to actually be beneficial when it comes to wildfires, I would suggest a program that allows people to use native and drought tolerant plants in zone 0, instead of using a scorched earth approach and just killing everything within 5 feet. Permaculture and native plants do not turn into dried brush and does not ignite as easily.
245	This appears to be an effort driven by insurance companies b
249	I approve of creating a 5-foot zone around my home, BUT will NEVER approve of creating a zone larger than that because anything larger is NOT science-based. Science has shown that building materials and proximity to other structures are the drivers of urban megafires, NOT vegetation. In fact, around structures, having trees, such as oaks, and other fire-adapted water-storing native plants, works to protect the structure and slow the spread of fire by catching embers before they reach the structure, disrupting the laminar flow. To maintain our sub/urban areas' livability, we need shade trees, plants for pollinators and other wildlife, etc. Creating wastelands of concrete and gravel beyond 5' will make the effects of climate change worse for people and create even more of a negative feedback loop.
250	Clearing will allow other more flammable species to invade. Primary cause for the cataclysmic spread of recent fires was flying embers from house and construction materials, and particular vegetation such as palm fronds.
274	This will make all of LA HOTTER and reduce food and cover for wildlife! We need vegetation cover
277	Transient fuels, such as firewood, lumber, trash cans, boxes, tools, and the miscellaneous junk from modern life will end up in that first five feet, and oftentimes, these fuels are far more combustible than plants. I have seen it a hundred times. Let plants catch firebrands and rob the atmosphere of energy and heat around structure. Obviously, sheared hedges should be outlawed up against buildings.



## SUMMARY FOR G02Q10

### List of other reason concerns

ID	Response
278	Certain trees and plants serve to block wind and actually retard fire. They also attract wildlife and serve extremely critical environmental purposes. I would consider these to actually be potentially protective in Zone 0. Many of the other items identified for removal from Zone 0 in your description should most definitely be placed elsewhere.
282	We have a native plant garden around our home. The majority of native plants are heat resistant and plants are important for preventing urban heat island which is a very real problem. Also, trees are important for shade and keeps our home cool in the summer. This Zone 0 approach is lacking any recognition if the importance of plants, even in high fire prone areas. If you focused on restricting non-native species, many of which are invasive and highly flammable, that might make more sense, but mandating a barren landscape is NOT the solution to urban wildfires.
283	Shade canopy trees provide cooling and oak trees in particular provide protection from ember driven fires. The Eaton fire that took my home was spread by wind borne embers (from burning houses). The huge, beautiful trees on Santa Rosa Ave saved almost every house on "Christmas Tree Lane". Native plants are often fire resistant. No one did the homework about appropriate vegetation. No one did the homework about more fire resistant home building methods and materials
287	It will increase the local climate not having shade trees, shrubs or vegetation. Plants, all of them, sequester carbon from the atmosphere that cools the local airshed. Plants and trees contain moisture. Composted mulch is not flammable like regular wood chips and this type of mulch can keep trees and plants hydrated which increases their ability to resist being burned. Hydrated plants can function to protect homes from burning. Composted mulch can also help conserve upwards of 50% on irrigation to keep plants and trees hydrated. There is no scientific evidence to support a zero vegetation perimeter. This practice would inly exacerbate the problem.
292	I am not in, but near one of the zones. We will take measures in zone 0 including replacing the deck with fire resistant materials, ember-resistant vents, and removing wood fences and making sure there is not dead brush in the zone. We do not believe maintained droughtresistent plants in the zone will be an issue. And absolutely not in the area extending from 5-30 feet.
300	Not only will it not reduce ignitability, destroying longstanding native plants in the zone would actually make my home MORE in danger of fire. Native plants, especially native trees like oaks, actually help suppress fire! Wooden fences and general home design are much bigger risk factors than native plants.

## SUMMARY FOR G02Q10

# List of other reason concerns

ID	Response
301	<p>This mandate represents a clear case of government overreach. It goes far beyond basic fire safety—it's an extreme, inflexible policy not grounded in sound science. By forcing uniform vegetation removal, it strips homeowners of the ability to manage their land in ways that are both safe and ecologically responsible. The policy ignores well-established data on how fires actually behave and threatens to devastate the natural character of our neighborhoods. Worse still, it risks creating an environmental crisis of its own. Native trees, plants, and wildlife—already under pressure—would suffer dramatically. This mandate undercuts decades of environmental progress and contradicts the very climate goals our state claims to champion.</p> <p>It's also ineffective: it would not have prevented recent fires in Palisades or Altadena. What we need instead are smarter building codes and resilient design standards that make homes less flammable—without sacrificing the green spaces that define our communities and our quality of life.</p> <p>Protect our environment. Respect property rights. Leave the green space alone. Thank you for considering common sense.</p>
307	<p>Well maintained plants have other benefits besides just looking good. Let's spend our energy and political capital in smarter ways</p>
313	<p>I do not live in a high severity fire zone, and I already take measures to reduce the ignition potential around the home.</p>
314	<p>Shade trees are essential to making a habitable city and I believe the science does not support this type of thoughtless removal of all vegetation. Well maintained trees and vegetation do not act to spread fire, and can even help to prevent it.</p>
315	<p>I'd like a chance to understand the science around this and the specific details regarding what I can and can't do. Is every kind of plant equally fireproof? Could some plants actually provide protection? Is anyone going to look into such things? Also wonder what might change if I take extra steps to make my rebuilt home extra-fire resistant (e.g., metal roof, frame, walls, etc.) Is there going to be any sort of dialogue about this or opportunity to present a "plan" to my local fire department. I very much agree with taking steps to protect buildings. Plants can play a role in protecting buildings with adequate planning, I believe, and help retain moisture around structures.</p>
318	<p>Restrict the sale of non native plants instead</p>

## SUMMARY FOR G02Q10

### List of other reason concerns

ID	Response
320	Due to the tight lot sizes in many hillside communities, and house builders constructing houses very close to lot lines, it does not seem like it'd be feasible to be in compliance of the Zone 0 rules as listed on this website.
321	Many native plants provide protection from both fire and also greatly help reduce temperatures during extreme heat.
326	<p>Vegetation lowers temperatures and makes outdoor space usable in a city that otherwise has major heat island effects</p> <p>Native plant species are highly flame resistant and such a blanket vegetation clearing requirement has a net negative effect on livability</p> <p>I don't think this is an appropriate tactic to reduce fire risk in residential areas. Focus on building materials and infrastructure that starts the fires themselves</p>
327	this does not factor the fire suppression benefits of healthy landscaping. Retention of moisture in the soil, ember blocking by certain trees, and just reducing temperatures .
329	There is a happy medium to be had, starting with plants that do not entice fire spread and more can be done with buildings themselves
333	Flammability of landscape and structure damage is not an "all or nothing" thing. Having severely dry plants or unirrigated weed species in Zone 0 could contribute, just like having a pile of any other flammable material. However, this does not mean that ALL plant material should be seen as a high-level threat to structure damage and fire spread. The peer reviewed literature does not seem to support this as a major factor in which houses do or do not burn in a fire event. It is tempting to adopt a wide-sweeping and simple regulatory approach, but in this case, that is likely to result in costs and impacts that are not justified by proven mitigation of risk.

## SUMMARY FOR G02Q10

### List of other reason concerns

ID	Response
335	<p>Misguided Priorities. The stated goal of these regulations is to "improve safety for firefighters defending a home," yet this was not the determining factor in the recent Eaton Fire in Altadena. In most cases homes were left to burn and a few homeowners decided to stay behind to do what they could. In other words, resources were constrained, and it was left up to us...the homeowner. Survivability of structures is the key issue, not vegetation removal. The real problem lies in the way structures are built and organized within fire-prone ecotone communities, not in the presence of plants and trees.</p> <p>Flawed "Defensible Space" Concept. The term "defensible space" is misleading. Instead, the focus would best be focused on creating "defensible homes," as it is the structures themselves that are flammable. Educating homeowners on fire-resistant building materials, proper architectural planning, and community-level strategies will be far more effective than enforcing arbitrary vegetation removal mandates.</p> <p>Unrealistic Requirements. The Zone 1 requirement of a 30' setback is unfeasible for most urban and suburban homeowners. The Zone 0 gravel perimeter is ineffective against embers that travel hundreds of feet, and is a further blight on our tightly knit communities. The removal of trees and vegetation in Zone 0, and beyond, further increases heat island effects and exacerbates drought conditions, making communities more vulnerable to extreme fire behavior.</p>
337	<p>I have a seven foot side yard shared with my neighbors house— a 5 foot zone 0 would mean our bathrooms are looking into each other with no fence or privacy. This is because these houses were built before modern day setbacks. How do we make it so our neighbors aren't peering into our master bedroom (or is theirs) while still maintaining a zone 0</p>
342	<p>Instead of building shade structures over our outdoor areas, we've planted and maintained trees and wisteria. These provide shade, habitat for birds and mammals, beauty and oxygen. These living shade structures attach to our house.</p>
345	<p>'Zone 0' is in opposition to sustainable landscapes and buildings, by: exacerbating urban heat island warming (unshading walls, roofs, and adjacent pavements and vehicles); increasing energy usage &amp; costs for increased air conditioning usage; reducing habitats for native wildlife, and harming human health and causing aesthetic loss - with less interacting with nature (passively in window/door views out &amp; actively on adjacent patios, decks, balconies). It will reduce property values for residences and the other structures no longer visually integrating with their sites and with the financial and ethical burdens of being less sustainable.</p>
356	<p>It will make our city look even more hardscaped and devoid of green space than it already is. I don't believe these measures will curtail the risk of urban wildfires and having the city mandate plantings on my own property seems a huge overstep of power.</p>

## SUMMARY FOR G02Q10

### List of other reason concerns

ID	Response
359	The barren space would invite weeds. It is an equity issue - on a large parcel it is easier to comply, than on a small urban lot. This may be the only garden space available. Vegetation can: slow a fire, produce food, reduce erosion, provide habitat, cool , beautify.
360	Not all plants behave the same when threatened with fire! This is a simplistic approach that doesn't take into account the way some plants in certain locations may help with fire resistance. Public education in the matter is critical.
364	You have no consideration for the positive things that plants add to our life such as the creation of oxygen keeping moisture around the property, the temperature control, that the use of other non-flammable materials might be built,into the house, the fact that it doesn't matter where the plants are if the wind is blowing embers around, and the fact that some trees protected houses from burning like ours!!
366	We need native trees and plants to maintain a healthy ecosystem and trees have a cooling effect in urban settings.
367	As described here, it sounds fine. As described recently, it sounds extreme and would require a serious overhaul of my yard. If that is really what we should do, then of course I want to do it, but I would like to make sure that we really need to do all these extreme things before they are required.
376	I currently have some large trees that add significant shade to my house and in the past have dropped the temperature significantly. Getting rid of those would cause a significant increase in heat, causing me to need to run an air conditioner much more than I currently have had to in the past.
388	I'm concerned with loosing the shade of trees near my home. and how it helps with cooling, and privacy.
398	"In the urban environment, it's the homes themselves that are the fire's fuel—the wood siding, the attic vents, the eaves, the debris in gutters. In urban fires, flames leap from rooftop to rooftop, structure to structure, driven by wind and embers. This is not a theory—it's the conclusion of multiple peer-reviewed studies conducted across Southern California. And yet, the state's new mandate focuses not on fortifying buildings or rethinking land use, but on regulating the plants in your yard—down to the inch." We need trees for shade and cooling, clean air, preventing landslides on hillsides and for other animals. Zone 0 does not address the real problems of urban fires and has catastrophic consequences to the environment.

## SUMMARY FOR G02Q10

# List of other reason concerns

ID	Response
400	I think it's passing the blame onto wildlife when wildlife was here before us and will be here after us. The real issue is building sustainable structures that have been developed for fire safety - for example the dome homes and other types of buildings - that use materials and shapes that serve the weather patterns and land use more efficiently. Green spaces are essential for shade (temp regulation) and therefore safety of children and elderly. They are essential for mental health (that's everyone). They are essential for wildlife creatures - pollinators, bugs, etc that exist to sustain life on this planet for all beings. This feels like a way to avoid the real causes and place the attention and blame somewhere else. Real issues need to be addressed.
404	Will not achieve its goal
410	Not sure what it entails if house will still look good
417	Decision needs to be based on solid evidence.
423	I need more substantiated evidence. I don't think a native garden around my house catching fire will ignite my stucco house. It is much more effective to focus on the buildings, building materials and other methods...Altadena houses caught fire from inside, with embers getting inside because of the wind. Once the fire was ablaze, the plants were not the driving force and 5 ft won't counteract winds. I'm also concerned because we are simultaneously trying to reduce urban heat, yet this policy would seem to encourage removing plants and increasing hardscaping.
424	I won't be able to have any trees on my property.
426	My house would have to be moved and reduced in size so that I may keep the small yard in front of it. It's already a small 800 sq ft home. I will keep trees and shrubs away from the structure. This I can do.
435	Trees support the shade needed in hot summers. Trees are very fire resistant.
455	Loss of trees means loss of shade. Loss of trees means less wildlife. Loss of trees means more pollution. Everything else I can agree with.
547	It is too general. The plant type, height, and maintenance should be taken into consideration. Therefore bringing awareness should be the first step. It will be cost effective too.

## SUMMARY FOR G02Q10

### List of other reason concerns

ID	Response
463	There is no enough space to support a 5' perimeter. Additionally, fire hardening the residence would be far more effective. Native trees can support the protection of a structure
464	This mandate is an astounding case of government overreach. It obliterates basic fire safety! It's an extreme, inflexible policy not grounded in sound science. By forcing uniform vegetation removal, homeowners are stripped of the ability to manage their land in ways that are both safe and ecologically responsible. The policy ignores well-established empirical data on how fires actually behave, threatens to devastate the natural character of our neighborhoods and worsen the effects of climate change. Worse still, it risks creating an environmental crisis of its own. Native trees, plants, and wildlife—already under pressure—would suffer dramatically. This mandate undercuts decades of environmental progress and contradicts the very climate goals our state claims to champion. It's also ineffective: it would not have prevented recent fires in Palisades or Altadena! What we need instead are smarter building codes and resilient design standards that make homes less flammable—without sacrificing the green spaces, the lungs which that define our communities and our quality of life. Protect our environment! Honor our property rights! Respect and leave the green space alone. The problem is global warming! This does not fix the problem. It makes the situation exponentially worse. This proposal treats a symptom, not the cause. Thank you for caring
466	This legislation is overkill. Why not keep the trees and bury the power lines. Why not support communities in rebuilding in ways that are fire resistant while keeping trees, plants, and beneficial habitat for wildlife and pollinators that can help mitigate the climate change that is creating these disastrous weather events in the first place.
470	I do not believe that Zone 0 as conceived by the State takes into account the benefits of healthy landscape vegetation, which at my home includes well-maintained nonnative plants and trees and Coast Live Oaks. I live where I live because of the natural environment and its biodiversity, and I will not destroy it.
472	I do not believe that Zone 0 as conceived by the State takes into account the benefits of healthy landscape vegetation, which at our home includes well-maintained nonnative plants and trees and Coast Live Oaks. We live where we live because of the natural environment and its biodiversity (especially birds). Please understand also that the birds and wildlife of our canyon are here because most homes provide similar types of habitat for them, whether or not intentionally, and so any forced landscape removal beyond responsible brush clearance would result in a devastating loss of our neighborhood's most cherished attributes.

## SUMMARY FOR G02Q10

### List of other reason concerns


ID	Response
476	It's obvious there was no research done on this so called "0" concept! Mind you, we were told to plant trees due to global warming and now we are told to cut down trees due to fires caused by global warming. If im suppose to provide fire insurance premiums because the banks want to safeguard their investment but yet the insurance companies want to safeguard their risk by creating loopholes with voodoo science, then we need to change those factors! To expect the homeowner to shoulder all the risk and at the same time hand over premiums to greedy corporate bankers/insurance companies is more the root of this proposed scam policy. Instead, lets go after the fire fighting community and their obvious shortfalls or government officials and their willy-nilly mismanagement! Lets not forget state bonuses for density housing and crazy infill dwelling compaction, this is crazy! This is all sorcery formulated by corporate payroll witchdoctors! Nothing more, nothing less!
479	My house burned down in the recent fires - not because of plants next to it. It burned down because there was no water in the house. It was still standing and the smoldering from an ember could have been put out by a garden hose.
491	I get a lot of mental health benefit from all of the beautiful trees in my neighborhood and many will be gone if this goes through.
502	Our house is at the bottom of a hill, to be compliant we would need to remove the trees keeping the hill where it is and not in the house. One portion of the hill fell last year due to the lack of trees in our neighbors property, they just added trees this year. The hill is also what forms the reservoir, so no hill, no reservoir. That reservoir was heavily used for the Palisades fire.
509	It is not supported by the science and if done by mandate would be a complete violation of my rights



SUMMARY FOR G03Q12

# Are you a member of an NFPA Firewise USA entity?


Answer	Count	Percentage
Yes (A001)	6	1.18%
No (A002)	327	64.12%
Uncertain (A003)	27	5.29%
No Answer	0	0.00%
Not completed or Not displayed	150	29.41%



SUMMARY FOR G03Q13

# Are you involved with an HOA/POA that is a Fire Safe Council?


Answer	Count	Percentage
Yes (A001)	19	3.73%
No (A002)	309	60.59%
Uncertain (A003)	32	6.27%
No Answer	0	0.00%
Not completed or Not displayed	150	29.41%



## SUMMARY FOR G01Q14

# Have you lost a home to a wildfire?


Answer	Count	Percentage
Yes (A001)	58	11.37%
No (A002)	302	59.22%
No Answer	0	0.00%
Not completed or Not displayed	150	29.41%



## SUMMARY FOR G01Q15

# Which wildfire?

Answer	Count	Percentage
Answer	58	11.37%
No answer	0	0.00%
Not completed or Not displayed	452	88.63%



## SUMMARY FOR G01Q15

# Which wildfire?

ID	Response
14	Bridge Fire
16	Palisades. Loss of use.
50	Palisades Wildfire.
66	2018 Woolsey and 2025 Palisades
73	Eaton Fire
93	Palisades
107	as a result of the 1994 Sylmar earthquake
156	1994 Northridge earthquake. My parents' home was destroyed because of a break in a neighboring home's gas main. Zone 0 would not have saved their home and it would not have saved homes in the recent fires in Pacific Palisades and Altadena. At my current home, I keep plants and trees trimmed and watered, but I do not think we should be forced by Zone 0 to live in a concrete jungle. If there is no vegetation, what will happen to the wildlife that depend on trees and plants for food and shelter?
179	Eaton
180	eaton canyon
187	eaton
213	Eaton

## SUMMARY FOR G01Q15

# Which wildfire?

ID	Response
241	Eaton
245	Eaton
261	Palisades/Malibu
267	Eaton
271	Eaton
273	woolsey
278	A wildfire that took place near the Sierras between Bishop and Mammoth in 1981.
283	the Eaton fire; I live well below the 'fire line' of Loma Alta drive.
286	Palisades
288	Palisades
289	Eaton Fire
293	Blue River fire in Vida, OR
300	Palisades Fire
315	Eaton Canyon

## SUMMARY FOR G01Q15

# Which wildfire?

ID	Response
327	Eaton
335	Eaton
359	a long time ago - 2005? Lake Isabella. It was an arson fire with high winds and dry conditions
364	Eaton Canyon/Altadena
365	Eaton
374	Eaton
375	Eaton
376	Eaton
377	Eaton canyon
394	Eaton
396	Eaton
408	Eaton
409	Eaton
412	Eaton

## SUMMARY FOR G01Q15

# Which wildfire?

ID	Response
413	Eaton
416	Eaton
422	Eaton Fire
423	Eaton
424	Eaton Canyon wildfire
426	Eaton Canyon (Altadena)
430	Eaton
432	Eaton
434	Eaton
435	Eaton Canyon
436	Eaton
446	Eaton
460	Palisades Fire
466	Eaton



## SUMMARY FOR G01Q15


# Which wildfire?

ID	Response
468	Eaton Fire
473	Palisades
479	Eaton
488	Eaton

## SUMMARY FOR G01Q16

# Have the recent wildfires in Los Angeles improved your willingness to adapt Zone 0 for your home?

Answer	Count	Percentage
Yes (A001)	87	17.06%
No (A002)	236	46.27%
Uncertain (A003)	37	7.25%
No Answer	0	0.00%
Not completed or Not displayed	150	29.41%





MySafe:LA  
1048 Irvine Ave., #440  
Newport Beach, CA 90266  
213.634.0100  
[www.mysafela.org](http://www.mysafela.org)

©2025 The Safe Community Project. All rights reserved. No duplication permitted without the prior express written permission of the Safe Community Project.

PROPERTY OF MYSAFE:LA