


## Sabha, Tamer

---

**From:** John Favvre  
**Sent:** Monday, June 16, 2025 7:39 AM  
**To:** Sabha, Tamer  
**Cc:** James Macpherson ; Jacqueline English; Rick Cole; Augustin, Chad; Márquez, Miguel  
**Subject:** Fire zones

[] CAUTION: This email was delivered from the Internet. Do not click links or open attachments unless you know the content is safe. Report phish using the Phish Alert Button. For more information about the Phish Alert Button view article "KB0011474" on the DoIT portal.

-----

To the Public Safety Committee for today's meeting

Greetings:

Please consider further study before adopting the Cal Fire Zones.

We have no access to the actual calculations for the West Bank of the Arroyo. It has been moderate; without explanation Cal Fire puts it up to Very High Danger. We should know if this was done correctly. The PWP plan shows the area not in the Fire danger zone on p.22 of its recent plan. First Street, relied on by realtors, shows it on real estate listings as moderate, a 1 to 3% chance of fire over the next thirty years. Pasadena has added better brush control and campsite removal. Power lines in the mountains are going down. Our own power lines are becoming safer. Winds blow from east to west, reducing the effect of possible hillside fires on the west side of the Arroyo.

And the draconian and overly generalized landscaping proposed remedies are less helpful than individualized house programs. Bare earth around brick walls is unnecessary. The costs of Cal Fire controls would be better spent on reducing the risk of fires in the thousands of palms and eucalyptus in the City's canopy. And on individually tailored safety programs for each house. Note that if there is a 3% chance of a conflagration fire destruction, house hardening is unlikely to help very much. Note too that the purported basis for Cal Fire's house hardening is unavoidably speculative reactions to structure survival rates after conflagrations, while it is nearly impossible to determine how much house hardening mattered, when destruction patterns seemed to be entirely wind driven, there was no way to determine the percentage of "survival" for "hardened" versus normal houses, and fire department service may well have saved many structures. Enforcement would be difficult and expensive.

Note, too, that no public hearing has allowed residents to hear from and discuss with the Fire Department or PWP or the Planning Department their analysis and possible alternatives. Why not try that and then decide on a plan?

Regards,

John Favvre