
To	CFPD Board and Calfire staff already involved in email chain: Patrick Griffin, Gary Burke, John Riddell, Austin Seely Patrick.Griffin@fire.ca.gov ; gburke@coastsidefire.org ; John.Riddell@fire.ca.gov ; Austin.Seely@fire.ca.gov ;
Cc	Schaller, Planning Commissioners, Monowitz, O'Neill, Mueller, Gina, who else? Slater-Carter and Jim Harvey, MWSD, more?
Bcc	
Subject	Request for Immediate CFPD Analysis of Midcoast Fire Concerns

The fire that destroyed 1452 Alamo, Montara on 9/29/23 punctuates concerns the MCC raised in prior years about fire hydrant testing and pressure, and others most recently described in some detail in its report and [comments on the proposed Cypress Point](#) 'affordable housing' project in Moss Beach. The one sentence reply provided on 9/13/23 by Patrick Griffin is not sufficient evidence that CFPD has thoroughly analyzed the fire risks posed in Montara/Moss Beach, both those extant and those which may be exacerbated by this dense development project.

Accordingly, this email describes the concerns from both the recent fire damage, and the prospective complications and risks posed by that development, and requests a written response on these matters before Planning makes a decision on the Cypress Point project. We believe the deadline for those comments to Mike Schaller is Dec., 2023.

Recent Problems

As witnessed by Board Members of MWSD, the response to the fire at 1452 Alamo took 20 minutes to respond and another 10 minutes to get water on the fire. That fire is 1.2 air miles and 1.8 miles by road from the Stetson station in Moss Beach. There appeared to be difficulty locating the local hydrant, and using it. The house was lost. What after-action assessment has CFPD produced and what are its recommendations?

Risks Posed by Cypress Point Project

In the [MCC's comments on Cypress Point DEIR](#) (SCH# 2022120189) ("the Project"),

we raised the following concerns about fire-related risks. The delays in responding to the 1452 Alamo Fire heightened our concerns for not only the subject Project and its neighbors, but also for the ability of CFPD to respond elsewhere in the Midcoast. The concerns we raised in that report are contained in Section 3.12, pp 62-72. There are 19 fire-related questions in that section which we are requesting CFPD to formally comment on, both to the MCC and to the County. Some highlights of those concerns are:

Evacuation: in the event of a fire at that Project, or nearby which threatens that project, what proof exists that evacuation can occur, esp. given only one entrance/exit to the project site? With the proposed one-way traffic on Carlos St., the addition of 250-350 new residents in the project, and the torturous, winding access through back streets to the Project's emergency entrance, is CFPD confident that response times both in Moss Beach and elsewhere in the Midcoast will remain adequate? *[Note that at the MidPen Moonridge development, 250 cars routinely park on the access road thereto, but the roads near this Project are as narrow as 13'.]* What changes would CFPD propose to the Project to alleviate evacuation concerns?

Communications: is CFPD supportive of a community fiber network in the area to improve communications proven inadequate both by the 1452 Alamo Fire and the MCC's report on Telecommunications? Has CFPD raised resolving this communications inadequacy as a condition of prior approval for the Project? Are sirens in the area needed?

Fire-fighting Water: MWSD has had only 400kgal of FFWS for a decade, in spite of continued housing growth in the area. What are the pressure/flow/duration requirements for fire fighting water for the Project? Does MWSD have the necessary water at elevation to meet those needs in the likely event of loss of power? Has CFPD placed a requirement on the Project for additional FFWS or related infrastructure? Has CFPD commented on the ability of the Project's on-site water tanks to serve the purposes described in the DEIR?

Fire Hydrant Viability: When the MCC last researched this topic, less than 1% of MWSD and/or CCWD hydrants were tested annually, in spite of a rolling 10-year requirement. 39% of the hydrants in Moss Beach were routinely below MWSD standard, and the 2 lowest were/are adjacent to the Project. Has more recent testing been conducted on Moss Beach hydrants, and what are the implications for fire-fighting in the Project, or the vicinity of Moss Beach in the event a fire spreads from the complex? Will the CFPD require new or improved hydrants proximate to the Project? What pressure will be required for what duration for hydrants identified as relevant to Moss Beach fire suppression?

Emergency Access: With the proposed one-way traffic on Carlos St., the addition of 250-350 new residents in the project, and the torturous, winding access through back streets to the Project's emergency entrance, is CFPD confident that response times both in Moss Beach and elsewhere in the Midcoast will remain adequate? *[Note that*

at the MidPen Moonridge development, 250 cars routinely park on the access road thereto, but the roads near this Project are as narrow as 13'.] Is CFPD confident that the back roads in Moss Beach can support emergency response vehicles' size and weight? What conditions of approval would CFPD request to ensure Project access is adequate? Does CFPD support the creation of a more direct access to the Project from Sierra St.? Does CFPD require signals at any intersections in Moss Beach on Hwy 1 to ensure timely emergency responder access? Given the proven difficulty of accessing the Stetson fire house via the sharp, steep turn at Stetson and California, how does the CFPD plan to route emergency vehicles to respond? [photos of these concerns and alternatives are in the MCC report cited above]

Fire-Fighting Capacity: Given that Hwy 1 can be cut by earthquake, storm surges, and/or falling eucalyptus at Surfer's Beach, Frenchman's Creek, Medio Creek and the Lantos Tunnel, is the capacity of the Stetson station sufficient ALONE to handle fires in the larger, more dense buildings proposed in the Project?

We hope these questions and issues are not new to CFPD, but for the avoidance of doubt and risks, we are writing to request a formal response from CFPD on these matters. Further, we invite CFPD to present and discuss their findings at a public meeting of the MCC or elsewhere on the Midcoast.

We would like an immediate acknowledgement of this email, including identification of the person responsible for a reply and an expected response deadline. Given the severity of these concerns and the County's in-process review of the Project, we view this matter as urgent.

Thanks in advance for your cooperation,

Gregg Dieguez, individually or by the MCC, depending on discussion.
