

**Maria Morris**

---

**From:** Steven E. Bier [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Monday, March 16, 2026 8:34 PM  
**To:** Lukasz Czerwinski; Maria Morris  
**Cc:** Jerry and Kanya Chrisco; Julian Granada; Brian Berkson; Chris Barajas; Armando Carmona; Guillermo Silva; Veronica Sanchez; [REDACTED]

**Subject:** Re: Final City Council Meeting re. Wakeland's Camino Terrace Proposal 2/19/2026

Dear City Council Members,

I am writing to formally express my strong concerns regarding the proposed Camino Terrace development project. At this time, I respectfully urge the City to either deny approval or place the project on hold until a comprehensive, independent fire zoning and safety assessment has been completed.

Given the increasing severity and frequency of wildfires in our region, it is critical that any new development—especially one situated in or near high-risk areas—be evaluated with the utmost care and objectivity. A standard review process is not sufficient in this case. What is needed is a thorough, independent analysis conducted by qualified fire safety experts who are not affiliated with the project developers. This assessment should specifically address evacuation feasibility, fire behavior modeling, defensible space requirements, and the capacity of existing emergency response infrastructure.

Of particular concern is the issue of safe ingress and egress. The current proposal's reliance on Canyon Terrace raises serious red flags due to its terrain, potential bottlenecks, and vulnerability during emergency situations. In the event of a wildfire or other evacuation scenario, residents must have reliable, accessible escape routes that are not compromised by steep grades, narrow roadways, or congestion risks. For this reason, I strongly request that primary ingress and egress access be established via flat Camino Real instead of Canyon Terrace. This adjustment is not simply a preference—it is a critical safety necessity.

Additionally, I want to clearly state my opposition to any blasting activities associated with this project. Blasting poses risks not only to the immediate environment but also to nearby homes, infrastructure, and the overall stability of the surrounding area. The potential for unintended consequences, including structural damage and increased fire risk, cannot be ignored.

This is not a matter of resisting development outright, but rather ensuring that any development proceeds responsibly, transparently, and with public safety as the top priority. Approving this project without addressing these serious concerns would set a troubling precedent and could place future residents and the broader community at unnecessary risk.

I respectfully ask that the City take the time to fully evaluate these issues and require the developer to meet a higher standard of safety and accountability. Until then, the Camino Terrace project should not move forward.

Thank you for your time, consideration, and commitment to protecting our community.

Sincerely,  
Steven Bier  
Homeowner, Canyon Terrace Community

Steve E. Bier, M.A. Ed.  
Education Specialist, Math & Gov./Econ.  
Head Coach: Cross Country, Swimming  
RUBIDOUX HIGH SCHOOL  
Master Activity Advisor  
CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF DIRECTORS OF ACTIVITIES

---

**From:** Lukasz Czerwinski <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 16, 2026 7:51:35 PM  
**To:** Maria Morris <mmorris@jurupavalley.org>  
**Cc:** Jerry and Kanya Chrisco <[REDACTED]> Julian Granada <[REDACTED]> Brian Berkson <bberkson@jurupavalley.org>; Chris Barajas <cbarajas@jurupavalley.org>; Armando Carmona <acarmona@jurupavalley.org>; Guillermo Silva <gsilva@jurupavalley.org>; Veronica Sanchez <VSanchez@jurupavalley.org>; [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**Subject:** Re: Final City Council Meeting re. Wakeland's Camino Terrace Proposal 2/19/2026

Good afternoon Maria,

Thank you for confirming the receipt of the community's six postulates.

The residents are concerned that the online agenda for this Thursday's meeting omits several critical and objective points of feedback. We would like to understand why the following issues were excluded:

1. ADA and Fire Department Code Violations: while the agenda mentions conditional approval with "ADA compliant curb ramps where applicable," it disregards consistent public testimony that the current site configuration **does NOT** allow for full ADA compliance. Specifically, federal law requires separate streets for ADA ingress and egress; the current proposal lacks a secondary means of egress. This has come up 3 times and you guys continue to look the other way. Why has this not been included as a disqualifying factor? You worry about power generators but are not concerned about disabled veterans who will be neighbours of ours and residents of Camino Terrace Apartments? Lack of ADA compliant secondary means of egress leads to the second point:

2. Alternative Site Access: several residents suggested utilizing the flatter terrain on Camino Real for property entry and exit. Why has this not been incorporated into the conditions for approval or addressed by the City Council?

3. The community has identified 14 code violations related to the current configuration. Several of these appear to reflect inconsistent standards and questionable approval decisions that clearly violate Riverside County Fire Department guidelines (OFM-01A). The Assistant Fire Marshall also signed off on ingress and egress on a 16% slope - not only is this a violation of every federal and state highway safety manual, but a clear double standard when it comes to fire evacuation approvals - the Fire Marshall refused to sign off on ingress and egress being on the same street in relation to two local developments which were on flat land and low-density: Countryside Estates and Richmond American Homes. Given these concerns, why has the city not issued a conditional approval contingent upon the Fire Marshal's re-evaluation and approval of the existing layout?

4. Fire Hazard Severity Zone (FHSZ) Re-evaluation: Mayor Pro Tem Chris Barajas noted on the record during final public hearing dated 2/19/2026 that the local topography, wind patterns, and vegetation have not changed in over 40 years, making the recent FHSZ downgrade questionable. He stated this still was a high fire hazard area. Why is a re-evaluation of this zoning not a requirement for conditional approval?

The community is deeply concerned by the recurring omission of these substantive issues by the City Council and legal counsel over the last three meetings. We urge the Council to incorporate these postulates into the formal conditions of approval.

Best regards,

Lukasz Czerwinski