

**Maria Morris**

---

**From:** Lukasz Czerwinski <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 19, 2026 1:09 AM  
**To:** Maria Morris; Brian Berkson; Chris Barajas; Armando Carmona; Guillermo Silva; Veronica Sanchez  
**Cc:** Jerry and Kanya Chrisco; Julian Granada; [REDACTED]

**Subject:** Immediate Request to Address Public Safety Concerns and Agenda Omissions – March 19 Council Meeting  
**Attachments:** 6-23-2025 Cal Fire - City - Wakeland - Fire Code Corrections Required.pdf; 14 Public Safety Code Violations - Wakeland's Camino Terrace Proposal (1).xlsx

Good evening Maria, Mayor Berkson, Mayor Pro Tem Chris Barajas, and Councilmembers,

Please enter this correspondence into the public record.

The March 19, 2026 agenda and staff report for the Camino Terrace Apartments vote remain unchanged. The community has received no responses to the six postulates submitted on March 11, 2026:

1. Potential litigation by Wakeland and the State (HCD)
2. Estimated cost of litigation
3. Omission of key public comments
4. Scope of the City's legal authority + community's demand for second legal opinion
5. Wakeland's declined opportunity for rebuttal
6. Fire Hazard Severity Zone (FHSZ) reclassification concerns

In addition, the agenda remains incomplete and fails to address four critical issues ahead of the final vote:

1. ADA and Fire Department code violations, including the lack of an ADA-compliant secondary means of egress.
2. Feasible alternative site access via Camino Real, as proposed by residents.
3. Fourteen identified code violations, with no conditional approval tied to Fire Marshal revaluation and re-approval of the current layout.
4. FHSZ re-evaluation concerns, including those raised in closing comments by Mayor Pro Tem Barajas

The community demands a clear explanation as to why none of these postulates or concerns have been incorporated into the project's conditions of approval or listed for Council consideration. These are not discretionary issues - they are objective, unresolved public safety risks.

Further, the attached County of Riverside Fire Department's June 23, 2025 letter (Gonzalez, English, Wakeland) explicitly outlines fire access and infrastructure requirements, including:

- **approach width**
- **turning radius**
- **deployment areas**
- **maximum 16% grade concerns re. fire truck access**
- **2.5% cross-slope limits**
- **need for adequate turnaround**
- **secondary access (current ingress/egress onto the same street is insufficient).**

These deficiencies remain present in Wakeland's December 2025 site-map submission. The developer refused rebuttal during the 2/19/2026 public hearing and clearly failed to mitigate these public safety concerns. To date, the community has not received a response to our letter to Rebecca Louie, Wakeland's CEO dated March 10th 2026.

Mayor Berkson, the community is extremely disappointed with the final deliberation and exchange between you and Mr. Peter Thorson on 2/19/2026 - these issues had been consistently brought up by the public speakers in past several City Council Meetings, and were raised again during the February 19, 2026 public comments session. We even sent you a table format summary presenting 14 factual, objective public safety and code violations.

Despite all this, and the Fire Marshal-aligned safety concerns (see attached correspondence), these public safety concerns were not addressed in the City Attorney's closing statement, which focused instead on costs of potential litigation exposure rather than the City's obligation to protect public safety. What is even more troubling is the fact that these objective public safety concerns are yet again excluded from tomorrow's City Council agenda and staff report.

The continued exclusion of these documented, objective safety issues from the City's deliberations is unacceptable.

We urge you to immediately amend the agenda and staff report to include these matters prior to the March 19, 2026, 7:00 p.m. City Council meeting.

Sincerely,  
Lukasz Czerwinski



# CAL FIRE – RIVERSIDE UNIT RIVERSIDE COUNTY FIRE DEPARTMENT

**BILL WEISER - Fire Chief**

Office of the County Fire Marshal  
4080 Lemon Street, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor Riverside, CA 92501  
(951) 955-4777 [www.rvcfire.org](http://www.rvcfire.org)

PROUDLY SERVING THE  
UNINCORPORATED AREAS  
OF RIVERSIDE COUNTY  
AND THE CITIES OF:

- Banning
- Beaumont
- Coachella
- Desert Hot Springs
- Eastvale
- Indian Wells
- Indio
- Jurupa Valley
- Lake Elsinore
- La Quinta
- Menifee
- Moreno Valley
- Norco
- Palm Desert
- Perris
- Rancho Mirage
- Rubidoux CSD
- San Jacinto
- Temecula
- Wildomar

**BOARD OF SUPERVISORS:**

- Jose Medina  
District 1
- Karen Spiegel  
District 2
- Chuck Washington  
District 3
- V. Manuel Perez  
District 4
- Dr. Yxstian Gutierrez  
District 5

## Planning Case Conditions

**Date:** June 23, 2025

**City Case Number:** MA24164  
**Planner:** Rob Gonzalez, Principal Planner

**Fire Permit Number:** FPDPR2400082  
**Reviewed By:** Tim English, Supervising Fire Marshal

**Project Name:** Wakeland Housing  
**Project Location:** 6000 Camino Real Jurupa Valley

**Project Description:** Redevelop an approximately 15.53-acre vacant site with a new 80-unit supportive housing development, accessory residential supportive services, a daycare facility, surface parking and landscape improvements.

It is the responsibility of the recipient of these Fire Department conditions to forward them to all interested parties. The permit number (**as it is noted above**) is required on all correspondence.

Additional information is available at our website: [www.rvcfire.org](http://www.rvcfire.org)

With respect to the planning conditions for the referenced project, the fire department requires the following fire protection measures be provided in accordance with Riverside County Ordinances, the current edition of California Fire Code (CFC) as adopted and amended by the County of Riverside and/or recognized fire protection standards.

1. **Fire Protection Water Supplies/Fire Flow** - Minimum fire flow for the construction of all buildings is required per CFC Appendix B. Prior to building permit issuance for new construction, the applicant shall provide documentation to show there exists a water system capable of delivering the required fire flow. Specific design features may increase or decrease the required fire flow.
  - a. Will Serve Letters from the responsible water purveyor are required prior to a map recordation.

2. **Fire Protection Water Supplies/Hydrants** - The minimum number of fire hydrants required, as well as the location and spacing of fire hydrants, shall comply with CFC Appendix C and NFPA 24. Fire hydrants shall be located no more than 400 feet from all portions of the exterior of the building along an approved route on a fire apparatus access road, unless otherwise approved by the fire department. In areas where new water mains are extended along streets and hydrants are not needed for protection of structures, standard fire hydrants shall be provided at spacing not to exceed 1,000 feet along streets for transportation hazards. Fire hydrants shall be at least 40 feet from the building it is serving. A fire hydrant shall be located within 20 to 100 feet of the fire department connection for buildings protected with a fire sprinkler system. The size and number of outlets required for the approved fire hydrants are 4" x 2 ½" x 2 ½" (super hydrant). Reference CFC as amended and NFPA 24.
  
3. **Fire Department Access** - Fire apparatus access roads shall be provided within 150 feet of all exterior portions of buildings, unless otherwise approved by the fire department. Fire apparatus access roads shall have an unobstructed width of no less than 24 feet. Dead-end fire apparatus access roads exceeding 150 feet in length shall provide an approved turn around. The minimum required turning radius of a fire apparatus access road is 38 feet outside radius and 14 feet inside radius. (For developments within the SRA and within the LRA VHFHSZ, the minimum required turning radius of a fire apparatus access road is 74 feet outside radius and 50 feet inside radius. See California Code of Regulations Title 14 Section 1273.04.) The construction of the fire apparatus access roads shall be all weather and capable of sustaining 75,000 lbs. Unless otherwise approved, the grade of a fire apparatus access road shall not exceed 16 percent, and the cross slope shall not exceed 2.5 percent. The angles of approach and departure for fire apparatus access roads shall be a maximum of 6 percent grade change for 25 feet of approach/departure. Reference CFC as amended and Riverside County Fire Department Policies and Standards.
  - a. Fire Lane Marking: Identification and marking of fire lanes, including curb details and signage, shall comply with all Riverside County Fire Department Standards.
  
4. **Fire Department Access Turn Around** – On-parcel dead-end fire apparatus access roads exceeding 150 feet in length shall provide a bulb turnaround at the terminus measuring a minimum of 38 feet outside radius and 14 feet inside radius. (For development within the SRA and within the LRA VHFHSZ, the bulb turnaround at the terminus shall be 40 feet outside radius and 16 feet inside radius). Parallel parking around the perimeter of the bulb is acceptable provided the bulb outside turning radius is increased by 8 feet. In-lieu of a bulb, a hammer-head type turnaround is acceptable where the top of the "T" dimension is 120 feet with the stem in the center. Additional turnaround designs may be acceptable as approved by the Fire Department. Reference CFC as amended and Riverside County Fire Department Policies and Standards.

5. **Secondary Access** – Unless otherwise approved by the Fire Department, dead end fire apparatus access roads shall not exceed (660 feet for Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone and High Fire Hazard Severity Zone areas. 800 feet for Moderate Fire Hazard Severity Zone.) 1,320 feet. Secondary egress/access fire apparatus access roads shall provide independent egress/access from/to the area or as otherwise approved by the Fire Department. Secondary egress/access fire apparatus access roads shall be as remote as possible from the primary fire apparatus access road to reduce the possibility that both routes will be obstructed by a single emergency. Additional fire apparatus access roads based on the potential for impairment by vehicle congestion, condition of terrain, climatic conditions, anticipated magnitude of a potential incident, or other factors that could limit access may be required by the Fire Department. Reference CFC as amended and Riverside County Fire Department Policies and Standards.
6. **Fire Department Building Construction Plan Review** - Submittal of construction plans to the Fire Department will be required. Final fire and life safety conditions will be addressed when the Fire Department reviews the plans. These conditions will be based on California Fire Code, California Building Code (CBC), and related codes/standards adopted at the time of construction plan submittal. Reference CFC as amended.
7. **Fire Sprinkler System** - All new commercial buildings and structures 3,600 square feet or larger will be required to install a fire sprinkler system. Reference CFC as amended.
8. **Fire Alarm and Detection System** - A water flow monitoring system and/or fire alarm system may be required as determined at time of building construction plan review. Reference CFC as amended.
9. **Hazardous Vegetation and Fuel Management Plan** - Projects in the Local Responsibility Area, Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, and the State Responsibility Area Very High, High, and Moderate Fire Hazard Severity Zones shall provide a Hazardous Vegetation and Fuel Management Plan to be reviewed and approved by the Fire Department. (A preliminary plan shall be provided to and approved by the Fire Department prior to any new parcel map recordation. A final plan shall be provided prior to grading permit clearances.) Reference CFC as amended.

10. **Materials and Construction Methods for Exterior Wildfire Exposure** - Projects in the Local Responsibility Area, Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone, and the State Responsibility Area Very High, High, and Moderate Fire Hazard Severity Zones shall comply with Chapter 7A of the California Building Code and California Code of Regulations, Title 14 Fire Safety Regulations. Reference CFC as amended.
  
11. **Traffic Calming Devices** - Requests for installation of traffic calming designs/devices on fire apparatus access roads shall be submitted and approved by the Fire Code Official. Reference CFC as amended.
  
12. **Gate Access** - All electronically operated gates shall be provided with Knox key switches and automatic sensors for access. These gates shall be provided with access to gate equipment or another method to open the gate if there is a power failure. (Manual gates shall not be locked unless a Knox padlock or Knox Box containing the key to the lock is installed in an approved location on the approach side of the gate). A pedestrian gate, if used to provide access, shall be a minimum 3 feet wide and provided with a Knox Box/Padlock if locked. Reference CFC as amended.
  
13. **Water Plans** - If fire hydrants are required to be installed, applicant/developer shall furnish the water system fire hydrant plans to the Fire Department for review and approval prior to building permit issuance. Plans shall be signed by a registered civil engineer, and shall confirm hydrant type, location, spacing, and minimum fire flow. Once plans are signed and approved by the local water authority, the originals shall be presented to the Fire Department for review and approval. Reference CFC as amended.

These conditions are preliminary, and further review will occur upon receipt of construction plans. Additional requirements may be required based upon the adopted codes at the time of submittal.

Tim English  
Supervising Fire Marshal / Office of the County Fire Marshal  
Riverside County Fire Department  
951-955-4777  
Tim.English@fire.ca.gov

Violation Count	Project Condition	Governing Standard / Regulation
1	No ADA-compliant secondary evacuation route	Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), 42 U.S.C. §12101; 28 C.F.R. Parts 35 & 36
2	Excessively long accessible evacuation path	ADA Standards for Accessible Design §§403–405
3	Disproportionate evacuation distances for wheelchair users	Rehabilitation Act §504; Fair Housing Act (FHA) 42 U.S.C. §§3601–3619; Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), 42 U.S.C. §12101
4	Excessive slopes on evacuation routes	ADA Standards for Accessible Design §§403–405
5	Evacuation route directed toward traffic corridor	Fair Housing Act accessibility requirements – 24 C.F.R. §100.205
6	Secondary evacuation via steep roadway grades	ADA Standards; FHA accessibility principles
7	Steep intersection grades	California Highway Design Manual (HDM)
8	Intersection approach slope exceeds national standards	AASHTO – A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets
9	Fire apparatus road bottlenecks	Riverside County Fire Department – Fire Department Access Requirements for Commercial & Residential Development, Guideline OFM-01A (Paragraph 2)
10	Improper building setbacks	Riverside County Fire Department – OFM-01A (Paragraph 4A)
11	Missing fire truck deployment areas	Riverside County Fire Department – OFM-01A (Paragraph 4C)
12	Parking / obstruction risk on narrow roads	Riverside County Fire Department – OFM-01A (Paragraph 6)
13	Excessive grade at fire apparatus entry	Riverside County Fire Department – OFM-01A (Paragraph 8)
14	Excessive fire access road slope	Riverside County Fire Department – OFM-01A (Paragraph 9)

Required Standard	Observed / Proposed Condition
Accessible evacuation routes must provide equal safe egress for disabled occupants	Only one accessible evacuation path is available within the site plan
Accessible routes should provide reasonable and equivalent access	Accessible path requires zig-zag travel approximately 6× longer than the direct pedestrian route
Housing receiving federal support must provide nondiscriminatory access	Buildings 5–8 require wheelchair users to travel approximately 10–12× farther during evacuation
Maximum running slope 5%; ramp slope 8.33%	Evacuation alternatives may require slopes approaching 16%
Accessible routes must be safe and usable	Evacuation may force residents toward steep downhill grade leading to Camino Real corridor
Accessible evacuation routes should maintain ADA grade limits	Canyon Terrace Drive ~16% uphill followed by Helmcrest Drive ~14% downhill without ADA infrastructure
Typical intersection grades for local access roads approximately 8–9%	Two T-intersections proposed on slopes approaching 16%
Recommended approach grades 2–3%; absolute constrained maximum 6%	Intersection approach located on slopes approaching 16%
Minimum 24-ft unobstructed fire apparatus access road width	Roadway bottlenecks appear to reduce width below requirement
10–30 ft safety buffer between structures and apparatus roads	Site configuration appears inconsistent with required buffer
Deployment areas typically required on two sides of buildings with 34-ft roadway width	Approved site plan appears to omit required deployment areas
Parking prohibited on roads narrower than 32 ft	Narrow road segments may allow parking or obstructions
Maximum 6% grade change within first 25 ft of apparatus entry	Approach toward Supportive Services Building appears steeper
Maximum fire apparatus access road grade 14%	Access routes toward Buildings 5 and 6 appear to exceed 14%

Degree of Deviation	Regulatory Risk
Secondary accessible evacuation route absent	Potential ADA accessibility violation
Substantial increase in evacuation travel distance	Disparate evacuation burden for disabled residents
Major disparity in emergency access	Potential disability discrimination liability
Approximately twice the maximum allowable ramp slope	Wheelchair evacuation may be impossible
Increased hazard exposure	Safety and accessibility compliance concerns
Grades far exceed ADA standards	Mobility-impaired residents may be unable to evacuate
Nearly double recommended grade	Unsafe vehicle operation
More than double the maximum limit	Increased crash risk
Below required fire access width	Fire engines may not reach buildings
Reduced safety setback	Limits fire apparatus positioning
Deployment requirements not satisfied	Reduced firefighting capability
Potential blockage of fire access routes	Delayed emergency response
Exceeds permitted approach grade	Fire apparatus maneuvering difficulty
Beyond allowable slope	Fire engines may be unable to access structures

## Maria Morris

---

**From:** Lukasz Czerwinski <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, March 18, 2026 11:45 PM  
**To:** Vanessa Garcia; Maria Morris  
**Cc:** Jerry and Kanya Chrisco; Brian Berkson; Chris Barajas; Armando Carmona; Guillermo Silva; Veronica Sanchez; [REDACTED]

**Subject:** Re: RVC FHSZ  
**Attachments:** 3-11-2026 Letter from Staff Chief of the State Fire Marshal.pdf

Good evening Maria,

Please include this correspondence in the public record. I would like to provide several corrections and clarifications to my email from yesterday.

### **1. Reinstatement of High/Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (FHSZ)**

The community respectfully urges the City of Jurupa Valley to exercise the authority explicitly granted by the State to amend the current Fire Hazard Severity Zone designations as supported by the attached correspondence from Ms. Emily Smith, Staff Chief of the State Fire Marshal. The amendment needs to align with historical fire hazard severity maps based on factual topography, vegetation, fuel sources, emergency access concerns, Santa Ana and Ocean wind tunnels, ember driven fire spread, and history of fires. Furthermore, Wakeland's proposal must comply with all Wildland-Urban Interface (WUI) construction standards applicable to a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ).

### **2. Compliance with State-Mandated Procedures**

I would like to correct my prior statement: the City of Jurupa Valley did post notice on its website indicating that Fire Hazard Severity Zones had been updated and provided an online public comment form. However, residents remain concerned and disappointed that this information was not effectively communicated through other channels.

Throughout 2025 and 2026, residents repeatedly raised concerns regarding FHSZ classifications and fire-related public safety issues during both in-person Planning Commission and City Council meetings. At no point were residents informed by City officials about the ability to amend these maps, the availability of public comment opportunities and deadlines, the implications of AB 211, or the City's authority to upgrade FHSZ classifications. The City's discretionary FHSZ upgrade authority was only clarified to the community in correspondence from the State Fire Marshal's Office dated March 11th 2026.

This lack of communication - whether due to oversight, miscommunication, or other factors - resulted in the community being unaware of its ability to participate meaningfully in the FHSZ update process.

### **3. Correction Regarding Wakeland's Application**

I would also like to clarify that Wakeland's application was originally filed on June 18, 2024, when the property was still classified under a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone (VHFHSZ), as reflected in the Fire Protection Plan for parcels APN No's. 185-460-001, 185-470-001, and 185-470-002 dated March 17, 2022.

Accordingly, Wakeland's application should continue to be evaluated under the VHFHSZ classification and must comply with all applicable laws and fire safety codes. If it does not meet these requirements, which residents believe it doesn't, the application should be rejected, the zoning designation restored to its historical VHFHSZ classification, and any future application resubmitted in compliance with those standards.

Sincerely,  
Lukasz Czerwinski

On Tue, Mar 17, 2026 at 11:23 PM Lukasz Czerwinski <[REDACTED]> wrote:  
Good evening Maria,

Please make sure this goes on a public record. Thank you kindly.

### **Dear Mayor Berkson and Members of the City Council,**

In light of recent correspondence from the California Natural Resources Agency - an office of Governor Gavin Newsom - confirming that the City of Jurupa Valley has full legal authority to amend the Fire Hazard Severity Zoning for parcels 185-470-001, 185-470-002, and 185-460-001, I am updating the community's position as follows:

#### **1. Reinstate the Fire Hazard Severity Zone**

The Fire Hazard Severity Zone was improperly downgraded by two levels - from "High" to "Zero." It must be reinstated based on well-established risk factors: documented fire history, terrain and topography, Santa Ana wind conditions (which can reach hurricane level 3-force intensity), vegetation, and available fuel sources.

The City can and should apply a consistency standard with surrounding communities - such as Lakeside Drive, Ridgeline Drive, Sundance Drive, and Pebblewood Court - which remain designated as High Fire Hazard Severity Zones under the 2025 statewide update. These zones prohibit high-density development for a fundamental reason: public safety and the protection of human life.

#### **2. Failure to Follow State-Mandated Procedures**

Per the California State Fire Marshal, local jurisdictions were required to follow specific procedures for the 2025 Fire Hazard Severity Zone updates, including:

- Mandatory public hearings within 120 days of the March 24, 2025 release

- Direct notification to affected property owners regarding classification changes

The City of Jurupa Valley and the Riverside County Fire Department failed to meet these legal requirements. As a result, the community urges you to exercise the authority explicitly granted by the State, including guidance from Ms. Emily Smith, Staff Chief of CAL FIRE's Office of the State Fire Marshal.

Because of this complete and utter failure, the applicant, Wakeland Housing and Development Corporation, was able to downsize and amend its proposal and advance it as a viable project under flawed conditions.

Mayor Berkson, under your leadership, the City did not fulfill its legal obligations as mandated by the State Fire Marshal. More critically, this lapse created an opening for a development proposal that would not have otherwise advanced under proper fire hazard severity zoning and safety standards.

You now have the opportunity - and the responsibility as public official - to correct this course and uphold your duty to protect and serve the community.

Thank you,  
Lukasz Czerwinski

On Tue, Mar 17, 2026 at 9:43 AM Vanessa Garcia [REDACTED] wrote:

Dear Mayor Berkson and City Council Members,

I am writing in opposition to the Camino Terrace project and in full support of my community.

For over a year, residents—not the City—have carried the burden of investigating and exposing the serious fire safety risks tied to this land and proposed development. We have done the work that should have been completed from the outset. We have invested our own time, energy, and resources to research, document, and present clear evidence of these dangers. That responsibility was yours—and it has not been met.

The risks are not minor, speculative, or exaggerated. They are severe and undeniable: powerful Santa Ana winds, steep and volatile terrain, rapid ember-driven fire spread, and dangerously limited evacuation routes. These conditions create a high-risk environment where lives—not just property—are at stake.

Yet despite being presented with this information, the City appears more concerned with the potential consequences of denying this project than with the very real threat to public safety. Let's be clear: choosing to move forward under these conditions is not just negligent—it is reckless.

It is also increasingly apparent that concern over potential legal action from the developer may be influencing the City's decision-making. If so, it represents a failure of leadership. The safety of residents is not negotiable and must never be outweighed by legal or financial pressure. We trust the City recognizes that our community stands ready to protect itself and ensure accountability.

CAL FIRE has made it clear that current hazard mapping relies on generalized modeling and does not fully capture the severity of conditions in this area. They have also confirmed that the City has both the authority and the responsibility to assign a higher fire risk classification. The question is whether you will act.

We strongly urge you to exercise that authority and place this project on hold until a thorough wildfire risk assessment and appropriate reclassification are completed to adequately address public safety concerns.

Continuing to advance this project as if these issues do not exist is unacceptable. This area should be classified as a high fire severity zone and is fundamentally incompatible with a development of this scale.

Protect the community you were elected to serve.

Sincerely,

Vanessa Garcia

On Mar 17, 2026, at 8:26 AM, Lukasz Czerwinski <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Good morning Maria,

Thank you so much, have a great day as well!

Lukasz

On Tue, Mar 17, 2026 at 8:21 AM Maria Morris <[mmorris@jurupavalley.org](mailto:mmorris@jurupavalley.org)> wrote:

Good morning,

Thank you for your correspondence. It will be distributed and made part of the record.

Have a great day!!

<image001.png>

**Maria Morris, CMC | City Clerk**

**CITY OF JURUPA VALLEY** T: 951.332.6464 ext. 172  
8930 Limonite Avenue, Jurupa Valley, CA 92509

[mmorris@jurupavalley.org](mailto:mmorris@jurupavalley.org) | [jurupavalley.org](http://jurupavalley.org)

**Connect with us on social media:**

[Facebook](#) | [Instagram](#) | [X](#)

---

**From:** Jerry and Kanya Chrisco <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Monday, March 16, 2026 7:55 PM  
**To:** Lukasz Czerwinski <[czerwinski.lp@gmail.com](mailto:czerwinski.lp@gmail.com)>; Maria Morris <[mmorris@jurupavalley.org](mailto:mmorris@jurupavalley.org)>; Brian Berkson <[bberkson@jurupavalley.org](mailto:bberkson@jurupavalley.org)>; Chris Barajas <[cbarajas@jurupavalley.org](mailto:cbarajas@jurupavalley.org)>; Armando Carmona <[acarmona@jurupavalley.org](mailto:acarmona@jurupavalley.org)>; Guillermo Silva <[gsilva@jurupavalley.org](mailto:gsilva@jurupavalley.org)>; Veronica Sanchez <[vsanchez@jurupavalley.org](mailto:vsanchez@jurupavalley.org)>; [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

**Subject:** Re: RVC FHSZ

Hi Maria,

Will you please confirm the receipt of the emails below and attached letter from the Office of the State Fire Marshal?

Best,

Kanya

On Mon, Mar 16, 2026 at 7:44 PM Jerry and Kanya Chrisco [REDACTED] wrote:

Dear Mayor Berkson and Jurupa Valley City Council,

Again, thank you for everything you do for Jurupa Valley. Below and attached are responses from the Office of the State Fire Marshal that address key questions and issues I shared with you in my [email dated March 12, 2026](#). In the attached letter, page 2 includes the following statement regarding the reduced Fire Hazard Severity Zone (FHSZ) classification of our area, including the proposed site of the Camino Terrace project:

“While there are open areas with natural fuels they are limited in extent, and in this particular case do not meet that model size limit (50 acres). The City of Jurupa Valley could amend their ordinance to include this area as FHSZ under their authority in Government Code statute.”

Please also refer to my March 12 email in which I cited an email from Assistant Fire Marshal Kylie Tillema, who indicated that the wildfire safety construction standards applied to the Camino Terrace project may change due to the property no longer being classified within an FHSZ.

In addition, during my telephone conversation on March 12, 2026, with Frank Bigelow, Deputy Director – Community Wildfire Preparedness and Mitigation with the Office of the State Fire Marshal, he confirmed that the construction standards applied to the Camino Terrace project would not reflect wildfire-specific safety requirements because the property is no longer classified as being within an FHSZ. As a result, the development may not be constructed to meet Wildland-Urban Interface (WUI) standards that are more appropriate for the area’s environmental characteristics.

This situation raises an ongoing public safety concern. If the project proceeds without WUI-aligned wildfire safety construction standards, the community – including the new residents at Camino Terrace, our community, Indian Hills, and homes off Lakeside – will face long-term wildfire hazards and risks that could otherwise be mitigated through appropriate FHSZ classification prior to project approval and construction. It must be underscored that once this project is approved by the City, the construction standards applied will automatically be those for areas not in an FHSZ; this approval will give the green light for construction of buildings at Camino Terrace with deficiencies for a Very High or High Severity hazard zone, which, if constructed in such a manner, will create a perpetual increased wildfire risk.

Therefore, I respectfully ask the City to follow up on Mayor Pro Tem Chris Barajas’ comments during the last public hearing. As he stated, the mountains, topography, winds, and fuel sources that contribute to wildfire risk still exist despite the recent CAL FIRE map change.

Based on the information provided in the attached letter from CAL FIRE, the City has the authority to conduct its own risk assessment and potentially amend its ordinance to designate this area as an FHSZ and restore its historic classification to Very High Severity. I respectfully request that the City consider exercising that authority and place the Camino

Terrace project on hold while a thorough wildfire risk evaluation and potential reclassification is completed in order to address these public safety concerns.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Kanya Chrisco



[Jurupa Valley, CA 92509](#)



----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Bigelow, Frank@CALFIRE** <[Frank.Bigelow@fire.ca.gov](mailto:Frank.Bigelow@fire.ca.gov)>

Date: Mon, Mar 16, 2026 at 4:41 PM

Subject: RVC FHSZ

To: [thechriscos@gmail.com](mailto:thechriscos@gmail.com) <[thechriscos@gmail.com](mailto:thechriscos@gmail.com)>

Kanya,

Thank you for reaching out with your questions. I'm glad we had a chance to connect last week. After reviewing your emails, our FHSZ team has provided a response, which I have attached. Please reach out if you have further questions.

<image002.png>

**Frank Bigelow**

Deputy Director - Community Wildfire

Preparedness and Mitigation

Office of the State Fire Marshal

[855 M St., Fresno, CA 93721](#)

(559) 259-5591 Cell

[<image003.png>](#)

<image004.png>

<image005.png>

<image006.png>

For wildfire preparedness and prevention tips, visit:

[ReadyForWildfire.org](https://www.readyforwildfire.org).

**DEPARTMENT OF FORESTRY AND FIRE PROTECTION****OFFICE OF THE STATE FIRE MARSHAL**

P.O. Box 944246  
SACRAMENTO, CA 94244-2460  
(916) 568-3800  
Website: [www.fire.ca.gov](http://www.fire.ca.gov)



March 11, 2026

Kanya Chrisco  
7480 Mountain Shadow Drive  
Jurupa Valley, Ca 92509

Dear Kanya Chrisco,

Thank you for reaching out about your concerns about the Local Responsibility Area (LRA) Fire Hazard Severity Zone (FHSZ) maps and the planning of Camino Terrace.

As discussed in your email, the concerns of wind factors, Fire History and Access/Egress in Camino Terrace.

Wind is used extensively in the FHSZ model but only for days that are conducive for fire spread (i.e., fuels are dry enough to support fire spread).

These are used as inputs to impact both expected fire behavior and ember production from wildland areas, as well as drive the transport of embers into non-wildland/developed areas. The data provided from the weather aggregation source Visual Crossin includes both measured and modeled data, but does not filter for dryness, and appears to be spatially generalized but assigned to very specific parcels. Downscaled winds at this level present false precision. That said, this area is characterized by both very high magnitude dry winds and more generally extreme fire weather conditions at high relative frequencies when compared to the average conditions across the state.

Fire history is used in FHSZ modeling to estimate burn probability. Records of small fires that are not within the state or federal protection areas can be missing, but individual fires influence the model by their areal size and are averaged over hundreds of thousands of acres within a given fire rotation stratum, and over the entire period of record (30 years). All large fires are captured and used. The 2022 fire referenced is a) an LRA fire that is not required for reporting but are desirable to include and b) outside the time domain for records used (1991-2020).

The specific area defined for the Camino Terrace Development Project as determined from the project plan (<https://www.wakelandhdc.com/camino-terrace.html>) has not changed due to recent 2025 FHSZ map recommendations.

Access/Egress and safety related to individual development are controlled via local zoning and building requirements.

The area in question is unzone in FHSZ due to not meeting the model requirement for area size of embedded wildlands (i.e., islands of wildlands fully surrounded by non-wildland/urbanized land cover). While there are open areas with natural fuels they are limited in extent, and in this particular case do not meet that model size limit (50 acres). The city of Jurupa Valley could amend their ordinance to include this area as FHSZ under their authority in Govt. Code statute.

Per GC 51179(b) (1) A local agency may, at its discretion, include areas within the jurisdiction of the local agency, not identified as very high fire hazard severity zones by the State Fire Marshal, as very high fire hazard severity zones following a finding supported by substantial evidence in the record that the requirements of Section 51182 are necessary for effective fire protection within the area.

(2) A local agency may, at its discretion, include areas within the jurisdiction of the local agency, not identified as moderate and high fire hazard severity zones by the State Fire Marshal, as moderate and high fire hazard severity zones, respectively.

(3) A local agency shall not decrease the level of fire hazard severity zone as identified by the State Fire Marshal for any area within the jurisdiction of the local agency, and, in exercising its discretion pursuant to paragraph (2), may only increase the level of fire hazard severity zone as identified by the State Fire Marshal for any area within the jurisdiction of the local agency.

If your local agency has adopted the maps as recommended by the State Fire Marshal, this concern needs to be addressed with them as this is their discretion. You can contact your local agency by utilizing these websites:

<https://jurupavalley.org/>  
[CityClerk@jurupavalley.org](mailto:CityClerk@jurupavalley.org)

Thank you again.

Sincerely,



Emily Smith  
CAL FIRE, Office of the State Fire Marshal  
Staff Chief, Wildfire Planning and Statistics



The March 19, 2026 agenda and staff report for the Camino Terrace Apartments vote remain unchanged. The community has received no responses to the six postulates submitted on March 11, 2026:

1. Potential litigation by Wakeland and the State (HCD)
2. Estimated cost of litigation
3. Omission of key public comments
4. Scope of the City's legal authority + community's demand for second legal opinion
5. Wakeland's declined opportunity for rebuttal
6. Fire Hazard Severity Zone (FHSZ) reclassification concerns

In addition, the agenda remains incomplete and fails to address four critical issues ahead of the final vote:

1. ADA and Fire Department code violations, including the lack of an ADA-compliant secondary means of egress.
2. Feasible alternative site access via Camino Real, as proposed by residents.
3. Fourteen identified code violations, with no conditional approval tied to Fire Marshal reevaluation and re-approval of the current layout.
4. FHSZ re-evaluation concerns, including those raised in closing comments by Mayor Pro Tem Barajas

The community demands a clear explanation as to why none of these postulates or concerns have been incorporated into the project's conditions of approval or listed for Council consideration. These are not discretionary issues - they are objective, unresolved public safety risks.

Further, the attached County of Riverside Fire Department's June 23, 2025 letter (Gonzalez, English, Wakeland) explicitly outlines fire access and infrastructure requirements, including:

- **approach width**
- **turning radius**
- **deployment areas**
- **maximum 16% grade concerns re. fire truck access**
- **2.5% cross-slope limits**
- **need for adequate turnaround**
- **secondary access (current ingress/egress onto the same street is insufficient).**

These deficiencies remain present in Wakeland's December 2025 site-map submission. The developer refused rebuttal during the 2/19/2026 public hearing and clearly failed to mitigate these public safety concerns. To date, the community has not received a response to our letter to Rebecca Louie, Wakeland's CEO dated March 10th 2026.

Mayor Berkson, the community is extremely disappointed with the final deliberation and exchange between you and Mr. Peter Thorson on 2/19/2026 - these issues had been consistently brought up by

the public speakers in past several City Council Meetings, and were raised again during the February 19, 2026 public comments session. We even sent you a table format summary presenting 14 factual, objective public safety and code violations.

Despite all this, and the Fire Marshal-aligned safety concerns (see attached correspondence), these public safety concerns were not addressed in the City Attorney's closing statement, which focused instead on costs of potential litigation exposure rather than the City's obligation to protect public safety. What is even more troubling is the fact that these objective public safety concerns are yet again excluded from tomorrow's City Council agenda and staff report.

The continued exclusion of these documented, objective safety issues from the City's deliberations is unacceptable.

We urge you to immediately amend the agenda and staff report to include these matters prior to the March 19, 2026, 7:00 p.m. City Council meeting.

Sincerely,  
Lukasz Czerwinski

## Maria Morris

---

**From:** Mil Amirian <[REDACTED]>  
**Sent:** Thursday, March 19, 2026 8:57 AM  
**To:** Maria Morris; Brian Berkson; Armando Carmona; Chris Barajas; Guillermo Silva; Veronica Sanchez; Ray Placentia; Lukasz Czerwinski; Rod Butler; Yvette Rodriguez; joe.tyler@fire.ca.gov; Fish, Robert@CALFIRE; steven bier@jUSD.k12.ca.us; Zisser, David@HCD; Ying, David@HCD; pam [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** Re: Immediate Request to Address Public Safety Concerns and Agenda Omissions – March 19 Council Meeting

Dear Mayor Berkson, Mayor Pro Tem Barajas, and Council members,

**Please enter this correspondence into the public record.**

I have lived adjacent to this site since 2019. I use the access road in question regularly. My children live and play in this neighborhood. I am not writing as an activist or an opponent of development. I am writing as a neighbor who has watched this process unfold and who is genuinely troubled by what I have seen.

My neighbors Lukasz Czerwinski and Ray Placentia have already placed the full record before you. I will not repeat it.

What I will say is this - I have attended the hearings, I have read the submissions, and I have watched valid, documented safety concerns raised be set aside without explanation, meeting after meeting. As a resident whose property sits directly next to this site, the fire access deficiencies are not abstract to me. The road being discussed is the one my family uses. The turnaround and grade concerns are about the street outside my home. If a fire truck cannot access this site safely, my family's safety is at stake too.

I had faith that this process would work. That faith has been tested. Tonight is the last opportunity to restore it.

I urge you to reject this project until the fire access and code concerns identified have been fully resolved and **independently** re-approved.

Respectfully,  
Mil Amirian  
Helmcrest resident

On Mar 19, 2026, at 7:48 AM, Ray Placentia [REDACTED] wrote:

Dear City Council,

The number of loose end and unanswered as well as unmitigated valid public safety concerns is astonishing to me.

I cannot imagine how you can possible still consider the approval of this project where the applicant has failed to address multiple public safety concerns presented by Clafire on 6/23/2025, and completely disregarded, as well as you did, the same concerns our residents brought up in last public hearing on 2/19/2026.

If you are going to approve this project, you will be acting knowingly and consciously with a complete disregard to valid, objective safety concerns presented by the State, Riverside County Fire Department, Jurup Valley Fire Marshal, and us - the community.

Pleas make this a public record available to all before tonight's vote.

I urge you to reject this project.

I have lost respect and trust in our city council members throughout this mismanaged public hearing process - you have a last and final chance to make things right tonight.

Ray Placentia

On Thu, Mar 19, 2026, 1:09 AM Lukasz Czerwinski [REDACTED] wrote:

Good evening Maria, Mayor Berkson, Mayor Pro Tem Chris Barajas, and Councilmembers,

Please enter this correspondence into the public record.

The March 19, 2026 agenda and staff report for the Camino Terrace Apartments vote remain unchanged. The community has received no responses to the six postulates submitted on March 11, 2026:

1. Potential litigation by Wakeland and the State (HCD)
2. Estimated cost of litigation
3. Omission of key public comments
4. Scope of the City's legal authority + community's demand for second legal opinion
5. Wakeland's declined opportunity for rebuttal
6. Fire Hazard Severity Zone (FHSZ) reclassification concerns

In addition, the agenda remains incomplete and fails to address four critical issues ahead of the final vote:

1. ADA and Fire Department code violations, including the lack of an ADA-compliant secondary means of egress.
2. Feasible alternative site access via Camino Real, as proposed by residents.

3. Fourteen identified code violations, with no conditional approval tied to Fire Marshal revaluation and re-approval of the current layout.
4. FHSZ re-evaluation concerns, including those raised in closing comments by Mayor Pro Tem Barajas

The community demands a clear explanation as to why none of these postulates or concerns have been incorporated into the project's conditions of approval or listed for Council consideration. These are not discretionary issues - they are objective, unresolved public safety risks.

Further, the attached County of Riverside Fire Department's June 23, 2025 letter (Gonzalez, English, Wakeland) explicitly outlines fire access and infrastructure requirements, including:

- **approach width**
- **turning radius**
- **deployment areas**
- **maximum 16% grade concerns re. fire truck access**
- **2.5% cross-slope limits**
- **need for adequate turnaround**
- **secondary access (current ingress/egress onto the same street is insufficient).**

These deficiencies remain present in Wakeland's December 2025 site-map submission. The developer refused rebuttal during the 2/19/2026 public hearing and clearly failed to mitigate these public safety concerns. To date, the community has not received a response to our letter to Rebecca Louie, Wakeland's CEO dated March 10th 2026.

Mayor Berkson, the community is extremely disappointed with the final deliberation and exchange between you and Mr. Peter Thorson on 2/19/2026 - these issues had been consistently brought up by the public speakers in past several City Council Meetings, and were raised again during the February 19, 2026 public comments session. We even sent you a table format summary presenting 14 factual, objective public safety and code violations.

Despite all this, and the Fire Marshal-aligned safety concerns (see attached correspondence), these public safety concerns were not addressed in the City Attorney's closing statement, which focused instead on costs of potential litigation exposure rather than the City's obligation to protect public safety. What is even more troubling is the fact that these objective public safety concerns are yet again excluded from tomorrow's City Council agenda and staff report.

The continued exclusion of these documented, objective safety issues from the City's deliberations is unacceptable.

We urge you to immediately amend the agenda and staff report to include these matters prior to the March 19, 2026, 7:00 p.m. City Council meeting.

Sincerely,  
Lukasz Czerwinski