

3/19/2026

Council Business A

Correspondences 18

Maria Morris

From: Michael Arroyo <[REDACTED]>
Sent: Thursday, March 19, 2026 10:52 AM
To: Maria Morris; Mil Amirian; 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; [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
Subject: Re: Immediate Request to Address Public Safety Concerns and Agenda Omissions – March 19 Council Meeting

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

Please enter this correspondence into the public record.

Many of our fellow residents have expressed numerous outstanding safety concerns. Most do not object to a plan to build, this just is not a viable location. The unique characteristics of this land (slopes, Fire Hazard Severity Zone (FHSZ), granite, water flow, utility infrastructure, traffic volume) demonstrate how sensitive it is. Ignoring this sensitivity is not only disregarding the lives and safety of the current residents, it is creating a safety risk for hundreds of potential new ones.

When a tragedy occurs, the documented fact that the city was forewarned and allowed this catastrophic environment to be built will devastate not only the community, but the entire City of Jurupa Valley. Given these safety concerns were not addressed, not only would lives be at risk, the financial impact could potentially bankrupt the city.

A river bottom fire with Santa Ana winds
Palm trees behind the old Rite Aid and winds
Granite fire and winds.

Any one of these could have been a start to something worse.

The neighborhood was literally putting out fires, on this subject property, started by flying embers.

Please keep our communities and our entire city safe.

I respectfully urge you to prevent this project from continuing while significant safety issues remain.

Michael Arroyo

...

[REDACTED]
jma@comcast.net, jma@comcast.net

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 possibly 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.

Please 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