

## Cindy Camargo

---

**From:** Marc Feldstein <marc.feldstein1990@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 28, 2022 9:59 AM  
**To:** Clerk  
**Subject:** Public Comment

Hello,

I am writing to comment on agenda items 10 (legislation, planning, etc.) and 14 (future calendar items).

The JPA is slated to consider the West Plateau project approval at some point in the near future. Myself and many residents take issue with not only the project itself, though *the process by which it has been and is now being handled*. While there were vague apologies at times, the repeated, untoward behavior weakens these apologies or suggests the person making the apology wasn't truly aware of what was done that could've been a lot better. Personal responsibility is not required at the JPA, yet terms that citizens used can be parsed by the syllable.

1. Citizens have been interacted with in a less than a desirable manner. For example, a Riverside City Councilor

(C. Conder) was referred to as HERS by the Executive Director. Besides not being accurate, it unnecessarily

invites territoriality and divisiveness, contributing to an adversarial dynamic. It also leads some to wonder

about the motivations of said public officials, that they'd go to such lengths, instead of more respectful, collaborative interactions.

References have been made to how 'one cannot deal with those people' (C Conder). This is an over-statement and anyone

in public service should know that those people is a pejorative term.

Territoriality was also expressed at a meeting at the March Museum. It was specifically stated that only certain topics will be

discussed, both formally and informally, which appears to encroach on the ideal of representative government and 1st amendment

rights. (G. Martin.) Yes, there can be agendas. Though to appear to limit what a constituent speaks to a city councilor about

before or after the meeting is excessive and demonstrative of a disdain for residents.

A similar expression was used when I called the JPA: I was told I was on the executive director's turf.

Also, if you're going to refer to TURF, don't deny you're engaging in *territoriality*. If you're referring to a public

official as yours, don't ignore the fact that this is unsavory or of poor diction.

Resident concerns are referred to as moot or irrelevant (J Perry). I mentioned the undue impact on Riverside

City fire services if the project is approved. It was stated that the site being outside the City makes this unimportant.

Yet, the City of Riverside has current MOU's and/or mutual aid agreements. If a City Fire Department crew is on-scene

at a property within March JPA or Moreno Valley, that's one less apparatus and 3 fewer personnel available

for the city of riverside. Hence, it was pre-mature to refer to a considered, reasonable issue as irrelevant.

Either the official was too quick to discount the concerns of we the lowly resident or he isn't completely certain how

certain aspects of city government works. Hence, his comments about thoroughly considering an issue are not

re-assuring as one can only consider what they're aware of; not what they should know by now.

2. Comparisons are made between the proposed project and what zoning allows. We the citizens compare the project

to current conditions. For example, going from no wall to an 11 foot wall is a huge change. Similarly, although 5 ppm

of a toxin may not meet state standards as harmful, it means going from 0 ppm to 5 ppm. Yet, the Executive Director

stated she wasn't terribly familiar with such standards or guidelines. To me, these standards are a focal point

of any project being considered.

3. There is zero concern for the future. This would be the 3rd such project in a short period of time, across the street

from residences and a church. This leads to market saturation, decreased safety and potentially increased crime.

How this is seen as consistent with the JPA's purpose is beyond me. JPA will dissolve leaving its mistakes

to the City and County.

4. There are a variety of Joint Powers organizations which are responsible for health, liability, and possibly property insurance,

along with other efforts. The specific comments, actions, etc. JPA folks have *chosen to make* will reflect poorly on such an entity

and all local governmental entities. That is unfortunate.

5. It is acceptable to threaten to end conversations, allege that folks have no purpose or mission, or engage in territoriality.

Yet, it is not ok to express that there is the appearance of a conflict of interest. Again, the perception of such a conflict

doesn't require the actual presence of a conflict of interest.

Hence, there is a double standard, where certain definitions or expectations don't apply to JPA actions. Saying my turf isn't being

territorial. Isn't being impolite. What elsewhere would appear to conflict with best practice, be disdainful, etc. are completely

acceptable at March JPA.

One can act as if exceeding modest state requirements is akin to bending over backwards or being saintly, empathic, or doing the right thing.

Commission members and JPA leaders can be unfamiliar with guidelines, processes or how city departments operate though merit

endless praise and appreciation.

Not so much.

**Marc J. Feldstein**