Community Media Consultancy Report

Governance, Fraud-Risk, and Oversight Concerns
March Joint Powers Authority (MJPA)
BRAC-Adjacent Redevelopment – March Air Reserve Base /
March Inland Port–Airport

Prepared by:
Mission Grove Neighborhood Alliance (MGNA)
A California Nonprofit Public Benefit Corporation (IRC § 501(c)(3))
a Community Media Consultancy

Contributing MGNA Writer:
Bill Clark – Investigative Journalist

Purpose:
Public Education, Accountability and Oversight Support

Date:
February 15, 2026

Executive Summary

The Mission Grove Neighborhood Alliance (MGNA) prepared this Community Media Consultancy Report to inform the public, civic leadership, and appropriate oversight authorities regarding recurring governance, transparency, audit, environmental reporting, airport operations, and fraud-risk concerns associated with the March Joint Powers Authority (MJPA) and its partner agencies. This report synthesizes independent oversight findings issued by the Riverside County Civil Grand Jury, legislative oversight materials from the California State Senate and Assembly, publications of the California State Auditor, and applicable statutory guidance to evaluate whether observed practices align with principles of open government, fiscal stewardship, and public accountability. [1,2,3,4,5,6]

This analysis is informed by the historical dissolution of California redevelopment agencies and the subsequent transfer of redevelopment-related authority to successor entities, including joint powers authorities (JPA). Legislative and independent oversight bodies have repeatedly cautioned that such governance structures present heightened transparency and accountability risks, absent strong external controls and sustained public oversight. [4,5]

The report further documents that MJPA redevelopment activities intersect with multiple layers of federal oversight, including association with Foreign-Trade Zone (FTZ) designation No. 244, federally regulated BRAC–EPA environmental remediation obligations, and Treasury-published federal financial assistance flows verified through USAspending.gov. [7,8,9,10] These federal intersections materially expand the governance and oversight context beyond the local level.

MGNA makes no findings of criminal conduct or legal liability. All observations and conclusions are derived exclusively from publicly available government records and recognized governance analysis frameworks and are presented solely for public education and accountability purposes.

While this report does not allege criminal conduct or intent, it concludes that unresolved structural deficiencies identified consistently across county, state, and federal oversight records are associated with elevated governance, transparency, fiscal accountability, and public-interest risk exposure. Taken together, these conditions warrant corrective action, informed public engagement, and continued oversight to safeguard the public interest.

Report Context

Methodology and Source Disclosure

This report relies exclusively on open-source government records, including Riverside County Civil Grand Jury reports, California State Auditor publications, California statutory authorities, legislative oversight reports issued by the California State Senate and Assembly, and publicly available federal records. Recognized governance and fraud-risk frameworks are applied solely as analytical tools and do not constitute allegations of wrongdoing.

MGNA makes no findings of criminal conduct or legal liability. All observations and conclusions are derived exclusively from publicly available government records and recognized governance analysis frameworks and are presented solely for public education and accountability purposes.

All cited materials are publicly available government records or publications issued by recognized governmental or international oversight bodies.

California Redevelopment Dissolution

California dissolved local redevelopment agencies in 2011–2012 following extensive findings of fiscal abuse, opaque financial practices, excessive debt accumulation, diversion of tax increment financing, and diminished public accountability. Successor entities, including joint powers authorities, assumed redevelopment functions under conditions that legislative bodies warned could replicate prior governance risks.

BRAC–EPA Superfund / Environmental Remediation Governance Context

The March Air Reserve Base redevelopment exists within the federal Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) environmental remediation framework, coordinated among the U.S. Department of Defense, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and state environmental regulators. Oversight literature recognizes elevated governance and oversight risk exposure in complex remediation environments where redevelopment pressures intersect with environmental cleanup obligations.

March Inland Port–Airport / Federal Trade Zone Nexus

The March Inland Port–Airport represents a significant redevelopment and logistics initiative operating within the March Air Reserve Base footprint. MJPA's association with Federal Trade Zone designation No. 244 establishes a direct federal regulatory nexus involving the U.S. Department of Commerce and the Foreign-Trade Zones Board.

Special-Purpose Authorities and Governance Risk Exposure

Independent federal and international oversight bodies, including the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO), the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), and the Financial Action Task Force (FATF), have documented that special-purpose authorities such as JPAs, Councils of Government, and economic development zones present elevated governance, transparency, and oversight risk exposure when oversight mechanisms are fragmented and reporting visibility is limited.

Narrative

Comparative Oversight Context: Free Trade Zones and Recognized Governance Risk Patterns

Independent federal and international oversight bodies have documented that special-purpose economic and redevelopment zones, including U.S. Foreign Trade Zones (FTZs), present elevated governance, transparency, and oversight risk exposure when oversight mechanisms are fragmented, reporting is decentralized, and public visibility is limited.

The U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO) concluded in its evaluation of the federal FTZ program that oversight agencies lacked a comprehensive program-wide ability to assess compliance risks consistently, citing fragmented reporting and limited risk aggregation capability. [2]

Similarly, international oversight bodies including OECD and FATF have documented that FTZs globally present governance vulnerabilities when accountability mechanisms rely heavily on decentralized reporting structures and lack consistent transparency safeguards. [3]

These federal and international findings closely parallel governance observations documented by the Riverside County Civil Grand Jury in its reviews of MJPA operations. [1]

Viewed in comparative governance context, MJPA governance concerns reflect structural risk characteristics observed in other special-purpose redevelopment authorities. Federal oversight literature consistently demonstrates that when significant public resources flow through entities with diffuse oversight and limited public reporting visibility, governance and accountability risk exposure increases materially. [24]

Federal Financial Exposure and Oversight Context: Treasury-Published Open-Source Verification

MGNA conducted an independent review of federal open-source spending data published by the United States Department of the Treasury through USAspending.gov.

This Treasury-published federal spending data independently confirms the presence of substantial federal financial activity within the same redevelopment environment referenced in Civil Grand Jury findings, reinforcing the broader governance and oversight significance of MJPA-associated redevelopment activity.

Federal financial assistance programs, including grants, direct payments, and federally supported programs, represent the primary form of federal financial interaction within the geographic redevelopment footprint.

Federal oversight literature consistently identifies decentralized financial assistance programs as governance environments requiring strong internal controls, transparency safeguards, and sustained independent oversight.

Federal Financial Exposure as a Governance Risk Multiplier

The predominance of federal financial assistance in the MJPA redevelopment environment increases structural conditions associated with elevated governance and fraud-risk exposure as defined in recognized public-sector internal control and governance risk literature.

Unlike federal procurement contracts involving direct federal supervision, federal assistance programs frequently operate within distributed accountability environments involving federal, state, regional, and local entities.

When such distributed federal financial exposure intersects with governance transparency limitations documented by independent oversight bodies, the potential consequences of governance deficiencies increase significantly in terms of fiscal stewardship, public accountability, and long-term public trust.

These findings do not allege misconduct. Rather, they illustrate recognized governance risk conditions requiring heightened transparency safeguards and sustained independent oversight.

BRAC–EPA Environmental Oversight Context and Long-Term Governance Implications

Federal environmental records confirm that redevelopment activities at and around March Air Reserve Base occur within a federally regulated environmental remediation framework under BRAC oversight.

Environmental remediation associated with former military installations involves multi-decade federal oversight obligations designed to protect public health and ensure safe land reuse.

The Riverside County Civil Grand Jury identified governance transparency and public awareness limitations in MJPA operations. [1]

Federal environmental remediation obligations reinforce the importance of sustained governance transparency, institutional accountability, and public oversight where redevelopment intersects with federally regulated environmental conditions.

The relevance of BRAC-EPA environmental oversight lies in demonstrating that MJPA redevelopment activity exists within a high-consequence regulatory environment requiring elevated governance diligence and sustained transparency.

Closing Summary

This Community Media Consultancy Report documents recurring governance, transparency, and oversight concerns identified by independent oversight bodies and legislative authorities in connection with the March Joint Powers Authority (MJPA).

When evaluated within the historical context of California redevelopment dissolution and alongside the expanded federal oversight nexus involving BRAC-EPA environmental obligations, Foreign-Trade Zone governance, and Treasury-verified federal financial assistance flows, the available record indicates recurring governance patterns consistent with systemic structural oversight concerns rather than isolated administrative issues. [1,2,7,8,9,10]

The Riverside County Civil Grand Jury did not characterize these issues as criminal conduct. Rather, it identified structural governance weaknesses that diminish transparency, diffuse accountability, and impair the public's ability to fully evaluate redevelopment governance and fiscal stewardship.

MGNA offers this report as a public-interest accountability record.

MGNA will continue to monitor publicly available records and publish future findings as additional verified information becomes available. Sustained transparency, clear accountability mechanisms, and continued independent oversight remain essential safeguards to protect public trust, fiscal stewardship, environmental safety, and long-term community interests.

Endnote Index and Source References

All cited materials are publicly available government records or publications issued by recognized governmental or international oversight bodies.

1. Riverside County Civil Grand Jury. (2024). March Joint Powers Authority: Marginally Transparent.
2. Riverside County Civil Grand Jury. (2025). March Joint Powers Authority: Mission Accomplished, Time to Completely Dissolve.
3. Riverside County Civil Grand Jury. (Multiple years). Reports concerning Riverside County Auditor-Controller and Board of Supervisors governance.
4. California State Senate Local Government Committee. (2007). Governments Working Together: A Citizen's Guide to Joint Powers Agreements.
5. California State Assembly Local Government Committee. (2012). Developments in the Use of Joint Powers Agreements and Joint Powers Authorities.
6. California State Auditor. Reports addressing local government internal controls and financial oversight.
7. U.S. Department of the Treasury. USAspending.gov Federal Spending Transparency Platform.
8. U.S. Government Accountability Office. Reports on Foreign Trade Zone oversight and compliance risk.
9. Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). Reports on governance risk in special economic zones.
10. Financial Action Task Force (FATF). Reports on governance risk, transparency, and trade-based financial oversight.