

**RESPONSES TO COMMENTS
CASE ROAD MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT**

Comment Letter No. 1

Jerry Sepulveda, President, Perris Valley Chamber of Commerce, May 31, 2024

ITEM 6B.



**PERRIS VALLEY
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE**

May 31, 2024

Executive Committee

Jerry Sepulveda
Primerica Financial
President

Michael Rowe
Papa Rowe's Kitchen
Vice President

Julia Burch
Secretary
Boys & girls Clubs of
Inland Valley

Robert Mason
Treasurer
Leading Edge Learning
Center

Ignacio Valdivia
Immediate Past
President

Directors

Violeta Aguilar-Wyrick
Xara Public Affairs

Victor Castro
Altura Credit Union

Parisa Jebelli
CR&R Environmental

Katie McClendon
Families Achieving
Success

Timothy Moore
Sons of the American
Legion Squadron 595

Rosalinda Rivas
Moreno Valley College

Cynthia Soriano
Innovation Mortgage
Group

Carmen Weatherly
Access Second Chance

Planning Commission
City of Perris
101 N. D Street
Perris, Ca 92570

Honorable Planning Commission Members,

On behalf of the Perris Valley Chamber of Commerce, we are writing to express our support for the proposed mixed-use development project that is currently under consideration. We believe that this development has the potential to bring significant economic benefits to our community while also enhancing the overall quality of life for our residents and visitors.

The location has sat vacant for over 20 years with no interest from the business community and now offers opportunities for immediate job creation and economic growth through the industrial and retail uses, while addressing growing and future needs within our community through the hotel and self-storage. Additionally, we believe that the proposed mixed-use development represents a thoughtful and strategic approach to land use planning given the proximity to the sewage treatment plant.

The project has the potential to generate economic growth, create jobs, and enhance the overall livability of our community. We urge the Planning Commission to support this project and help bring these benefits to fruition.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Jerry R. Sepulveda
President
Perris Valley Chamber of Commerce

cc: Kenneth Phung, Director of Development Services
Patricia Brenes, Planning Manager

1.1

Comment 1.1: The commenter expresses the support of the Perris Valley Chamber of Commerce for the Project, stating that “this development has the potential to bring significant economic benefits to our community while also enhancing the overall quality of life for our residents and visitors.” The commenter further states that the site has sat vacant for an extended period of time and “now offers opportunities for immediate job creation and economic growth through the industrial and retail uses, while addressing growing and future needs within our community through the hotel and self-storage.” The commenter further states the Project “represents a thoughtful and strategic approach to land use planning given the proximity to the sewage treatment plant.”

Response 1.1: The commenter’s support of the Project is noted. Since the comment does not question the content or conclusions of the EIR Addendum, no further response is required.

Comment Letter No. 2

Jill Menez, June 4, 2024

From: Jill Menez <jillmenez99@gmail.com>
Date: June 4, 2024 at 7:28:19 PM PDT
To: Kenneth Phung <kphung@cityofperris.org>
Subject: Item 6B Planning Commission Meeting 6/5/24

Hello Kenneth,

My name is Jillian [Menez](#) and I am a resident of South Perris as well as a community advocate with Perris Neighbors in Action. I have been looking over the plans for the Case Road Mixed-Use Project, item 6B in tomorrow's Planning Commission agenda, and I wanted to bring to your attention a few of the issues I have found regarding this project.

The first issue that I have found is that the warehouse component is inconsistent with the zoning of this area. While, yes, the city's General Plan zoning allows warehousing with a Conditional Use Permit - the Green Valley Specific Plan zoning laws states no such exemption or permittance.

The zoning guidelines as presented in the [Green Valley Specific Plan Amendment](#) from 2020 prohibits "*Any enterprise which produces or causes any dust, smoke, **gas, noise, fumes, odors, or vibrations** which are or may be detrimental to other property in the neighborhood or to the welfare of the occupants thereof.*" (3.6.2 under "Prohibited Uses in Business/Professional zoning" Page 3-33). The diesel exhaust, odors, vibrations from the semi trucks and loud noise from operations make this project incompatible with the zoning as well as the nearby future residents who will be residing only 400 feet away from the site.

This project should not be permissible under even the zoning guidelines of the General Plan as an industrial warehouse does not "fit in" with the surrounding commercial and residential components and it should be denied its CUP. It is far too large and close to the future residential as well as the existing commercial.

2.1

This project should not be permissible under even the zoning guidelines of the General Plan as an industrial warehouse does not "fit in" with the surrounding commercial and residential components and it should be denied its CUP. It is far too large and close to the future residential as well as the existing commercial.

2.1 (Cont'd)

Also, it is unclear if there has been any updated EIR since the original 1990 EIR for the Green Valley Specific Plan. A 500,000 square foot warehouse is a far detachment from the original uses of this region and thus a new EIR should be completed in order to account for the environmental effects of this warehouse project as well as its cumulative impact on the city. This plan proposes a massive warehouse which will be in the direct vicinity to incoming homes. This needs to be investigated.

2.2

This project could be great for the city, Perris residents are desperate for more fulfilling activities within city limits. The introduction and massive success of Septembers Taproom and Eatery adjacent to this project goes to show how popular this could be.

Also, for clarification, the applicant proposes the following as a community benefit: "*Construction of either Commercial Building E, F, G or the hotel (with Basins located on lots*

C and D) concurrently with the proposed industrial warehouse building, along with all the street frontage improvements along Green Valley Parkway for the entire commercial length" am I understanding correctly that the applicant will not build the entire proposed plan at the same time? If so, then that is unacceptable.

[The proposed "community benefits" for this project are insufficient and absurd. The widening of Case Road is purely to benefit their truck usage *NOT* the community, the Certificate of Occupancy is simply a \$400,000 buy-out which will allow the developer to move forward on the warehouse before any of the commercial development is secured, and the fact that it is considered a bonus that one of the other components will be built concurrently with the warehouse is an insult to residents like me who live in the area and have been waiting for meaningful development that has been promised for 30 years now.

2.3

In summary, I would like clarification on the environmental review that has been done for this project as well as on whether or not *all* components of this project are planned to be built concurrently.

On behalf of Perris Neighbors in Action, I urge the planning commission to reconsider this project and deny the CUP proposed for the industrial warehouse component. As it stands, this is not a good project. There is much potential however, and it should be sent back for revision to remove or **greatly** reduce the warehouse component.

2.4

Thank you,

Jillian Menez

Perris Neighbors in Action

Comment 2.1: The commenter claims that the industrial portion of the Project is inconsistent with the existing zoning.

Response 2.1: The Project site is comprised of Planning Areas 40, 41, and 44 of the Green Valley Specific Plan (GVSP). The industrial portion of the Project is located within Planning Area 40. Planning Area 40 is designated Business and Professional by the GVSP. (GVSP, page 2-3.) In the Business Professional designation, various uses are permitted provided that a conditional use permit is first obtained. (GVSP, page 3-35.) Such uses include Business Park uses requiring a conditional use permit per Perris Municipal Code Section 19.44. (*Id.*)

Perris Municipal Code Section 19.44 is the City’s zoning code for industrial uses and includes three industrial zoning districts: Business Park, Light Industrial, and General Industrial. Under the Business Park zoning designation, warehouse and warehouse distribution centers are allowed with a conditional use permit. (Perris Municipal Code Section 19.44.020.) Business Park is defined to include uses generally served by arterial roadways and freeways and including, among others, warehousing/distribution, wholesaling, and large-scale warehouse. (Perris Municipal Code Section 19.44.010.) Warehousing and distribution is defined as “a building or premises in which goods, merchandise or equipment are stored for eventual distribution.” (Perris Municipal Code Section 19.08.010.)

The commenter claims that the use is prohibited based on a general “nuisance” type provision in the GVSP prohibiting enterprises which produce or cause dust, smoke, gas, noise, fumes, or vibration which may be detrimental to other property in the neighborhood. (GVSP, page 3-35.) However, the commenter does not provide any substantial evidence that the Project would result in any of these impacts. A full environmental assessment of the Project was prepared by expert consultants and is reflected in the Addendum to the final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the GVSP and supporting expert studies. The EIR Addendum, supported by substantial evidence, concludes that the Project would not result in any of the referenced impacts, nor would it increase the severity of any previously identified significant effects from the Final EIR for the GVSP. Moreover, the Project would adhere to the City’s Good Neighbor Guidelines for the Siting of New and/or Modified Industrial Facilities designed to avoid or minimize such potential impacts. In addition, the Project site is located adjacent to an existing regional wastewater treatment plant and commercial retail uses, both of which would be compatible with the Project’s proposed industrial use. As such, the proposed industrial portion of the Project would not be detrimental to other property in the neighborhood.

In short, warehousing and distribution is allowed within Planning Area 40 with a conditional use permit, as is being sought here, and is consistent with the zoning.

Comment 2.2: The commenter contends that a new EIR should be completed in order to account for the environmental effects of the industrial portion of the Project.

Response 2.2: A complete EIR was prepared by the City for the entire GVSP. It analyzed the impacts of 4,210 dwelling units, 42.3 acres of business and professional office space, 72.7 acres of commercial retail, 108.7 acres of industrial, 24 acres for three school sites, and 51.1 acres of public parks. In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (State CEQA Guidelines), no further EIR can legally be required for the Project unless there is substantial evidence that the Project would result in new or substantially more severe significant impacts than were disclosed in the GVSP EIR. (Public Resources Code Section 21166; State CEQA Guidelines Section

15162.) Here, multiple reports by expert consultants confirm that the Project would not result in any new or more severe significant impacts than were disclosed in the GVSP EIR. In fact, those reports show that in key areas such as air quality, greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, and traffic, the Project would result in far fewer impacts than were disclosed in the GVSP Final EIR. (See EIR Addendum, pages 4-22, 4-64, 4-114 to 4-115 [showing reduced air quality emissions to all criteria pollutants, approximately 25,000 less metric tons of GHG emissions, and 17,069 fewer trips].).

Consistent with CEQA, the City has prepared several addendums to the Final EIR for other projects within the GVSP area. For instance, in 2017, the City approved the Phase 1A Project consisting of 314 single family homes. In 2020, the City approved the Phase 1B Project consisting of 1,240 dwelling units. In 2023, the City approved the Phase 2 Project with 1,756 dwelling units, a K-8 school for up to 1,000 students, 43,700 square feet of commercial development, and multiple open space areas and a park.

In short, because there is no substantial evidence that the Project would result in new or substantially more severe significant impacts, the City can and should legally rely on the Addendum to the GVSP Final EIR for the Project.

Comment 2.3: The commenter states that the proposed community benefits for the Project are “insufficient and absurd.”

Response 2.3: The Project applicant is not seeking a Development Agreement and thus is not obligated by state or local law to provide “community benefits” or related exactions beyond those required by City Code and standards. Nonetheless, the Project applicant contends that the Project itself would provide substantial benefits to the community with increased shopping, dining, and lodging opportunities that would also increase tax revenues for the City. In addition, the Project applicant has agreed to phase the Project so as to develop industrial and commercial uses concurrently and widen Case Road beyond what is needed legally to accommodate the Project.

Comment 2.4: The commenter asks that the mixed-use development project be denied based on the industrial building.

Response 2.4: This comment expresses a request of the commenter. The comment does not question the content or conclusions of the EIR Addendum. No response is required.

Comment Letter No. 3

Adam Carrillo, June 4, 2024

From: [Adam Carrillo](#)
To: [Nathan Perez](#)
Subject: Subject
Date: Tuesday, June 4, 2024 9:49:07 PM

Good afternoon,

I am a resident here in Perris, California. I strongly disagree with another warehouse being built in the city of Perris the pollution, the air. The environment is bad for the resident here. I also believe that this warehouse will be built closer to homes that are being built , we have to take consideration of those who live in those houses all the noise that they will encounter . There should be no more warehouses built. please look around you and understand as a resident here there's more traffic, more trailers all around on Ramona express going towards Moreno Valley and so forth. These warehouse buildings have to stop. I am a union carpenter myself, and I understand that we build warehouses however I disagree with more being built I'd rather be able to have clean air around my environment around our kids. As a resident here, I please ask you to deny this project and allow more restaurants, entertainment around the area , grocery stores to be built I have to drive about 15 minutes just to go to a grocery store. We should do better for our city. Also improving and having more light posts in the streets, we should be making our city look beautiful , instead we're making it look horrible and a Ghost Town.

Thank you

3.1

3.2

Comment 3.1: The commenter states his opposition to the Project based on air pollution, traffic, and noise.

Response 3.1: See Response 2.2 and Response 4.3. In addition, the Addendum to the Final EIR concluded that the Project would not generate operational noise levels in exceedance of the City's daytime or nighttime noise level standards at any existing residences or planned future residential development within the GVSP area (See EIR Addendum, pages 4-97 through 4-99).

Comment 3.2: The commenter asks that the mixed-use development project be denied based on the industrial building.

Response 3.2: This comment expresses a request of the commenter. The comment does not question the content or conclusions of the EIR Addendum. No response is required.

Comment Letter No. 4

Dennise Jimenez, June 4, 2024

From: Jimenez, Dennise <Dennise.Jimenez@molinahealthcare.com>

Sent: Wednesday, June 5, 2024 10:33 AM

To: Nathan Perez <NPerez@cityofperris.org>; Patricia Brenes <pbrenes@CityofPerris.org>; Kenneth Phung <kphung@cityofperris.org>; twheeler@rivco.org; district1@rivco.org

Cc: Dennise Jimenez <dennise.jimenez81@gmail.com>

Subject: Subject: Urgent Request to Halt Future Warehouse Projects in the Inland Empire - item 4.7

Good afternoon planning commission members & county planning department,

I hope this email finds you well. I am writing to express my deep concern regarding the ongoing development of warehouse projects in our region and to urgently request that the County take immediate action to halt any future warehouse projects in the Inland Empire.

4.1

As a resident of this community, I have witnessed firsthand the significant environmental and health impacts that the proliferation of warehouses and the associated increase in trucking activities have had on our area. I live in an unincorporated area of District 5 and I used to have the view to mystic lake. Now, all I see are all the lights of the sketchers plant and we can hear the noise throughout the day & night. The Inland Empire already suffers from severe air quality issues, and the continuous expansion of warehouse operations exacerbates these problems. The emissions from diesel trucks, coupled with the heavy traffic congestion they create, contribute to elevated levels of air pollution, which has been linked to a variety of serious health problems, including respiratory and cardiovascular diseases.

4.2

As a nurse who has studied the environmental impact in our community, I see that the continued growth of these projects will only worsen the health of our constituents. We are facing an increase in lung and cardiovascular issues, which prevents us from focusing on preventative health measures. Moreover, the environmental degradation caused by these developments is not limited to air quality. The construction and operation of large-scale warehouses also strain our water resources, increase noise pollution, and contribute to the urban heat island effect, further diminishing the quality of life for our residents. The long-term health and environmental sustainability of our community should be a priority. While economic development is important, it is crucial that we pursue avenues that do not come at such a high cost to our environment and public health. There are alternative paths to economic growth that do not rely on the warehouse and logistics industry, and I urge the County and planning commissioners to explore and invest in these options.

4.3

I respectfully request that we focus on a moratorium on all future warehouse projects in the Inland Empire until comprehensive environmental and health impact assessments can be conducted and reviewed, we see another interest in building a 500k + sq. footage warehouse in Mead Valley that requires changing the zoning of the area in which that warehouse is planned. I encourage the Council to engage with community members, environmental experts, and public health professionals to develop a sustainable plan that balances economic development with the well-being of our environment and residents.

4.4

There are already empty warehouses in the city of Perris and Moreno Valley that can be utilized. These warehouses do not attract higher-earning constituents who can bring more revenue into our cities. Instead, we are attracting low-paying jobs that affect members of our community in the long run in their abilities to provide for their families, purchase houses and thrive.

Thank you for your attention to this critical issue. I look forward to your response and hope to see decisive action taken to protect the health and future of our community.

Thank you for your attention to this critical issue. I look forward to your response and hope to see decisive action taken to protect the health and future of our community.

“Focusing on the impacts of the 3,321 warehouses larger than 100,000 square feet in the South Coast Air Basin, which includes the counties of Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, and San Bernardino, researchers found that warehouses generate over 200 million diesel truck trips, which in turn produce over 300,000 pounds of diesel particulate matter, 30 million pounds of nitrogen oxide, and 15 billion pounds of carbon dioxide per year.”

The study from our LOCAL university.

<https://news.ucr.edu/articles/2024/02/28/warehouse-and-trucking-industries-inland-empire-have-provided-more-jobs-also#:~:text=Focusing%20on%20the%20impacts%20of,produce%20over%20300%2C000%20pounds%20of>

Dennise Jimenez | MPH, LVN, CCM, Lean 6σ (Black Belt)
Member of Riverside County Oversight Board
Citizens Bond Committee – Vice Chair
SSBCI Phone Queue Team Lead, Healthcare Services
MCS EMU Care Management
Genesys Phone: 562-317-2132 & Cell # 951-478-1216
SSBCI Phone Queue Number - 866-472-4582
Dennise.Jimenez@MolinaHealthcare.com

Comment 4.1: The commenter expresses deep concern regarding the ongoing development of warehouse projects in the region.

Response 4.1: This comment does not question the content or conclusions of the EIR Addendum. No response is required.

Comment 4.2: The commenter states that the growth of warehouse projects will worsen the health of area residents, citing concerns with air quality and traffic.

Response 4.2: The Project would result in substantially less air quality and greenhouse gas emissions than were assumed to occur under the Green Valley Specific Plan (GVSP) Final EIR. (See EIR Addendum, pages 4-22, 4-64.) However, as detailed in the EIR Addendum, the mitigation adopted with the GVSP Final EIR would continue to apply to the Proposed Project. In addition, since the GVSP has been approved, the City adopted the City of Perris Good Neighbor Guidelines for the Siting of New and/or Modified Industrial Facilities to minimize air quality and health effects on sensitive receptors. Additional updated mitigation has been recommended in the EIR Addendum to further reduce operational emissions associated with the Project. (See EIR Addendum, pages 4-27 and 4-28.) The EIR Addendum also concluded that the Project would result in emissions below the South Coast Air Quality Management District’s localized significance thresholds for construction and operations. (See EIR Addendum, pages 4-23 to 4-24.) Furthermore, the Project would result in 17,069 fewer average daily vehicle trips than were assumed to occur in the GVSP Final EIR. Thus, both Project and cumulative trips would be less than previously analyzed and disclosed. The detailed trip generation analysis is provided in the Trip Generation Memo provided as Appendix G to the EIR Addendum. In addition, a full analysis of existing plus ambient plus Project plus cumulative conditions is provided in the Traffic Analysis attached as Appendix G to the EIR Addendum. Moreover, a full Mobile Source Health Risk Assessment was prepared for the Project. (EIR Addendum, Appendix C.) The Health Risk Assessment concluded that the maximum cancer risk exposure was 1.23 in one million, which is well below the South Coast Air Quality Management District’s significance threshold of 10 in one million. (EIR Addendum, page 4-25.) In other words, the Project’s calculated health risk is 87 percent below the applicable significance threshold.

Comment 4.3: The commenter contends that the construction of warehouse buildings strains water resources, increases noise pollution, and adds to the heat island effect.

Response 4.3: A Water Supply Assessment was prepared for the Project by the Eastern Municipal Water District (EMWD). (EIR Addendum, Appendix J.) The Water Supply Assessment concludes that the EMWD will be

able to provide adequate water supplies to meet the potable water demand of the Project as part of its existing and future demands. (EIR Addendum, page 4-122.) In regard to noise, a Noise and Vibration Analysis was prepared. (EIR Addendum, Appendix K.) The analysis concludes that Project noise levels would be below all applicable noise level standards. (EIR Addendum, pages 4-98 to 4-99.) It is also important to point out that the industrial building would be separated from future residential development by a 6-foot-high wall at the property line, followed by a landscape buffer of approximately 104 feet with mature 36-inch box trees, followed by an additional 14-foot-tall wall around the truck parking area. In accordance with the Perris Good Neighbor Guidelines, the closest truck docks would be located at least 300 feet from the future multi-family residential zoned property. The truck parking area is oriented towards Case Road adjacent to the EMWD treatment plant, with the truck driveway configured to direct traffic towards Case Road. In response to heat island effect, the Project would result in less greenhouse gas emissions than were assumed to occur under the approved GVSP. (EIR Addendum, page. 4-64.)

Comment 4.4: The commenter urges a moratorium on warehouse development.

Response 4.4: This comment expresses a request of the commenter. The comment does not question the content or conclusions of the Addendum. No response is required.

Comment Letter No. 5

Cheryl Kitzerow, Community Development Director, City of Menifee, June 5, 2024



29844 Haun Rd. Menifee CA. 92586
(951) 672-6777 | Fax (951) 679-3843
cityofmenifee.us

June 5, 2024

Nathan Perez
Project Planner
City of Perris
135 N. D Street
Perris, CA 92570-2200

RE: Development Agreement 23-05060, Conditional Use Permit 23-05047 & Tentative Parcel Map PM 38814 (PLN23-05059) – Industrial and Commercial Development on 44 acres at Ethanac and Case Roads

Dear Mr. Perez,

The City of Menifee (“Menifee”) appreciates the opportunity to comment on the above-referenced project generally located at the southwest corner of Watson Road and Case Road and at the northeast corner of Green Valley Parkway and Ethanac Road within the City of Perris (“Perris”) consisting of a Development Agreement, Conditional Use Permit, and Tentative Parcel Map to construct a 480,000 square-foot industrial building, self-storage facility consisting of a 96,000 square foot and 98,000 square-foot two-story buildings, an 80,000 square-foot, four-story hotel and a 27,000 square-foot commercial retail shopping center with two 2,800 square-foot drive-through restaurants (“Project”).

Menifee provides the following comments given the Project’s adjacency to Menifee:

Transportation/Traffic:

1. A Global Traffic Analysis for this segment of Ethanac Road (also known as the Ethanac corridor) is currently being prepared for the Cities of Menifee and Perris. This global study will further clarify the improvements that are required along the Ethanac corridor. A project-specific traffic analysis is therefore premature in that the Global Traffic Analysis must be completed first in order to master plan the entire Ethanac corridor.
2. The project proposes to construct a new signalized intersection at Green Valley Parkway and Ethanac Road. The proposed intersection is approximately 600 feet west of the signalized intersection of Barnett Road at Ethanac Road and approximately 750 feet west of the signalized intersection of Case Road at Ethanac Road; thus, resulting in 3 signals within 750 feet. The distance between Case Road and Barnett Road signalized intersections is substandard and the addition of another signalized intersection will impact capacity, flow, and safety on Ethanac Road (classified as an Expressway in both Perris and Menifee General Plans). In addition, there is a commercial driveway on the north side of Ethanac Road approximately 150 feet west of Case Road and approximately 35 feet west of Barnett Road which is substandard and creates

5.1

5.2

Bill Zimmerman Mayor	Dean Deines Mayor Pro Tem District 4	Bob Karwin Councilmember District 1	Ricky Estrada Councilmember District 2	Lesia A. Sobek Councilmember District 3	Armando G. Villa City Manager
--------------------------------	---	--	---	--	---

- significant safety issues. The project should either realign Green Valley Pkwy further to the west to align with Evans Road on the south side of Ethanac Road or realign Barnett Road on the south side of Ethanac Road to align with Case Road to the north to eliminate one signalized intersection within the 750' distance. By realigning Barnett to the east to align with Case also improves the substandard distance to the commercial driveway. 5.2
3. Please clarify how the fair share contribution was calculated for the realignment of the Ethanac / Barnett intersection. It seems inconsistent with the calculation used for the contribution being required of City of Menifee projects that are significantly further from the intersection and have significantly lower traffic impacts. 5.3
4. The following approved projects in the City of Menifee's jurisdiction are also in the immediate vicinity of this project:
- Ethanac Square (City of Menifee Planning Case No. PP / CUP 2017-060 – In Final Engineering (PM37289). 5.4
 - Ethanac and Barnett Warehouse project (City of Menifee Planning Case No. PP PLN21-0290 - Entitled).
- The applicant / developer should coordinate with the City of Menifee regarding these projects, to ensure that the recommendations in the Transportation Analysis do not conflict with the traffic recommendations for these City of Menifee projects.
5. The applicant / developer and the City of Perris should coordinate with Caltrans for the necessary right-of-way required for future interchange widening and improvements. 5.5
6. The applicant / developer should provide appropriate right-of-way dedication for the ultimate improvements along Ethanac Road. It should be noted that Ethanac Road is designated as a 6 to 8-Lane Divided Expressway in the Circulation Element of the City of Menifee's General Plan. 5.6
7. Section 4.10: Hydrology and Water Quality: Based on the information presented in this section, it is uncertain as to where the post-development flows will go and how they will be mitigated and treated. Please provide this information. There shall be no flows draining to the City of Menifee's MS4 facilities. 5.7



29844 Haun Rd. Menifee CA. 92586
(951) 672-6777 | Fax (951) 679-3843
cityofmenifee.us

We appreciate your consideration of these comments and thank you again for the opportunity to provide comments. If you have questions, please contact Doug Darnell, Principal Planner, at 951-723-3744 or by e-mail at ddarnell@cityofmenifee.us

Sincerely,

Cheryl Kitzerow

Cheryl Kitzerow, AICP
Community Development Director

- Cc: Kenneth Phung, City of Perris Director of Development Services
- Patricia Brenes, City of Perris Planning Manager
- Nick Fidler, City of Menifee Public Works Director
- Alberto Paiva, City of Menifee Public Works Deputy Director
- Orlando Hernandez, City of Menifee Deputy Community Development Director
- Doug Darnell, City of Menifee Principal Planner

Bill Zimmerman Mayor	Dean Deines Mayor Pro Tem District 4	Bob Karwin Councilmember District 1	Ricky Estrada Councilmember District 2	Lesa A. Sobek Councilmember District 3	Armando G. Villa City Manager
--------------------------------	---	--	---	---	---

Comment 5.1: The commenter states that a joint traffic study is underway for Ethanac Road and that a project-specific traffic study is “premature” and that the joint traffic study “must be completed first in order to master plan the entire Ethanac corridor.”

Response 5.1: The Project Traffic Analysis thoroughly and comprehensively addresses 24 area intersections, including multiple intersections along Ethanac Road. (EIR Addendum, Appendix G.) It also includes a list of detailed recommendations, including building out Ethanac Road to its ultimate half-width as an expressway (184-foot right-of-way) from Green Valley Parkway to the Project’s eastern boundary consistent with the City and GVSP standards. The Traffic Analysis specifies signalization and lane widening improvements along Ethanac Road which the Project would construct or pay its fair share towards. The Project Traffic Analysis is adequate and conforms to all industry and engineering best practices. There is no requirement to delay processing of the project based on a future, unadopted study. (See, e.g. State CEQA Guidelines Section 15125 [CEQA requires analysis of whether a project is inconsistent with applicable plans, which are defined by case law as those which have been adopted and are legally in effect].)

Further, the Project Traffic Analysis was prepared based on a scope of work approved by the City Engineer. On November 30, 2023, the traffic consultant contacted City of Menifee Planning Staff to obtain a current list of projects anticipated to contribute traffic to the study area intersections and to confirm that the information on the Menifee website contained the latest information available to use for the study. On December 5, 2023, Menifee Senior Planner Russell Brown confirmed that the information on the Menifee website contained the latest information available and was appropriate to use for the Project Traffic Analysis.

Comment 5.2: The commenter questions the location of a new traffic signal at Green Valley Parkway and Ethanac Road given the location of other nearby signals and commercial driveways. The commenter states that Green Valley Parkway should instead be realigned to the west to align with Evans Road or that Barnett Road should instead be realigned to the east to align with Case Road to eliminate one signalized intersection.

Response 5.2: The adopted Green Valley Specific Plan (GVSP) and recorded Final Map 24648 set the alignments for Green Valley Parkway and Case Road, which have been accounted for through median improvements already completed by the City of Perris along Ethanac Road at Green Valley Parkway. Final Map 24648 plainly depicts the approved alignment of Ethanac Road and its intersections with Green Valley Parkway, Case Road, Evans Road, and Barnett Road. Any proposed development south of Ethanac Road should account for recorded maps, existing rights-of-way, and existing improvements as part of any proposed improvements to Barnett Road, Evans Road, and Ethanac Road. Specifically, any potential realignment of Barnett Road with Case Road should be completed by future development proposals south of Ethanac Road adjacent to Barnett Road.

The installation of a signalized intersection at Green Valley Parkway and Ethanac Road was imposed as a mitigation measure in the GVSP Final EIR. The Perris Crossing Retail Center was conditioned on installing a traffic signal at Case Road/Ethanac Road. In addition, the GVSP Phase 1B approvals were conditioned on the installation of a traffic signal at Green Valley Parkway and Ethanac Road and payment of fair share contributions towards the traffic signals at Ethanac Road and Case Road.

The Proposed Project adheres to previous approvals for the GVSP, recorded Final Map 24648, and existing improvements to Ethanac Road, Case Road, and Green Valley Parkway. The traffic signal at Green Valley Parkway and Ethanac Road is not a new proposed intersection or signal. The signal is an identified improvement of the GVSP Final EIR and approved traffic mitigation. Engineering Condition No. 5 requires installation of the traffic signal if the necessary encroachment permit can be obtained from the City of Menifee and, if not, restricts traffic movement at this intersection to right-in/right-out, left-in only.

Comment 5.3: The commenter asks for a clarification of how the fair share contribution was calculated for the Ethanac/Barnett intersection, claiming it seems inconsistent with the fair share contribution of Menifee projects.

Response 5.3: A discussion of the fair share calculation methodology is contained in Section 2.7 of the Project Traffic Analysis. (EIR Addendum, Appendix G.) The Project’s fair share cost of improvements is determined based on the following equation, which is the ratio of Project traffic to new traffic, and new traffic less existing baseline traffic:

$$\text{Project Fair Share \%} = \frac{\text{Project AM/PM Traffic}}{(\text{EAPC}^1 (2026) \text{ AM/PM Total Traffic} - \text{Existing (2024) AM/PM Traffic})}$$

The Project fair share percentage was calculated for both the AM and PM peak hours and the highest of the two was selected.

The Project’s fair share impact to the Ethanac/Barnett intersection was calculated based on the above methodology and determined to be 7.3 percent. Engineering Condition No. 24 requires the Project applicant to pay this fair share cost towards improvements at the Ethanac/Barnett intersection.

Comment 5.4: The commenter requests clarification that the recommendations in the Traffic Analysis do not conflict with the Ethanac Square and Ethanac & Barnett Warehouse projects.

Response 5.4: As confirmed by City of Perris Engineering Staff, the recommendations in the Traffic Analysis do not conflict with the referenced projects.

Comment 5.5: The commenter states that the applicant and City should coordinate with Caltrans for the necessary right-of-way required for future interchange widening and improvements.

Response 5.5: Per the Project Traffic Analysis, the Project does not cause the need for any improvements to the highway interchanges. Improvements are identified as needed under Existing plus Ambient plus Cumulative conditions. The Project’s fair share contribution toward such improvements is listed in Table 1-3 of the Project Traffic Analysis.

Comment 5.6: The commenter states that the applicant should provide appropriate right-of-way dedication for the ultimate improvements along Ethanac Road.

Response 5.6: Per Engineering Condition No. 10, the Project would be conditioned to dedicate adequate right-of-way on Ethanac Road along the property frontage to accommodate a 104-foot half width dedicated right-of-way from Green Valley Parkway to the Project’s eastern boundary. The required improvements for the dedicated portion of Ethanac Road are specified in Engineering Condition No. 5.

Comment 5.7: The commenter questions where post-development flows will go and how they will be treated. The commenter states that no flows should drain to the City of Menifee’s MS4 facilities.

Response 5.7: As noted in the EIR Addendum, the Project would be subject to Mitigation Measure 4.3.3 from the GVSP Final EIR, which includes requirements to address site runoff, water quality, and erosion and sedimentation. In addition to the mitigation measure in the 1990 Final EIR, the EIR Addendum included Mitigation Measure HYDRO-1 as an update to portions of Mitigation Measure 4.3.3 from the GVSP Final EIR. Mitigation Measure HYDRO-1 requires implementation of a complete final drainage plan and adequate onsite storm drainage facilities. In addition, the Project would include the construction of an additional water quality

¹ “EAPC” refers to Existing plus Ambient plus Project plus Cumulative conditions.

basin, in addition to maintaining an existing water quality detention basin, thereby reducing the amount of runoff from the Project site. As such, Project stormwater runoff would be controlled onsite and would not drain to Menifee's MS4 facilities.

Comment Letter No. 6

Franco Pacheco, June 5, 2024

From: [Franco Pacheco](#)
To: [Nathan Perez](#); [Kenneth Phung](#); [Patricia Brenes](#)
Subject: Public hearing 6-5-24 item 6b public comment
Date: Wednesday, June 5, 2024 3:10:18 PM

Hello planning commission

My name is Franco Pacheco with Perris parents for clean air. I would like to raise concerns for case road mixed use project. This project needs to be revised with the industrial warehouse removed completely. Perris cannot support another warehouse in our area . It will be less that 400 ft If not less away from a planned residential community. If the developers can come back without the industrial aspect and more recreational and or commercial instead it would go a long way in getting our city back on track. I am requesting an independent Eir by a non biased third party be prepared. What will be the cumulative affects from an added influx of trucks once the site is operational? Will the warehouse be air conditioned for workers ? Will it provide long term jobs with a prevailing wage and benefits? Is there a tenant already ? Is this zoned for large industrial ? Will this affect the 30x30 plan? I recommend a motion to deny the warehouse part of this project.

6.1
6.2
6.3
6.4
6.5 &
6.6

Thank you
Franco Pacheco
Sent from my iPhone

Comment 6.1: The commenter expresses opposition to the Project based on the industrial building.

Response 6.1: This comment does not question the content or conclusions of the EIR Addendum. No response is required.

Comment 6.2: The commenter requests that an independent EIR be prepared by a non-biased third party.

Response 6.2: The Green Valley Specific Plan (GVSP) Final EIR was prepared by an environmental consultant under contract to the City of Perris. Because no new or substantially more severe significant environmental impacts were identified, an Addendum to that EIR was prepared by Ascent Environmental. Ascent is an expert environmental consulting firm that also prepared the previous Addendums to the GVSP Final EIR. Prior to publication of the EIR Addendum, the EIR Addendum and associated technical reports were reviewed consistency and accuracy by City staff and Cadence Environmental Consultants, the City's expert environmental consultant, and revisions and clarifications were made in response to Cadence's comments. This is expressly allowed under CEQA and is consistent with other development projects in the City of Perris. As such, the EIR Addendum reflects the City's independent judgment and analysis.

Comment 6.3: The commenter asks about the cumulative traffic impacts of the Project.

Response 6.3: The Project would result in approximately 17,069 fewer trips than were assumed to occur in the GVSP Final EIR. Thus, both Project and cumulative trips would be less than previously reported and approved. The detailed trip generation analysis is provided in the Trip Generation Memo provided as Appendix G to the EIR Addendum. In addition, a full analysis of existing plus ambient plus project plus cumulative conditions is provided in the Traffic Analysis attached as Appendix G to the EIR Addendum. It includes recommendations for improvements to area intersections which the Project would be obligated to pay its fair share contribution towards in accordance with Engineering Conditions of Approval.

Comment 6.4: The commenter raises questions about operational working conditions related to the industrial building.

Response 6.4: This comment pertains to potential working conditions at the proposed warehouse. It does not pertain to potential impacts on the environment and does not question the content or conclusions of the EIR Addendum. No response is required.

Comment 6.5: The commenter asks whether the site is zoned for the proposed industrial building.

Response 6.5: See Response 2.1.

Comment 6.6: The commenter asks whether the Project will affect the 30 x 30 plan.

Response 6.6: In October 2020, Governor Newsom issued Executive Order No. N-28-20, which establishes a state goal of conserving 30% of California's lands and coastal waters by 2030. The 30 x 30 goal is intended to help accelerate conservation of state lands and coastal waters through voluntary, collaborative action with partners across the state to: conserve and restore biodiversity, expand access to nature, and mitigate and build resilience to climate change. The Project site is planned and zoned for commercial and industrial uses. It is not identified as a conservation opportunity site as part of the 30 x 30 goal. Thus, the Project would not impact or affect the 30 x 30 plan.

Comment Letter No. 7

Victoria Carmena, June 5, 2024

From: [Victoria Camarena](#)
To: [Nathan Perez](#); [Patricia Brenes](#); [Kenneth Phung](#)
Subject: Item 6B
Date: Wednesday, June 5, 2024 4:02:19 PM

Good afternoon,

I am writing in regards to item 6B on tonight's agenda. With another warehouse project being presented to the planning commission, I would like to reiterate my stance on the development of warehouses in the city of Perris and surrounding unincorporated areas.

This city is currently overwhelmed with warehouses. Again, the traffic here is only getting worse. The jobs offered by these warehouses are not sustainable nor are they safe for workers. The air quality in Perris is terrible, making those with asthma or allergies have exacerbated symptoms. The risks of developing cancer from diesel emissions is a real concern, especially with the amount of warehouses already in the city.

7.1

I don't appreciate how little these developers are offering when they are choosing to go forward with projects that are detrimental to our community and our quality of life. Although a mixed use project is better than just one big warehouse, it seems that we are still only being offered crumbs. I would like to see this area have more to offer. I don't want a warehouse taking over most of that space. It would be nice to see a bigger shopping center or some dine-in restaurants. Maybe even a theater, since we recently lost the one we had. I'd like to see these developers take the time to research this city and come up with proposals that will enhance Perris. We do not need nor want any more warehouses.

7.2

7.3

Thank you,

Victoria Camarena

Comment 7.1: The commenter states opposition to the Project based on air quality, traffic, and health risk.

Response 7.1: See Response 2.2 and Response 4.2.

Comment 7.2: The commenter questions the community benefits afforded by the Project.

Response 7.2: See Response 2.3.

Comment 7.3: The commenter express opposition to the industrial portion of the Project and requests more dine-in restaurants or a theater.

Response 7.3: This comment expresses opposition to the Project and a request of the commenter. The comment does not question the content or conclusions of the Addendum. No response is required.

Comment Letter No. 8

Silvia Tercero, June 5, 2024

From: [Silvia Tercero](#)
To: [Kenneth Phung](#); [Nathan Perez](#); [Patricia Brenes](#)
Subject: Case Road Mixed-Use Project
Date: Wednesday, June 5, 2024 5:19:10 PM

Dear Members of the Planning Division,

My name is Silvia Tercero and I am a current resident of Perris. I have been looking over the plans for the Case Road Mixed-Use Project, item 6B in today's Planning Commission agenda, and I wanted to bring to your attention a few of the issues I have found regarding this project.

It is unclear whether there has been an updated Environmental Impact Report (EIR) since the original assessment in 1990. Given the proximity of future residents, located just 400 feet away, and the potential cumulative impacts on the city, it is imperative that a recent EIR be conducted to accurately assess environmental impacts.

8.1

Additionally, the project fails to align with the objectives outlined in the Green Valley Specific Plan Amendment 2, which emphasizes a mixed residential and commercial community. Specifically, the inclusion of a 500,000 square foot warehouse contradicts the plan's emphasis on commercial and multi-family uses within walking distance of the South Perris Metrolink Station (1.5 under "Design Objectives" Page 1-7) . If the warehouse is built, it will be an inefficient use of walkable commercial space for future Green Valley residents.

8.2

I also have concerns regarding the proposed inclusion of two drive-thrus in the project. Our city would greatly benefit from a more diverse array of dining options. Drive-thru franchises often specialize in fast food from large chains, which may not align with our community's desire for healthier and more unique culinary experiences. Instead, we could advocate for restaurant spaces that prioritize traditional table service, nurturing a culture of local ownership and fostering walkable dining experiences for the future residents of Green Valley.

8.3

Overall, this lot of land has great potential for commercial activity due to its proximity to a transit station, freeway, and future homes. Why not instead advocate for a walkable shopping/recreational center for the future residents of this area? As you may know, walkability is a good investment for our community— walkable shopping centers not only increase property values for residents but also increase tax revenue for the city. With more foot traffic and business activity, there's a greater flow of revenue from local sales taxes, which can be allocated towards essential services such as education, infrastructure, and public safety. By advocating for and prioritizing the development of walkable shopping centers, the city not only enhances the quality of life for its residents but also cultivates a thriving economic ecosystem that benefits everyone.

8.4

I urge the planning commission to reconsider this project and deny the Conditional Use Permit for the industrial warehouse component. With its commercial potential, this land should be revisited to prioritize developments that align with the community's needs and vision.

8.5

Thank you,
-Silvia Tercero

Comment 8.1: The commenter contends that a new EIR should be completed to accurately assess environmental impacts.

Response 8.1: See Response 2.2.

Comment 8.2: The commenter questions whether the Project is consistent with the Green Valley Specific Plan.

Response 8.2: See Response 2.1.

Comment 8.3: The commenter expresses the view that the Project should include more dine-in restaurants.

Response 8.3: This comment expresses an opinion of the commenter. The comment does not question the content or conclusions of the EIR Addendum. No response is required.

Comment 8.4: The commenter expresses the view that the Project should be developed as a walkable shopping/recreational center for future residents of the area.

Response 8.4: The Project has been designed to allow for the safe and convenient movement of pedestrians, bicyclists, and motorists. The comment does not question the content or conclusions of the EIR Addendum. No further response is required.

Comment 8.5: The commenter expresses the view that the mixed-use development Project be denied based on the industrial building.

Response 8.5: This comment expresses an opinion of the commenter. The comment does not question the content or conclusions of the Addendum. No response is required.

Comment Letter No. 9

Humberto Flores, June 5, 2024

From: [Humberto Flores](#)
To: [Nathan Perez](#); [Patricia Brenes](#); kpjung@cityofperris.org
Subject: Do Not Approve the Proposed Warehouse.
Date: Wednesday, June 5, 2024 5:43:21 PM

Hello,

I am a doctoral student who studies environmental racism and accepting the proposed warehouse is environmental racism, It will affect my family, friends, communities, and I. I hope that you do the right thing and not approve it.

9.1

Best,

Humberto Flores
Doctoral Student
Department of Sociology
UC Santa Barbara

Comment 9.1: The commenter asks that the Project be denied based on allegations that the industrial portion of the Project is environmental racism.

Response 9.1: This comment expresses an opinion of the commenter. The comment does not question the content or conclusions of the EIR Addendum. No response is required.

Comment Letter No. 10

Karla Cervantes, June 5, 2024

From: [Karla Cervantes](#)
To: [Nathan Perez](#)
Subject: Warehouse project Case Road Mixed Use
Date: Wednesday, June 5, 2024 6:19:26 PM

Hi my name is Karla Cervantes I'm a member of Perris Parents for Clean Air. I saw this project being presented and I strongly oppose it. We have a hue issue with warehouse pollution In Perris and in Riverside county. What will be the cumulative damages of this warehouse? what will be the gain for residents other than crappy warehouse jobs? what will be the chemicals coming in and out of that facility? how will those chemicals effect residents?	10.1
will there be union jobs at this project? how will this affect property value in the area? will there be trees that are specifically for carbon control emission? We know the affects of PM2.5 are harmful. how will this project mitigate the emissions caused by the trucks going in and out of this facility?	10.2
	10.3

Comment 10.1: The commenter states opposition to the Project based on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, and health risk.

Response 10.1: See Response 2.2 and Response 4.2.

Comment 10.2: The commenter questions how the Project will affect property values and if the Project will employ union labor.

Response 10.2: This comment pertains to property values and employment conditions. Economic factors including property values and employment conditions do not pertain to potential impacts on the environment under the California Environmental Quality Act. As such, this comment does not question the content or conclusions of the EIR Addendum. No response is required.

Comment 10.3: The commenter raises questions about air quality impacts and mitigation.

Response 10.3: See Response 2.2 and Response 4.2.

Comment Letter No. 11

Natalie Solares, June 5, 2024

From: [Natalie](#)
To: [Nathan Perez](#); [Patricia Brenes](#); kphun@cityofperris.org
Subject: City resident in opposition of 'mixed use' project in South Perris
Date: Wednesday, June 5, 2024 7:27:10 PM

Good evening Perris Planning Commission,

My name is Natalie Solares, I live in South Perris on 6th street, and I am in opposition to the approval of the 'mixed use' project in South Perris. The City already has too many warehouses and it has been a pattern to see approval of projects that end up being for warehouse development only.

The City of Perris deserves better and approving warehouses will only continue to worsen the health of our kids. Please don't approve this project. The City of Perris needs more green spaces than warehouses. The City of Perris does not need to contribute anymore to the air pollution that impacts the City because of the warehouse semi-trucks and worker vehicles.

Thank you,
Natalie Solares

11.1

Comment 11.1: The commenter states her opposition to the Project based on air quality and health risk.

Response 11.1: This comment expresses an opinion of the commenter. See Response 2.2 and Response 4.2.

Comment Letter No. 12

(Jesse) Adam Carrillo, June 4, 2024

From: [Adam Carrillo](#)
To: [Nathan Perez](#)
Subject: Finalization
Date: Tuesday, June 4, 2024 9:41:24 PM

Good afternoon,

My name is Jesse and I am a resident here in Perris, California. I strongly disagree with another warehouse being built in the city of Perris the pollution, the air. The environment is bad for the resident here. I also believe that this warehouse will be built closer to homes that are being built , we have to take consideration of those who live in those houses all the noise that they will encounter . There should be no more warehouses built. please look around you and understand as a resident here there's more traffic, more trailers all around on Ramona express going towards Moreno Valley and so forth. These warehouse buildings have to stop. I am a union carpenter myself, and I understand that we build warehouses however I disagree with more being built I'd rather be able to have clean air around my environment around our kids. As a resident here, I please ask you to deny this project and allow more restaurants, entertainment around the area , grocery stores to be built I have to drive about 15 minutes just to go to a grocery store. We should do better for our city. Also improving and having more light posts in the streets, we should be making our city look beautiful , instead we're making it look horrible and a Ghost Town.

Sent from my iPhone

12.1

12.2

Comment 12.1: The commenter states opposition to the Project based on air pollution, traffic, and noise.

Response 12.1: See Response 2.2, Response 4.2, and Response 4.3.

Comment 12.2: The commenter asks that the mixed-use development project be denied based on the industrial building.

Response 12.2: This comment expresses a request of the commenter. The comment does not question the content or conclusions of the EIR Addendum. No response is required.

**RESPONSE TO COMMENTS
CASE ROAD MIXED-USE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT**

Comment Letter No. 13

Amy McNeill, Engineering Project Manager, Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District, July 30, 2024

JASON E. UHLEY
General Manager-Chief Engineer



1995 MARKET STREET
RIVERSIDE, CA 92501
951.955.1200
951.788.9965 FAX
www.rcflood.org

RIVERSIDE COUNTY FLOOD CONTROL
AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT

July 30, 2024

257267

City of Perris
Planning Department
135 North D Street
Perris, CA 92570

Attention: Nathan Perez

Re: VPM 23-05059 (PM 38814), CUP 23-05047,
CUP 23-05208, CUP 23-05210,
DPR 23-00013 and DPR 23-00014,
APNs 327-220-012 and 327-220-044

The Riverside County Flood Control and Water Conservation District (District) does not normally recommend conditions for land divisions or other land use cases in incorporated cities. The District also does not plan check City land use cases or provide State Division of Real Estate letters or other flood hazard reports for such cases. District comments/recommendations for such cases are normally limited to items of specific interest to the District including District Master Drainage Plan facilities, other regional flood control and drainage facilities which could be considered a logical component or extension of a master plan system, and District Area Drainage Plan fees (development mitigation fees). In addition, information of a general nature is provided.

13.1

The District's review is based on the above-referenced project transmittal, received July 25, 2024. The District **has not** reviewed the proposed project in detail, and the following comments do not in any way constitute or imply District approval or endorsement of the proposed project with respect to flood hazard, public health and safety, or any other such issue:

- This project would not be impacted by District Master Drainage Plan facilities, nor are other facilities of regional interest proposed.
- This project involves District proposed Master Drainage Plan facilities, namely, Romoland Master Drainage Plan Line A-13. The District will accept ownership of such facilities on written request by the City. The Project Applicant shall enter into a cooperative agreement establishing the terms and conditions of inspection, operation, and maintenance with the District and any other maintenance partners. Facilities must be constructed to District standards, and District plan check and inspection will be required for District acceptance. Plan check, inspection, and administrative fees will be required. All regulatory permits (and all documents pertaining thereto, e.g., Habitat Mitigation and Monitoring Plans, Conservation Plans/Easements) that are to be secured by the Applicant for both facility construction and maintenance shall be submitted to the District for review. The regulatory permits' terms and conditions shall be approved by the District prior to improvement plan approval, map recordation, or finalization of the regulatory permits. There shall be no unreasonable constraint upon the District's ability to operate and maintain the flood control facility(ies) to protect public health and safety.
- This project proposes channels, storm drains larger than 36 inches in diameter, or other facilities that could be considered regional in nature and/or a logical extension a District's facility, the District would consider accepting ownership of such facilities on written request by the City. The Project Applicant shall enter into a cooperative agreement establishing the terms and conditions of inspection, operation, and maintenance with the District and any other maintenance partners. Facilities must be constructed to District standards, and District plan check and inspection will be required for District acceptance. Plan check, inspection, and administrative fees will be required. The regulatory permits' terms and conditions shall be approved by the District prior to improvement plan approval, map recordation, or finalization of

13.2

City of Perris

- 2 -

July 30, 2024

Re: VPM 23-05059 (PM 38814), CUP 23-05047,
CUP 23-05208, CUP 23-05210,
DPR 23-00013 and DPR 23-00014,
APNs 327-220-012 and 327-220-044

257267

the regulatory permits. There shall be no unreasonable constraint upon the District's ability to operate and maintain the flood control facility(ies) to protect public health and safety.

This project is located within the limits of the District's Perris Valley San Jacinto River Homeland/Romoland Line A Homeland/Romoland Line B Area Drainage Plan for which drainage fees have been adopted. If the project is proposing to create additional impervious surface area, applicable fees should be paid (in accordance with the Rules and Regulations for Administration of Area Drainage Plans) to the Flood Control District or City prior to issuance of grading or building permits. Fees to be paid should be at the rate in effect at the time of issuance of the actual permit.

13.3

An encroachment permit shall be obtained for any construction related activities occurring within District right of way or facilities, namely, Romoland Master Drainage Plan Line A-13 and Romoland Master Drainage Plan Line A. If a proposed storm drain connection exceeds the hydraulic performance of the existing drainage facilities, mitigation will be required. For further information, contact the District's Encroachment Permit Section at 951.955.1266.

13.4

The District's previous comments dated June 7, 2024 are still valid.

13.5

GENERAL INFORMATION

This project may require a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit from the State Water Resources Control Board. Clearance for grading, recordation, or other final approval should not be given until the City has determined that the project has been granted a permit or is shown to be exempt.

If this project involves a Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) mapped floodplain, then the City should require the applicant to provide all studies, calculations, plans, and other information required to meet FEMA requirements, and should further require the applicant obtain a Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLOMR) prior to grading, recordation, or other final approval of the project and a Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) prior to occupancy.

The project proponent shall bear the responsibility for complying with all applicable mitigation measures defined in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) document (i.e., Negative Declaration, Mitigated Negative Declaration, Environmental Impact Report) and/or Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, if a CEQA document was prepared for the project. The project proponent shall also bear the responsibility for complying with all other federal, state, and local environmental rules and regulations that may apply.

13.6

If a natural watercourse or mapped floodplain is impacted by this project, the City should require the applicant to obtain a Section 1602 Agreement from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife and a Clean Water Act Section 404 Permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, or written correspondence from these agencies indicating the project is exempt from these requirements. A Clean Water Act Section 401 Water Quality Certification may be required from the local California Regional Water Quality Control Board prior to issuance of the Corps 404 permit.

Very truly yours,



AMY MCNEILL
Engineering Project Manager

Attachment

EM:blj

Comment 13.1: The commenter provides general information with respect to limiting its comments on specific items within the District's purview, acknowledges that the District has not reviewed the project in detail and does not plan check City land use cases, and clarifies that the comments do not constitute endorsements or approvals.

Response 13.1: The commenter's general background information is noted. Since the comment does not question the content or conclusions of the EIR Addendum, no further response is required.

Comment 13.2: The commenter indicates that the project involves District proposed Master Drainage Plan facilities, namely, Romoland Master Drainage Plan Line A-13. The District indicates that it will accept ownership of such facilities on written request by the City and that the Project Applicant shall enter into a cooperative agreement establishing the terms and conditions of inspection, operation, and maintenance with the District and any other maintenance partners. Additionally, the comment states that facilities must be constructed to District standards, and District plan check and inspection will be required for District acceptance. Plan check, inspection, and administrative fees will be required, and all regulatory permits are to be secured by the Applicant and shall be submitted to the District for review. Furthermore, the District has approval authority over regulatory permit terms and conditions, which shall be secured prior to improvement plan approval, map recordation, or finalization of the regulatory permits. Finally, the District requires that operation and maintenance of the flood control facility to protect public health and safety shall not be constrained.

Response 13.2: The commenter's identification of the project involving Romoland Master Drainage Plan Line A-13 is acknowledged. All District requirements will be adhered to by the applicant and the City during design, permitting, construction, and operation. Since the comment does not question the content or conclusions of the EIR Addendum, no further response is required.

Comment 13.3: The commenter indicates that the project is located within the limits of the District's San Jacinto River Drainage Plan and that applicable drainage fees shall be paid prior to issuance of grading or building permits.

Response 13.3: The commenter's identification of the project within the San Jacinto River Drainage Plan area is acknowledged. Applicable drainage fees will be paid by the applicant prior to issuance of grading or building permits. All District requirements will be adhered to by the applicant and the City during design, permitting, construction, and operation. Since the comment does not question the content or conclusions of the EIR Addendum, no further response is required.

Comment 13.4: The commenter indicates that an encroachment permit shall be obtained for any construction related activities occurring within District right of way or facilities, namely, Romoland Master Drainage Plan Line A-13 and Romoland Master Drainage Plan Line A. Additionally, the comment states that mitigation would be required if a proposed storm drain connection exceeds the hydraulic performance of the existing drainage facilities.

Response 13.4: The commenter's identification of requirements to obtain an encroachment permit for construction activities within the Romoland Master Drainage Plan Line A-13 and Line A is acknowledged. An encroachment permit will be obtained prior to issuance of a grading or building permit for the Project. Drainage will be designed to be within the hydraulic capacity of the existing drainage facilities. All District requirements will be adhered to by the applicant and the City during design, permitting, construction, and operation. Since the comment does not question the content or conclusions of the EIR Addendum, no further response is required.

Comment 13.5: The commenter states that the District's previous comments dated June 7, 2024 are still valid.

Response 13.5: The commenter's previous comments dated June 7, 2024, which are the same as comments in this letter, are acknowledged. Comments have been addressed accordingly.

Comment 13.6: The commenter provides general information regarding National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit, Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) floodplain mapping, and natural watercourse permitting requirements, and notes that the project proponent shall comply with all CEQA mitigation measures and other regulatory requirements.

Response 13.6: The commenter's identification of permitting requirements is acknowledged. The project proponent will comply with applicable permit requirements and obtain any necessary permits prior to issuance of a grading or building permit. Additionally, an EIR Addendum was prepared for the Project, which identified mitigation measures to reduce potentially significant impacts. The project applicant will be required to implement all feasible mitigation measures identified in the EIR Addendum. Since the comment does not question the content or conclusions of the EIR Addendum, no further response is required.