

From: skydiveperrispat@aol.com
To: [Nathan Perez](#)
Subject: PLN 22-05046, DPR 22-0005 CUP 23-05107
Date: Wednesday, November 1, 2023 1:55:28 PM
Attachments: [Letter to Mr. Perez & City Planning PLN 22-05046 DRP- 22-00005 CUP 23-05107 10-31-23.pdf](#)

Mr. Perez, Issues I see that need to be addressed regarding the EIR for the proposed project. I'm sure there will be many more comments to follow as this will definitely jeopardize the safety of the airport and its patrons if built as proposed. Thank you, Patrick Conatser,

10-31-2023

Mr. Perez, Commissioners and Staff- Regarding Perris Airport Logistics Center PLN 22-05046, DPR 22-00005, CUP 23-05107

My name is Patrick Conatser I am the co-owner and manager of the Perris Valley Public Airport (L-65) and I am opposed the project as proposed and here are a few examples of EIR concerns.

Why is the project named "Perris Airport Logistics Center" it has nothing to do with the airport other than to endanger it and its customers. We at the airport don't like the use of what we consider our name. Unless their intent is to build around the airport so close that it forces us to close for safety and take the runway to use for airfreight.

My family and I have been the custodians and owners of The Perris Valley Airport, a Public Use Airport, for almost 50 years. With that goes the responsibility to protect the Safety of the Public. A Public that may be flying in an airplane or parachuting from one. The proposed development impinges on that responsibility and in the event of an accident or incident, you can be sure that the developer and the City will be subject to liability from many sources for all the reasons outlined. Therefore, the EIR must address issues related to the continued safety of flight and that of parachute activity in all applicable categories of the evaluation.

Some examples from the Notice of Preparation dated 10-20-2023:

On page 2 discusses water runoff and indicates that drainage will be to a storm drain and associated water basins. reference is made to bird attractions. The proposed development includes two water basins and landscaping that serve as bird attractants. Birds and aircraft do not mix, and when birds are in proximity to an airport, the results can be deadly. This aspect of compatibility with existing land uses needs to be fully addressed in the EIR.

Page 2 indicates that drainage will be into a storm drain on airport property. The fact that the airport is all in floodplain and a floodway and already a low point. How can you drain a table? We are concerned about the additional water standing and otherwise and our existing pavement and runway areas. That needs to be fully addressed in the EIR.

Something that must be addressed as well is I regards to runoff is runoff from the Wind as well and the Turbulent Effect on the runway and parachute landing areas. Turbulent effects that are potentially dangerous and deadly. With the help of experts and extensive wind analysis the project must be designed with Public Aviation Safety in mind. Currently, based upon preliminary results the project will have a severe negative impact upon the Publics Safety. This should be fully addressed in the EIR.

Regarding comments concerning: The Airport Comprehensive Land Use Compatibility Plan that Johnson Aviation was hired by the City to help develop, the applicants expert, on page 2, we believe that the FAA erred in classifying the Perris Airport as having a Utility Runway. A utility runway is intended to serve small aircraft. We are, in fact, Larger than a utility runway given the aircraft that operate from and are based at Perris. Examples being DC-3s, our DC-9, an 80 passenger Jet aircraft and many Military Aircraft like USMC Ospreys, CH 56 helicopters and Canadian Military Buffalo. Most of these aircraft are used for military training and active at the Airport. This results in a Wider FAR Part 77 Primary Surface than that used by the FAA in their obstruction analysis of the proposed structures. The Wider Primary Surface increases the

extent of the penetration of the FAR Part 77 transitional surface by nearly 18' and therefore some building points first determined Not to penetrate this surface now Do penetrate it, and others penetrate by an additional 18'. We are bringing this to the FAA and their miscalculation may affect their current finding of no hazard. The ALUC is also being advised when we meet with them. We believe the plan is outdated and needs revision. The EIR should investigate this matter fully.

Page 2 indicates that there are no historical sites near the proposed development. I would think that the Perris Valley Airport that was dedicated by the Perris Valley Chamber of Commerce on October 8, 1933, and has been in the same location for 90 years is a Historical Part of The City of Perris and the Inland Empire. We believe the Perris Valley Airport is a historical site as an airport and a skydiving facility. This aspect should be considered in the EIR.

Page 3 states that the Airport is used primarily for recreation-based flights. That is far from the truth. Although recreational flight activity occurs at the Airport, the predominant use is in support of skydiving activity for our Military Training, then Recreational, Commercial & Movie Production and a Public Airport although privately owned, open to the Public. Open to the Public for many different business-related uses. We do approximately 120,000 jumps annually and thousands of aircraft operations with our larger aircraft, which are those primarily utilized by our military. We are a busy Public Airport. The EIR should evaluate the types and extent of all aviation activity at the Airport. (We can provide data that is not classified.)

Page 4 indicates that there are no apparent end users of the proposed project. Well, why is it being built in the first place? The EIR should establish that the proposed project fulfills a defined need and purpose and not be built on speculation. Further, its economic impact on the City and its Citizens should be evaluated in the EIR. (We are a major employer for Perris and support many local families averaging anywhere from 160 to 200 employees regularly.)

Page 5 discusses an existing utility easement that runs through the Airport property. Yes, there were utility easements granted when we purchased the property, but this is a Public-Use Runway and there are many potential issues that can arise if this easement is accessed for construction such as closure of the runway during construction. The use of the easements should be addressed together with their impacts in the EIR.

Page 6 mentions lighting. The EIR should define the location, elevation and type of these lights. They may require notification to the FAA for their obstruction analysis. Any glare from these lights on aviation activity should also be addressed in the EIR. We do operate at night; we do have runway lights primarily for Military training. Training safety can be affected by the addition of parking lot and other lighting affecting the nighttime navigation of parachutes and pilots to their assigned landing areas on airport property. The use of night vision goggles will be impaired causing potential safety problems. These lighting impacts should be evaluated fully in the EIR.

An additional impact is that the project proposes to remove trees along Ellis Road. Trees that have been there close to 100 years. These trees have provided two safety features for the Airport and the community. One being that they are a natural blast fence for aircraft, jet and otherwise to keep cars and pedestrians from being impacted by jet blast when an aircraft is taking off on Runway 15. and Second is that the trees serve as an indicator for the electrical wires that run along Ellis Road. Not to mention trees are becoming in short supply and dirty trucks are in abundance. This will need to be fully addressed in the EIR.

We being landowners understand the applicants' needs and desires to build out their property and are not opposed to development. We just would like to see a project that is compatible with the airport and the flying Public. Maybe something smaller and further from the runway and landing areas, but that's for the experts to decide. Safety is our primary concern, we have been in Perris as a family business since 1976 and would like the family to be here another almost 50 years.

I greatly appreciate your diligence in this matter and thank you for your time and allowing my input to the scope of the proposed project.

Patrick Conatser

Perris Valley Airport
2091 Goetz. Rd. Perris Ca. 92570
951-203-5668