

Date: February 2, 2026
Prepared by: Meaghan Truman, Senior Environmental Planner
To: Albert Armijo, City of Perris
Site: Harvest Landing Retail Center and Business Park Project
Subject: **Responses to Karla Cervantes, Letter L3**

This memo contains responses to comments related to the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) that the City of Perris received on December 17, 2025, prior to the City's City Council meeting on February 11, 2026 for which the Project is on the agenda.

As further detailed in the individual responses to comments below, none of the comments indicate that there would be a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified environmental impact that would not be mitigated, or that there would be any of the other circumstances requiring recirculation as described in CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5. No new significant environmental impact would result from the Project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented, there is no substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact, no feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed would lessen the environmental impacts of the proposed Project, and the EIR is not fundamentally inadequate and conclusory in nature.

Letter L3: Karla Cervantes (2 pages) Late Comment letter

From: Karla Cervantes <karla.cervantes@sierraclub.org>
Sent: Wednesday, December 17, 2025 8:49 AM
To: Albert Armijo <aarmijo@CityofPerris.org>
Subject: Harvest Landing

Hello,

I am writing a letter in opposition of the project "Harvest Landing".
The current plan of this does include a structure described as a parcel hub which would fall into the category of a distribution center. There is also concerns on how this project is being introduced in phases as if it's a separate project which is confusing to residents. There should be a presentation on the project as a whole in order to understand the environmental impacts. Due to the project being proposed in phases, this development asks that the Planning Commission only evaluate a part of the project that will omit industrial development that will be included in the overall project plan. The City of Perris and its residents have made it clear that they do not want or need any more logistics and warehouses in their City. There are also concerns on how this project will affect the traffic in the neighboring community of Mead

L3.1

L3.2

L3.3

Valley which currently has the highest amount of diesel trucks per capita in the Inland Empire. Perris comes close to Mead Valley and it is in the top 5 areas of concern in the region for air quality due to the truck emissions. There are current studies that show children and elderly in the City of Perris have a higher percentage of asthma and respiratory illnesses in comparison to 15 years ago.

L3.3 cont.

L3.4

AB98 will also be taking effect on January 1st, 2026 and the City's current truck routes can not support logistics in the area being proposed for the different phases. I urge you all to vote no on this project due to these reasons.

L3.5

Respectfully,

--

Karla Cervantes

(she/her)

San Geronimo Chapter Coordinator

Karla.Cervantes@sierraclub.org



Response to Letter L3: Karla Cervantes, dated December 17, 2025

This comment letter was received after the Draft EIR public review and comment period ended on July 14, 2025. As stated in Section 15088 of the CEQA Guidelines, Lead Agencies are not required to respond to letters received outside of the noticed comment period. However, the following responses have been prepared to provide clarity regarding the environmental concerns that have been raised and to enhance the administrative record for consideration of the Project by the City of Perris City Council.

Comment L3.1: This comment states the commenter's opposition to the Project and that the current plan includes a parcel hub which would be considered a distribution center.

Response L3.1: This comment expresses the commenter's opposition to the proposed Project and is incorrect in stating that a parcel hub "would fall into the category of a distribution center." Parcel hubs are operationally different from traditional warehouses or distribution centers and are better aligned with the intent of the Specific Plan Mixed Business Use (MBU) designation. Parcel hubs function as last-mile facilities with smaller service areas, higher percentage of passenger vehicles, shorter truck trips, and fewer heavy-duty truck movements, whereas large warehouse or distribution centers have a higher percentage of truck trips and longer haul trips. Allowing parcel hubs supports local and regional delivery needs, compared to conventional warehouse uses, including distribution centers, which are more focused on larger regional, national, and even international delivery needs. Therefore, the local and smaller regional focus of parcel hubs make them more appropriate within the MBU area compared to general warehouse use, including distribution centers, and in conformance with the City's moratorium. In addition, the proposed plans have been reviewed by the City Planning Department for consistency with the City's moratorium. Thus, no further response is warranted.

Comment L3.2: This comment expresses the commenter's concern that the introduction of the Project in phases is confusing to residents and states that the Project should be present in its entirety to allow for a full understanding of the environmental impacts. This comment also states that phasing results in the Planning Commission evaluating only a portion of the Project, omitting industrial development included in the overall Project plan, and states that the City of Perris and its residents do not want or need more logistics and warehouses.

Response L3.2: There is no phase within the Specific Plan that proposes warehouse uses as it is no longer an allowed use within the proposed Specific Plan Amendment. The Draft EIR includes analysis of the two phases of construction of the Specific Plan but analyzes all potential environmental impacts from buildout of the Project as a whole. The Phase 1 area of the Specific Plan would include a 139.89-acre business park, 22.16-acre community shopping center, 24.33-acre commercial big box retail store, a 12.91-acre water quality basin, and 36.5 acres of roadway improvements. Construction and operation of the Phase 1 development is analyzed at a project level within the Draft EIR.

There is no proposed development within Phase 2. Buildout of the Phase 2 future development area would occur pursuant to future site plan applications, which would each undergo review by the City of Perris Planning Division. In order to provide a conservative estimate of potential environmental impacts, the maximum allowed development intensity for the Phase 2 buildout of 4,007,955 square feet is analyzed in the Draft EIR.

As mentioned on Final EIR page 3-47, the proposed Specific Plan Amendment would not allow warehouse uses. The Draft EIR still analyzes the impacts of potential warehouses being developed onsite in order to provide the most conservative analysis of the development of the Project site. No warehouses would be permitted without a future Specific Plan Amendment, which would trigger additional discretionary review and further CEQA analysis.

Comment L3.3: This comment expresses the commenter's concern that the Project would affect traffic in Mead Valley which has the highest amount of diesel trucks per capita in the Inland Empire.

Response L3.3: The comment does not raise a specific issue with the adequacy of the Draft EIR. Impacts related to transportation and traffic are discussed in Section 5.16, *Transportation*, on pages 5.16-17 through 5.16-33 of the Draft EIR. The existing truck routes that currently serve the Project vicinity, and which would be used by the proposed Project, include Frontage Road, Indian Avenue, and Placentia Avenue including the I-215 interchanges at Harley Knox Boulevard and Placentia Avenue. Trucks accessing the Project site would turn east after exiting the I215 freeway onto Placentia Avenue and then turn onto Frontage Street or Indian Avenue. No trucks accessing the Project site would turn into Mead Valley. Because this comment does not express any specific concern or question regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR, no further response is required or provided.

Comment L3.4: This comment states that Perris is among the top five areas of concern in the region for air quality due to truck emissions and states that current studies show higher rates of asthma and respiratory illnesses in children compared to 15 years ago.

Response L3.4: The comment does not raise a specific issue with the adequacy of the Draft EIR. Impacts related to air quality and health risk are discussed in Section 5.3, *Air Quality*, on pages 5.3-29 through 5.3-76 of the Draft EIR. For project-specific and cumulative health risk impacts, the South Coast AQMD utilizes a cancer risk significance threshold of 10 in 1 million. To ensure that both Phase 1 and Phase 2 impacts would be less than significant, Mitigation Measure AQ-20 requires either: a minimum 1,000-foot setback between building loading docks and the residential development east of Barrett Avenue and between Val Verde Elementary School to any future MBU development on the Phase 2 block east of Indian Avenue; restriction of diesel powered trucks accessing any future MBU development on the Phase 2 block east of Indian Avenue; or preparation of a site-specific health risk analysis prior to approval of any future MBU development on the Phase 2 block east of Indian Avenue demonstrating that significant cancer risk impacts could be avoided without implementation of setbacks or diesel truck restrictions. As shown in Draft EIR Table 5.3-47, with implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-20 and Mitigation Measure AQ-8 (limiting idling to 3 minutes), the cancer risk would be reduced to 5.74 in one million without the Overlay and 7.05 in one million with the Overlay, which would not exceed the South Coast AQMD project level and cumulative significance threshold of 10 in one million. Because this comment does not express any specific concern or question regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR, no further response is required or provided.

Comment L3.5: This comment states that AB 98 will take effect on January 1st, 2026, and states that the City's truck routes cannot support logistic uses in the area proposed for the Project. This comment urges decisions makers to vote no on the Project.

Response L3.5: Assembly Bill (AB) 98 introduced Government Code section 65098 which includes Section 65098.1.5(c), that states, "this chapter shall not apply to any logistics projects that were subject to a commenced local entitlement process prior to September 30, 2024." The proposed Project entered the local entitlement process with the City of Perris prior to September 30, 2024. Therefore, pursuant to Government Code Section 65098.1.6(a), the requirements established by AB 98 do not apply to the proposed Project, and the Project is not required to comply with these statutes.

Additionally, this comment expresses the commenter's opinion and opposition to the proposed Project. The comment does not raise a specific issue with the adequacy of the Draft EIR. Because the comment does not express any specific concern or question regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR, no further response is required or provided.