

**Date:** February 3, 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 Inland Valley Alliance for Environmental Justice, Letter L7**

---

This memo contains responses to comments related to the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) that the City of Perris received on December 15, 2025, prior to the City’s City Council meeting on February 11, 2026 for which the Project is on the agenda. It should be noted that similar comments have been previously submitted in a comment letter to the Draft EIR, and responded to in the Final EIR, as detailed below.

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 L7: Franco Pacheco (6 pages) Late Comment letter**



---

**From:** Franco <inlandvalleyalliance@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, December 16, 2025 4:47 PM  
**To:** Albert Armijo <aarmijo@CityofPerris.org>; City Clerk <CityClerk@cityofperris.org>  
**Subject:** Re: public comment harvest landing item 6a

Can I get a receipt that the planning commission has received this public comment for Wednesdays planning commission meeting and it has been sent to the commissioners ?

Franco Pacheco  
Inland Valley Alliance for Environmental Justice



<https://www.inlandvalleyalliance.org/>

On Mon, Dec 15, 2025 at 10:48 PM Franco <[inlandvalleyalliance@gmail.com](mailto:inlandvalleyalliance@gmail.com)> wrote:

Hello Planning commission,

Inland Valley Alliance opposes the proposed actions amending the Harvest landing specific plan to allow for the development of a 391,725 sq ft distribution "parcel hub" otherwise known as a warehouse. The rezoning of residential originally 1860 units into MBU to accommodate distribution uses therefore lowering residential units to 615 units is opposite of what this original specific plan was designed for. The location of the distribution facility is poorly placed. The distribution

L7.1

hub should be relocated directly next to the freeway away from commercial, public, and residential uses. The original agreement already has land zoned that can accommodate a building for these uses. This project has been revised to force future development of warehouse projects leaving the residents of Perris once again forced to bare the burden of increased truck traffic and diesel pollution. I would also remind the commision that The Perris City Council unanimously voted to enact a 45 day moratorium on "establishment and expansion of Industrial warehousing and distribution uses". "Parcel Hub" falls under this category due to its distribution/warehouse uses and because this project has yet to be approved prior to the moratorium it is not exempt. The way Howard industries is putting forth this project is very misleading. I will also point out the staff report on Val Verde school district's support of the project is false. The letter provided does not claim to support the project. It states "The Val Verde Unified School District ("District") writes this letter to notify the City of Perris that the District has commenced discussions and negotiations with Howard Industrial Partners ("Howard") regarding a potential property exchange involving the District's property located at 2656 Indian Avenue, Perris, California 92571, and Howard's property located at 600 Water Avenue, Perris, California 92571. The parties have executed a Letter of Intent and have begun due diligence activities and evaluation of the respective properties". Nowhere does it say the district supports the project, just informs of ongoing negotiations. I have spoken to board member Miranda and the deputy superintendent and both have clearly stated that Val Verde has yet to bring this issue up for consideration and they cannot give support to a project or deal that has yet to be made. The developer is not paying for a new school, only the land it would be built on, worsening the financial state of the school district to build a new school.

L7.1  
cont.

L7.2

I have spoken with a community member from Bloomington named Miguel who has been fighting a warehouse development that has destroyed parts of his community and the similarities to what is happening in Perris is very disturbing. He gave me a timeline of events that led to the Colton joint unified school district losing money , enrollment and receiving broken promises in return for dealing with this developer (Howard industries). At the beginning Howard industries purchased a majority of homes and properties in the proposed area of the project in Bloomington. Note not all homes were purchased by the time the project was approved by the board of supervisors. Howard industries continues to advocate for the construction of warehouses despite homes still being occupied. Then significant events of extortion occur . Example: Resident Felipe Ortiz's family home being bulldozed with children inside. This has been documented. Howard Industries promises to construct a new school on nearby property so that Zimmerman Elementary school is replaced. This

L7.3

convinced Colton unified to support **but after homes were destroyed** the CJUSD loses student enrollment due to the warehouses development. The lack of student enrollment means less funds for school from federal or state sources. Due to this in combination with Howard industries forced removal of Felipe's Ortiz's ranch which caused a disapproval from public opinion, Howard industries is unofficially removed as a developer. The removal of Howard from the project causes a multi year pause in construction because the EIR is not done properly. This is a huge loss of income for Brookfield(partner developer). Brookefiled returns years later with a new project proposal but it's the same project only this time around there are NO promises for a new school. Only a buffer wall between the school and 56 football fields of warehouse space with 1400 daily truck trips. What we can learn from the Bloomington story and their experience with Howard is that destroying a school for more warehouses is a bad deal. Even with promises from the developer to build a new school, funding might be cut, state and federal grants will disappear. The harvest landing project may allude to the promise of a new school but that may not even be possible if student enrollment continues to decline. It has been proven that development of warehouses instead of housing leads to families moving away and less federal and state funds for districts. Not to mention worse air quality, increased truck traffic and danger zones for the public. The current plan for the area around Val Verde elementary is zoned for more residential so increasing the residential area around the school would only help with funding and enrollment.

L7.3  
cont.

This project is also not built anywhere near an approved truck route plan. The city also has updated the GNG and is still in the process of implementing more protections along with studies of the effects of our current warehousing on its residents. Perris has an industrial distribution development at every onramp from the freeway except Nuevo rd (the exit where this project would be located). Adding this facility right of this onramp would forever cement Perris's name as Warehouse valley or Warehouse city (whichever you prefer). It will also worsen traffic at the heart of the city where the project lies between three schools Perris High , Val Verde Elementary and Innovations horizons. It is already a struggle to get children to school on time. Adding a high output traffic facility here will not only worsen traffic but also endanger the kids who walk to school.

L7.4

At the last Perris council meeting they reported on a "fiscal emergency" the report actually shows how distribution and e-commerce is dying down. Centers like "Forever 21" going bankrupt and automation are costing the city in lower tax revenue while attempting to keep up with the repair of road degradation due to the increased truck traffic. This project as presented will only lead to more warehousing in the specific

L7.5

plan. An estimated more than 4,000,000 sq ft which is being omitted from the proposal due to phase 1 plots west and south of the project only request for a zone change. ALL phases should have a clear project plan to determine future development and compatibility. This is why the original project specific plan was approved to be kept in place because it could be developed at any time.

L7.5  
cont.

Also the original plan had a system for developing a lake with the natural wells on the site. Approving the "parcel Hub" distribution center directly over the wells cuts off the water source that could be used to create the original plan lake or used to provide a water cooling pad for residents. I will also point out that the sports park in the development will not be provided until phase two (if provided at all) and will take more than 5 years after the approval of phase 2 developments to even begin.

L7.6

This project would eliminate existing approved housing units, alter the Specific Plan in ways that encourage even more warehousing, and directly conflict with the City of Perris' ongoing warehouse moratorium. The project threatens natural wells, would significantly increase truck traffic, and is not located on an approved truck route. It is also inconsistent with the updated General Plan Guidelines, would worsen local air pollution, and relies on vague promises of a future school—promises that, in similar developments, have ultimately shifted financial burdens onto the community and reduced funding for education. This project also leaves questions about the future of phase 1,2 and the timeline of the sports park.

I have attached the current warehouse map of our city. This distribution "Parcel hub" falls under the same category as any industrial warehouse and even has higher rates of truck traffic and pollution. Approving this project will only put residents more at risk of the related health burdens.

L7.7

I have also attached the original and new plans for comparison and to highlight the major changes in a pretty decent development plan for Perris.

I request the commision to allow me to present the items at my public comment as visual aids on the mounted tv's and projectors.

Below I have attached information on the bloomington project and articles.

<https://laist.com/news/climate-environment/how-a-warehouse-development-is-reshaping-one-community-in-the-inland-empire>

<https://www.frontline-observer.com/pavement-politics-how-developers-are-shaping-politics-in-the-inland-empire/#:~:text=On%20the%20morning%20of%20January,currently%20being%20occupied%20without%20permission.>

For all these reasons and many more please recommend a denial of this project to move forward.

Regards,

--

Franco Pacheco

Inland Valley Alliance for Environmental Justice



<https://www.inlandvalleyalliance.org/>

L7.7 cont.

**Response to Letter L7: Inland Valley Alliance for Environmental Justice, dated December 15, 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 L7.1:** This comment states the commenter’s opposition to the proposed Specific Plan Amendment and reminds the City Council of the 45-day moratorium enacted on industrial warehousing and distribution uses, which the commenter states would be applicable to the proposed parcel hub use.

**Response L7.1:** This comment expresses the commenter’s opposition to the proposed amendments to the Harvest Landing Specific Plan and incorrectly refers to the proposed distribution parcel hub as “otherwise known as a warehouse.” Parcel hubs are operationally different from traditional warehouses 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 warehouses 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 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 was 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 of Perris Planning Division for consistency with the City’s moratorium. Thus, no further response is warranted.

**Comment L7.2:** This comment states that Val Verde Elementary School has not stated support for the Project and the developer would not pay for a new school.

**Response L7.2:** This comment does not question the content or conclusions of the Draft EIR or identify any potential environmental impacts that were not evaluated in the Draft EIR. Thus, no further response is warranted. However, the commenter’s opinions are included in the Final EIR and will be considered by the City of Perris City Council when it chooses whether to approve or deny the proposed Project.

**Comment L7.3:** This comment discusses a Bloomington community member who has been affected by warehouse development in the community of Bloomington. The comment accounts how Howard Industrial Partners development in Bloomington resulted in the loss of student enrollment and funding for the Colton Unified School District. The comment further states that the development of warehouses instead of housing will lead to families moving away, worsened air quality, and increased traffic.

**Response L7.3:** This comment does not question the content or conclusions of the Draft EIR or identify any potential environmental impacts that were not evaluated in the Draft EIR prepared for the proposed Project. Potential impacts related to transportation and traffic are discussed in Section 5.1 6, *Transportation*, on pages 5.16-17 through 5.16-33 of the Draft EIR and potential impacts related to air quality are discussed in Section 5.3, *Air Quality*, on pages 5.3-29 through 5.3-76. Thus, no further response is warranted. However, the commenter’s opinions are included in the Final EIR and will be considered by the Perris City Council when it chooses whether to approve or deny the proposed Project.

**Comment L7.4:** This comment states that the Project is not near any approved truck routes and the City of Perris is already full of industrial development resulting in worsened traffic in an area surrounded by schools.

**Response L7.4:** The City of Perris General Plan Circulation Element designates truck routes (shown in Draft EIR Figure 5.16-1) and provides street standards within the Project vicinity. Further, the Harvest Landing Specific Plan provides street standards and design guidelines. 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. As discussed in Draft EIR Section 3.0, *Project Description*, the Project would include five truck driveways along

Frontage Road and installation of a truck-only Private Drive A for the industrial portion of the Phase 1 development. The commercial component of the Phase 1 development would require one truck driveway along Orange Avenue, one truck driveway along Harvest Landing Way, and one truck driveway along Barrett Avenue south of Orange Avenue. Lastly, while potential development plans and internal circulation within the Phase 2 area are unknown at this time, the City of Perris will be conditioning the Project to solely provide truck driveways for Phase 2 developments along Orange Avenue and Frontage Road in order to avoid the sensitive receptors located along Indian Avenue (so long as Val Verde Elementary school is operational along Indian Avenue) and Barrett Avenue. Therefore, the proposed Project would be consistent with the existing truck routes designated in the City of Perris General Plan Circulation Element and the Harvest Landing Specific Plan. Thus, potential impacts related to truck route facilities would not occur.

Additionally, this comment expresses the commenter's opinion and does not provide any substantial evidence of significant environmental impacts that have not already been disclosed in the Draft EIR or that the Draft EIR's transportation analysis is lacking. Potential 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. 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.

**Comment L7.5:** This comment states that the revised Specific Plan Amendment would result in additional warehousing not less. The commenter requests for a clear Project plan to determine the future buildout.

**Response L7.5:** 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.

Furthermore, 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, 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 this Draft EIR.

There is no proposed development within Phase 2. Buildout of the future development area would occur pursuant to future entitlement submittals to the City of Perris. 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.

**Comment L7.6:** This comment states that the proposed parcel hub is to be developed directly over water wells cutting off the water source for the original lake plan. The comment further states that the sports park would not be developed until phase 2 is developed, which could take more than 5 years.

**Response L7.6:** As discussed in Section 5.10, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, of the Draft EIR, two active water wells are located within the Specific Plan Area, at 2364 Indian Avenue and southeast of the intersection of Perris Boulevard and Orange Avenue. As proposed, the Project would cap the abandoned and existing wells and drill a new well within the proposed WQMP area to supply irrigation water for the proposed landscaping at an estimated rate of 2.89 acre-feet per year, which is less than the historic on-site groundwater use.

This comment does not question the content or conclusions of the Draft EIR or identify any potential environmental impacts that were not evaluated in the Draft EIR. Thus, no further response is warranted. However, the commenter's opinions are included in the Final EIR and will be considered by the City of Perris City Council when it chooses whether to approve or deny the proposed Project.

**Comment L7.7:** This comment states that the parcel hub distinction falls under the same category as any industrial warehouse with even higher rates of truck traffic and pollution. This comment also states that the approval of the Project would only increase residents' health risks and recommends denial of the Project.

**Response L7.7:** As discussed in Response L7.1, parcel hubs are operationally different from traditional warehouses and are better aligned with the intent of the Specific Plan Mixed Business Use (MBU) designation, and the proposed plans have been reviewed by the City of Perris Planning Division for consistency with the City's moratorium.

Additionally, this comment expresses the commenter's opinion and does not provide any substantial evidence of significant environmental impacts that have not already been disclosed in the Draft EIR, or that the Draft EIR's analysis is lacking. Potential 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 and potential impacts related to air quality, pollution, and health risk are discussed in Section 5.3, *Air Quality*, on pages 5.3-29 through 5.3-76. 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 the comment does not express any specific concern or question regarding the adequacy of the Draft EIR, no further response is required or provided.