

Executive Summary

ES.1 Introduction

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (California Public Resources Code, Sections 21000 et seq.) requires that lead agencies consider the potential environmental consequences of projects over which they have discretionary approval authority prior to taking approval action on such projects. An Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is a public document designed to provide local and State government agency decision-makers, special districts, and the public with an analysis of potential environmental consequences to support informed decision making.

This Draft EIR has been prepared to identify, analyze, and mitigate, to the extent feasible, the potential significant environmental effects associated with the construction and implementation of the proposed Perris Airport Logistics Center Project (herein referred to as the Proposed Project), which is located in the City of Perris.

This EIR has been prepared pursuant to the requirements of the CEQA and the Guidelines for the Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA Guidelines, found in Title 14, California Code of Regulations, Chapter 3, Section 15000 et seq.). As discussed in Section 1.2.2, Type and Purpose of this Draft EIR, and in accordance with CEQA, this Draft EIR has been prepared as a “Project EIR” as defined by CEQA Guidelines, Section 15161. The City of Perris is the lead agency for the Proposed Project under CEQA and is responsible for preparing this Draft EIR. The City, as the lead agency, will review and consider the Draft EIR and the Final EIR in its decision to approve, revise, or deny the Proposed Project.

A summary description of the required permits and actions is provided in Section 2.7, and a complete description of the Project is provided in Section 2, Project Description of this Draft EIR. This Draft EIR focuses on those environmental impacts identified as potentially significant in the Notice of Preparation completed for the Proposed Project (refer to Section 1.4, Scope of the Environmental Impact Report and Appendix A of this EIR).

The City of Perris has reviewed and revised, as necessary, all submitted drafts, technical studies, and reports for consistency with City policies and requirements and this Draft EIR reflect its own independent judgment. Preparation of this Draft EIR included reliance on appropriate City technical personnel and a review of all technical subconsultant reports.

This Executive Summary has been prepared in accordance with Section 15123(b) of the CEQA Guidelines, which states that an EIR should contain a brief summary of the proposed actions and its consequences and should identify: 1) each significant effect with proposed mitigation measures and alternatives that would reduce or avoid that effect; 2) areas of controversy known to the lead

agency; and 3) issues to be resolved, including the choice among alternatives and how to mitigate significant effects.

ES.2 Project Location and Setting

The Project Site is in the southern part of the City of Perris, in Riverside County. The Project Site lies at the southeastern portion of the intersection between East Ellis Avenue and Goetz Road. Three paved roads adjoin the Subject Property: East Ellis Avenue adjoins the Project Site on the north; Case Road on the east, and Goetz Road on the west. The Project Site shares interior property lines with the runway of Perris Valley Airport. Figure 2-1, Regional Location, shows the Project Site in a regional context and Figure 2-2, Project Site, shows the Project Site and surrounding streets. The Project Site consists of undeveloped land with native vegetation (see Figure 2-3, Aerial Photography). The Project Site is comprised of seven parcels that total 87.69 gross (82.71 net)-acres in size, designated as Site 1 and Site 2. Site 1 encompasses Assessor's Parcel Numbers (APNs) 330-090-031, -033, -036, -038, -040 and 330-100-031. Site 2 encompasses Assessor's Parcel Number 330-090-034.

Northwest of Site 1 is an apartment complex and directly north of Site 1 is an open field. East of Site 1 is the runway of Perris Valley Airport, a private airport primarily used for recreation-based flights. South of Site 1 is the Perris Valley Airport parking lot and an indoor skydiving facility. To the west of Site 1 is Goetz Road. North of Site 2 is a trucking school, a single-family house that appears to be a business, and a recycling facility. To the east and south of Site 2 are open fields. To the west of Site is the runway of Perris Valley Airport.

ES.3 Project Description

The Proposed Project involves proposed Tentative Parcel Map (TPM) No. 38412 to combine the existing seven parcel Project Site into two parcels. The existing APNs subject to the proposed changes are: 330-090-031, 330-090-033, 330-090-034, 330-090-036, 330-090-038, 330-090-040, 330-100-031.

The Project Applicant proposes to combine the seven existing parcels into two via a parcel map in order to construct two industrial warehouse/distribution buildings (Building 1 = 795,109 square feet and Building 2 = 71,961 square feet) on Site 1 and a trailer storage lot with a 100-square-foot guard shack on Site 2. The General Plan designates the Project Site for Light Industrial and General Industrial uses. As allowed under these land use designations, the Proposed Project involves the construction and operation of two industrial buildings and a trailer storage lot with a guard shack. The proposed industrial buildings are designed to comply with the standards and guidelines set forth in the City of Perris General Plan including but not limited to the following: on-site design standards and guidelines (including site layout, architecture, lighting, and others), off-site design standards and guidelines (including circulation and infrastructure), landscaping, industrial design

standards and guidelines, and infrastructure. The Proposed Project has also been designed to comply with applicable requirements of the 2014 March Air Reserve Base/Inland Port Airport (March ARB/IPA) Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan (ALUCP) relative to uses within Compatibility Zone E as well as the Perris Valley ALUCP relative to uses within Compatibility Zones A through D.

Currently, there are no identified end users for the Proposed Project. Intended occupants for the Proposed Project include distribution firms seeking an Inland Empire location from which to service their client base. Since end users are unknown, hours of operation and employee count will vary, but the Proposed Project buildings are assumed for planning purposes to operate 24 hours per day, 7 days per week. Office workers would likely have typical shifts of Monday through Friday, 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM, while warehouse staff could work in day, evening, and night shifts. Specific hours of operation would be identified during the tenant improvement process.

The following discretionary actions are required for the Proposed Project:

- Tentative Parcel Map (TPM) No. 38412 to combine the existing seven parcel Project Site into two parcels. The existing APNs subject to the proposed changes are: 330-090-031, 330-090-033, 330-090-034, 330-090-036, 330-090-038, 330-090-040, 330-100-031.
- Development Plan Review (DPR) 22-00005 for the proposed industrial warehouse buildings.
- Conditional Use Permit (CUP) 23-05107 to allow for the proposed trailer storage lot.
- Certification of the Final EIR with the determination that the Final EIR has been prepared in compliance with the requirements of CEQA.

ES.3.1 Project Alternatives

In accordance with Section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines, Section 5.0 of this Draft EIR addresses alternatives that can eliminate or reduce the potentially significant impacts of the Proposed Project. Section 5.0 provides descriptions of each alternative, a comparative analysis of the potential environmental effects of each alternative to those associated with the Proposed Project, and a discussion of each alternative's ability to meet the Project objectives. Following is a summary description of the alternatives evaluated in this Draft EIR. For a more detailed discussion of these alternatives and the relative impacts associated with each alternative compared to the Project, refer to Section 5.0, Alternatives. As required by CEQA, Section 5.0 also identifies alternatives considered but eliminated from detailed analysis, and the environmentally superior alternative.

Alternative 1 – No Project/No Development Alternative

The No Project/No Development Alternative would result in no new development or other improvements within the Project Site. Therefore, under the No Project/No Development

Alternative, the proposed development of two industrial warehouse/distribution buildings (Building 1 = 795,109 square feet and Building 2 = 71,961 square feet) on Site 1 and a trailer storage lot with a 100-square-foot guard shack on Site 2, and associated parking, infrastructure, and landscaping would not occur. The Project Site would remain in its current condition and would remain vacant.

Alternative 2 – Single Building Site Plan Alternative

Under this alternative, the Project Site would be developed with one industrial building with a total square footage of 795,109 square feet. This alternative eliminates Building 2, which comprises 71,961 square feet of building space. Site 2 would remain the same under this alternative with the proposed trailer storage lot and the 100-square-foot guard shack. This alternative provides 517 spaces for trailer parking on Site 1, in lieu of the 71,961 square foot building. When compared to the Proposed Project, this alternative would result in a 71,961 square feet reduction of building space, 133 less parking stalls, 227 more trailer parking spaces, and one less grade door.

Alternative 3 – Reduced Intensity Alternative

Under this alternative, the Project Site would be developed with one smaller industrial building with a total square footage of 605,102 square feet. This alternative also eliminates Building 2, which comprises 71,961 square feet of building space. Site 2 would remain the same under this alternative with the trailer storage lot and the 100-square-foot guard shack. This alternative represents a reduction of approximately 30 percent (30%) of building square footage as compared to the Proposed Project. This alternative provides an additional 611 trailer stalls for trailer parking in lieu of Building 2.

ES.4 Issues To Be Resolved

Section 15123(b)(3) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR contain a discussion of issues to be resolved, including the choice among alternatives and whether or how to mitigate significant impacts. With respect to the Proposed Project, the key issues to be resolved include decisions by the City of Perris as lead agency, as to:

- Whether this environmental document adequately describes the potential environmental impacts of the Proposed Project.
- Whether the recommended mitigation measures should be modified and/or adopted.
- Whether the Proposed Project benefits override those environmental impacts that cannot be feasibly avoided or mitigated to a less than significant level.
- Whether there are other mitigation measures that should be applied to the Proposed Project besides those identified in this EIR.

- Whether there are any alternatives to the Proposed Project that would substantially lessen any of its significant impacts while achieving most of the basic Project objectives.

ES.5 Areas Of Controversy

Section 15123(b)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines indicates that an EIR summary should identify areas of controversy known to the lead agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public. This Draft EIR has taken into consideration the comments received from the public and various agencies in response to the Notice of Preparation and a Draft EIR public scoping meeting with the City of Perris Planning Commission. Written comments received during the Notice of Preparation and Draft EIR scoping period are contained in Appendix A of this EIR. Environmental issues that have been raised during opportunities for public input on the project are summarized in Section 1.3, Scoping Process, and are addressed in each relevant issue area analyzed in Section 4.0 of this Draft EIR.

Based on input received from the public during the scoping process, the primary area of controversy has been raised by the owners and patrons of Perris Valley Airport. There was ongoing concern that the Proposed Project would result in safety impacts that could lead to the closure of the airport. Commenters voiced concerns that if the airport were to close it would lead to the loss of jobs, negatively impact tourism revenue, and eliminate military training capabilities that currently occur at Perris Valley Airport. Other areas of concern included traffic impacts resulting from the Proposed Project, specifically at Case Road/Ellis Avenue and Case Road/Goetz Road.

ES.6 Summary of Significant Environmental Impacts

Table 1-1, Summary of Environmental Impacts for the Proposed Project, presents a summary of the environmental impacts resulting from the Proposed Project as determined in this Draft EIR. Table 1-1 addresses those topical issues and associated thresholds for which it was determined in the Notice of Preparation that impacts would be potentially significant and Project-level analysis has been provided in this Draft EIR. Topics for which it was determined that no further analysis is required in this Draft EIR are discussed in Section 6.0, Other CEQA Considerations, of this Draft EIR, and include: agricultural and forestry resources, mineral resources, population and housing, public services, and wildfire.

The environmental issue areas identified for study this Draft EIR are aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, energy, geology and soils, greenhouse gas emissions, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use and planning, noise, recreation, transportation, tribal cultural resources, and utilities and service systems. The potential Proposed Project and cumulative impacts for these topical issues are addressed in Section 4.0 of

this EIR. Draft Growth-inducing impacts and significant irreversible environmental changes are addressed in Section 6.0, Other CEQA Considerations.

For each environmental topic, Table 1-1 includes Project-level mitigation measures identified for impacts determined to be potentially significant. As shown in Table 1-1, the Project would result in less than significant impacts with the incorporation of mitigation measures and for the following topical issues evaluated in this Draft EIR:

Aesthetics	Hydrology and Water Quality
Air Quality	Land Use and Planning
Biological Resources	Noise
Cultural Resources	Public Services
Energy	Recreation
Geology and Soils	Transportation
Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Tribal Cultural Resources
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	Utilities and Service Systems

Following implementation of mitigation measures, the Proposed Project would not result in any significant and unavoidable impacts.

Table ES-1. Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Section 4.1, Aesthetics		
<p>Threshold 1: Scenic Vistas Less Than Significant. The Proposed Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>
<p>Threshold 2: Scenic Resources Less Than Significant. The Proposed Project would not substantially damage scenic resources including but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>
<p>Threshold 3: Degradation of Existing Visual Character or Conflict with Zoning or Regulations for Scenic Quality Less Than Significant. The Proposed Project would not degrade the existing visual character or conflict with zoning or regulations for scenic quality.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>
<p>Threshold 4: Light and Glare Potentially Significant. Without mitigation, the Proposed Project would have the potential to create a new source of substantial light or glare during construction, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.</p>	<p>MM AES-1 Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the Proposed Project Owner/Developer shall provide evidence to the City that the Contractor Specifications require that any temporary nighttime lighting installed during construction for security, or any other purpose shall be downward facing and hooded or shielded to prevent security light from spilling outside the staging area or from directly broadcasting security light into the sky or onto adjacent residential properties. Compliance with this measure shall be verified by the City of Perris' Building Division during construction.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant</p>

Table ES-1. Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Section 4.2, Air Quality		
<p>Threshold 1: Consistency with Applicable Air Quality Plan Potentially Significant. The Proposed Project may result in violation of regional and local significance thresholds for VOC emissions during construction.</p>	<p>MM AQ-1 Criteria Pollutant Emissions – Architectural Coatings. Prior to Issuance of a Building Permit, the Proposed Project Owner/Developer shall submit specifications to the City of Perris’ Building Division for review and approval that demonstrate that VOC emissions associated with architectural coatings shall be reduced through the use of “Super-Compliant” VOC coatings and paints (as defined in South Coast AQMD Rule 1113), or pre-coated materials such as bathroom stall dividers, and metal awnings. specifications shall be included in building as Construction specifications.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant.</p>
<p>Threshold 2: Cumulative Increase in Criteria Pollutant Emissions Potentially Significant. The Proposed Project may result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants for which the SCAB is in non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard. Specifically, without mitigation, the Proposed Project could increase emissions of VOCs above SCAQMD thresholds.</p>	<p>Refer to mitigation measure MM AQ-1, above.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant.</p>
<p>Threshold 3: Sensitive Receptors Less Than Significant. The Proposed Project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant.</p>
<p>Threshold 4: Odors Less Than Significant. The Proposed Project would not result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people.</p>	<p>No mitigation is required.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant.</p>

Table ES-1. Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Section 4.3, Biological Resources		
<p>Threshold 1: Candidate, Sensitive, or Special-Status Species</p> <p>Potentially Significant. The Proposed Project would have the potential to impact species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species.</p>	<p>MM BIO-1: MSHCP Burrowing Owl 30-Day Pre-Construction Survey. The Project Proponent/Developer shall retain a qualified biologist to conduct a pre-construction survey for resident burrowing owls within 30 days prior to commencement of initial ground-disturbing activities (e.g., vegetation clearing, clearing and grubbing, grading, tree removal, site watering, equipment staging) at the Project Site. The survey shall include the Project Site, off-site disturbance areas, and all suitable burrowing owl habitat within a 500-foot buffer. The results of the survey shall be submitted to the City of Perris Planning Division prior to obtaining a grading permit.</p> <p>In addition, a pre-construction survey for resident burrowing owls shall also be conducted within 3 days prior to commencement initial ground-disturbing activities. If burrowing owls are observed during the Migratory Bird Treaty Act nesting bird survey (mitigation measure MM BIO-2), to be conducted within 3 days of ground disturbance or vegetation clearance, the observation shall be reported to the City of Perris. If ground-disturbing activities in these areas are delayed or suspended for more than 30 days after the pre-construction survey, the area shall be resurveyed for owls. The pre-construction survey and any relocation activity will be conducted in accordance with the current Burrowing Owl Instruction for the Western Riverside MSHCP.</p> <p>If burrowing owl are not detected during the pre-construction survey, no further mitigation is required.</p> <p>If burrowing owl are detected, the City of Perris shall be sent written notification within 3 days of detection of burrowing owls. If active nests (i.e., occupied by eggs or fledglings) are identified during the pre-construction survey, the Project Proponent/Developer shall not commence activities until no sign is present that the burrows are being used by adult or juvenile owls or following CDFW approval of a Burrowing Owl Plan as described below. If owl presence is difficult to determine, the Project biologist shall monitor the</p>	<p>Less Than Significant.</p>

Table ES-1. Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	<p>burrows with motion-activated trail cameras for at least 24 hours to evaluate burrow occupancy. The Project biologist and Project Proponent/Developer shall coordinate with the City of Perris Planning Division and the CDFW, to develop a Burrowing Owl Plan to be approved by the City in consultation with the CDFW and the City of Perris prior to commencing Project activities. The Burrowing Owl Plan shall be prepared in accordance with guidelines in the CDFW Staff Report on Burrowing Owl (March 2012) and MSHCP. The Burrowing Owl Plan shall describe proposed avoidance, minimization, relocation, and monitoring as applicable. The Burrowing Owl Plan shall include the number and location of occupied burrow sites and details on proposed buffers if avoiding the burrowing owls and information on the adjacent or nearby suitable habitat available to owls for relocation. If no suitable habitat is available nearby for relocation, details regarding the creation and funding of artificial burrows (numbers, location, and type of burrows) and management activities for relocated owls may also be required in the Burrowing Owl Plan. If occupied burrows are to be actively relocated, the Burrowing Owl Plan shall include the procedures for such active relocation. Prior to active relocation, the Project Proponent/Developer and the City of Perris shall consult with and obtain approval from the CDFW regarding the active relocation procedures. A final report shall be prepared by the Project biologist documenting the results of compliance with the Burrowing Owl Plan. The report shall be submitted to the City of Perris, and CDFW prior to the start of Project construction activities. The Project biologist shall verify the nesting effort has finished according to methods identified in the Burrowing Owl Plan. When the Project biologist determines that burrowing owls are no longer occupying the Project Site, Project activities may begin.</p> <p>If burrowing owl are discovered to occupy the Project Site after Project construction activities have started, then construction activities shall be halted immediately. The Project Proponent/Developer shall notify the City of Perris within 48 hours of detection. A Burrowing Owl Plan, as detailed above, shall be implemented, unless subsequent surveys determine that burrowing owls no longer are present at the Project Site. The City shall be responsible</p>	

Table ES-1. Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	<p>for implementing appropriate avoidance and mitigation measures, including burrow avoidance, passive or active relocation, or other appropriate mitigation measures as identified in the Burrowing Owl Plan.</p> <p>MM BIO-2: Regulatory Requirement MBTA & CDFW. In order to avoid violation of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and the CDFG Code Sections 3503, 3503.5, and 3513, site-preparation activities (ground disturbance, construction activities, staging equipment, and removal of trees and vegetation) for the Proposed Project shall be avoided, to the greatest extent possible, during the nesting season of potentially occurring native and migratory bird species (generally September 1st to February 14th for songbirds; September 1 to January 14 for raptors, although the nesting season may be extended due to weather and drought conditions).</p> <p>If site-preparation activities are proposed during the nesting/breeding season, the Project Proponent/Developer shall retain a qualified biologist to conduct a pre-activity field survey prior to the issuance of grading permits for the Proposed Project to determine if active nests of species protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act or the California Fish and Game Code are present in the construction zone. The nest surveys shall include the Project Site and adjacent areas where Project activities have the potential to cause nest failure. The survey results shall be provided to the City's Planning Division. The Project Proponent/Developer shall adhere to the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Project Proponent/Developer shall retain a qualified biologist experienced in: identifying local and migratory bird species of special concern; conducting bird surveys using appropriate survey methodology; nesting surveying techniques, recognizing breeding and nesting behaviors, locating nests and breeding territories, and identifying nesting stages and nest success; determining/establishing appropriate avoidance and minimization measures; and monitoring the efficacy of implemented avoidance and minimization measures. 2. Pre-activity field surveys shall be conducted at the appropriate time of day/night, during appropriate weather conditions, no more than 3 days 	

Table ES-1. Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	<p>prior to the initiation of Project activities. Surveys shall encompass all suitable areas including trees, shrubs, bare ground, burrows, cavities, and structures. Survey duration shall take into consideration the size of the Project Site; density, and complexity of the habitat; number of survey participants; survey techniques employed; and shall be sufficient to ensure the data collected is complete and accurate.</p> <p>If no nesting birds are observed during the survey, site-preparation and construction activities may begin. However, if active nests (including nesting raptors) are located, then avoidance or minimization measures shall be undertaken in consultation with the City of Perris. Measures shall include immediate establishment of an appropriate buffer zone to be established by the Project biologist, and approved by the City of Perris, based on their best professional judgment and experience. The buffer around the nest shall be delineated and flagged, and no construction activity shall occur within the buffer area until the Project biologist determines nesting species have fledged and the nest is no longer active, or the nest has failed. The Project biologist shall monitor the nest at the onset of Project activities and at the onset of any changes in such Project activities (e.g., increase in number or type of equipment, change in equipment usage, etc.) to determine the efficacy of the buffer. If the Project biologist determines that such Project activities may be causing an adverse reaction, the Project biologist shall adjust the buffer accordingly or implement alternative avoidance and minimization measures, such as redirecting or rescheduling construction or erecting sound barriers. All work within these buffers will be halted until the nesting effort is finished (i.e., the juveniles are surviving independent from the nest).</p> <p>The Project biologist shall review and verify compliance with these nesting avoidance buffers and shall verify the nesting effort has finished. Work can resume within these avoidance areas when no other active nests are found.</p> <p>Upon completion of the survey and nesting bird monitoring, a report shall be prepared and submitted to City of Perris Planning Division for mitigation monitoring compliance record keeping.</p>	

Table ES-1. Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Threshold 2: Riparian Habitat and Other Sensitive Natural Communities</p> <p>Less Than Significant. The Proposed Project would have the potential to cause an adverse effect on a riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the CDFW or USFWS.</p>	<p>No mitigation required.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant.</p>
<p>Threshold 3: Wetlands</p> <p>Less Than Significant. The Proposed Project would not cause a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands (including but not limited to marsh, vernal pool, and coastal).</p>	<p>No mitigation required.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant.</p>
<p>Threshold 4: Native Resident or Migratory Fish or Wildlife Species</p> <p>Potentially Significant. The Proposed Project would remove vegetation that has the potential to support nesting birds protected by federal and state regulations. A wide range of habitat and vegetation types have the potential to support nesting birds.</p>	<p>Refer to MM BIO-1, above.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant.</p>
<p>Threshold 5: Conflict with Tree Preservation Policy or Ordinance</p> <p>Less Than Significant. The Proposed Project would not conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.</p>	<p>No mitigation required.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant.</p>

Table ES-1. Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Threshold 6: Conflict with Habitat Conservation Plan</p> <p>Potentially Significant. The Proposed Project would have the potential to conflict with the provisions of an adopted HCP, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state HCP.</p>	<p>Refer to mitigation measures MM BIO-1 and MM BIO-2, above.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant.</p>
<p>Section 4.4, Cultural Resources</p>		
<p>Threshold 1: Historical Resources</p> <p>Less Than Significant. The Proposed Project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to Section 15064.5.</p>	<p>No mitigation required.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant.</p>
<p>Threshold 2: Archaeological Resources</p> <p>Potentially Significant. Without mitigation, the Proposed Project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5.</p>	<p>MM CUL-1</p> <p>Archaeological Resource – Monitoring. Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the Project Proponent/Developer shall retain a professional archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Standards for Archaeology (U.S. Department of Interior, 2012; Registered Professional Archaeologist preferred). The primary task of the Project archaeologist shall be to monitor the initial ground-disturbing activities at both the Project site and any off-site Project-related improvement areas for the identification of any previously unknown archaeological and/or cultural resources. Selection of the Project archaeologist shall be subject to the approval of the City of Perris Director of Development Services and no ground-disturbing activities shall occur at the site or within the off-site project improvement areas until the Project archaeologist has been approved by the City.</p> <p>The Project archaeologist shall be responsible for monitoring ground-disturbing activities, maintaining daily field notes and a photographic record, and for reporting all finds to the developer and the City of Perris in a timely manner. The Project archaeologist shall be prepared and</p>	<p>Less Than Significant.</p>

Table ES-1. Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	<p>equipped to record and salvage cultural resources that may be unearthed during ground-disturbing activities and shall be empowered to temporarily halt or divert ground-disturbing equipment within a 50-foot radius of the find to allow time for the recording and removal of the resources. Work may continue outside the 50-foot radius.</p> <p>The Property Owner/Project Proponent/Developer shall also enter into an agreement with either the Soboba Band of Luiseño Indians, the Pechanga Band of Indians, or the Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians for a Native American Tribal representative (observer/monitor) to work along with the Project archaeologist. This Tribal representative will assist in the identification of Native American resources and will act as a representative between the City, the Property Owner/Project Proponent/Developer, and Native American Tribal Cultural Resources Department. The Native American Tribal representative should be on-site during all ground-disturbing of each portion of the Project Site including clearing, grubbing, tree removals, grading, trenching, etc. The Native American Tribal representative should be on-site any time the Project archaeologist is required to be on-site. Working with the Project archaeologist, the Native American representative shall have the authority to halt, redirect, or divert any activities in areas where the identification, recording, or recovery of Native American resources are ongoing.</p> <p>The agreement between the Property Owner/Project Proponent/Developer and the Native American Tribe shall include, but not be limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An agreement that artifacts will be reburied on-site and in an area of permanent protection; • Reburial shall not occur until all cataloging and basic recordation have been completed by the consulting archaeologist; 	

Table ES-1. Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Native American artifacts that cannot be avoided or relocated at the Project Site shall be prepared for curation at an accredited curation facility in Riverside County that meets federal standards (per 36 CFR Part 79) and available to archaeologists/researchers for further study; and • The Project archaeologist shall deliver the Native American artifacts, including title, to the identified curation facility within a reasonable amount of time, along with applicable fees for permanent curation. <p>The Property Owner/Project Proponent/Developer shall submit a fully executed copy of the agreement to the City of Perris Planning Division to ensure compliance with this condition of approval. Upon verification, the City of Perris Planning Division shall clear this condition. This agreement shall not modify any condition of approval or mitigation measure.</p> <p>In the event that archaeological resources are discovered at the Project Site or within the off-site Project improvement areas, the handling of the discovered resource(s) will differ, depending on the nature of the find. Consistent with California Public Resources Code, Section 21083.2(b), and Assembly Bill 52 (Chapter 532, Statutes of 2014), avoidance shall be the preferred method of preservation for Native American/Tribal cultural/archaeological resources. However, it is understood that all artifacts, with the exception of human remains and related grave goods or sacred/ceremonial/religious objects, belong to the Property Owner. The Property Owner shall commit to the relinquishing and reburial and/or curation of all artifacts identified as being of Native American origin. All artifacts, Native American or otherwise, discovered during the monitoring program shall be recorded and inventoried by the consulting archaeologist.</p>	

Table ES-1. Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	<p>If any Native American artifacts are identified when Native American Tribal representatives are not present, all reasonable measures shall be taken to protect the resource(s) in situ and the City Planning Division and Native American Tribal representative shall be notified. The designated Native American Tribal representative will be given sufficient time to examine the find. If the find is determined to be of sacred or religious value, the Native American Tribal representative will work with the City and Project archaeologist to protect the resource in accordance with Tribal requirements as may be feasible. All analysis will be undertaken in a manner that avoids destruction or other adverse impacts.</p> <p>In the event that human remains are discovered at the Project Site or within the off-site Project improvement areas, Regulatory Implementation condition RI CUL-1 shall immediately apply, and all items found in association with Native American human remains shall be considered grave goods or sacred in origin and subject to special handling.</p> <p>Non-Native American artifacts shall be inventoried, assessed, and analyzed for cultural affiliation, personal affiliation (prior ownership), function, and temporal placement. Subsequent to analysis and reporting, these artifacts will be subjected to curation, as deemed appropriate, or returned to the Property Owner.</p> <p>Once grading activities have ceased and/or the Project archaeologist, in consultation with the designated Native American Tribal representative, determines that monitoring is no longer warranted, monitoring activities can be discontinued following notification to the City of Perris Planning Division.</p>	

Table ES-1. Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	<p>A report of findings, including an itemized inventory of artifacts, shall be prepared upon completion of the tasks outlined above. The report shall include all data outlined by the Office of Historic Preservation guidelines, including a conclusion of the significance of all recovered, relocated, and reburied artifacts. A copy of the report shall also be filed with the City of Perris Planning Division, the South Coastal Information Center and the Native American Tribe involved with the Project.</p>	
Section 4.5, Energy		
<p>Threshold 1: Wasteful or Inefficient Energy Usage Less Than Significant. The Proposed Project would not result in potentially significant environmental impacts due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation.</p>	<p>No mitigation required.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant.</p>
<p>Threshold 2: Conflict with Renewable or Energy Efficiency Plan Less Than Significant. The Proposed Project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.</p>	<p>No mitigation required.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant.</p>

Table ES-1. Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Section 4.6, Geology and Soils		
<p>Threshold 1: Exposure to Seismic-Related Hazards Less Than Significant. With implementation of design considerations in accordance with the CBC and implementation of recommendations from the Geotechnical Investigation, the Proposed Project would have a less than significant impact with regard to exposure to seismic-related hazards.</p>	<p>No mitigation required.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant.</p>
<p>Threshold 2: Soil Erosion or Topsoil Loss Less Than Significant. The Proposed Project would not result in a substantial adverse impact with regard to substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil.</p>	<p>No mitigation required.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant.</p>
<p>Threshold 3: Geologic Stability Less Than Significant. With adherence to all applicable regulations and conformance to applicable building codes, the Proposed Project would not result in significant adverse impacts with regard to geologic stability.</p>	<p>No mitigation required.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant.</p>
<p>Threshold 4: Expansive Soils Less Than Significant. With conformance with the CBC and City of Perris Municipal Code Title 16, and implementation of the provisions and recommendations outlined in the Geotechnical Investigation (Appendix E), a less than significant impact would occur.</p>	<p>No mitigation required.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant.</p>

Table ES-1. Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Threshold 5: Septic Tanks or Alternative Wastewater Disposal Systems</p> <p>No Impact. The Proposed Project would be connected to existing sewer lines, and there would be no impact related to on-site soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.</p>	<p>No mitigation required.</p>	<p>No impact.</p>
<p>Threshold 6: Paleontological Resources</p> <p>Potentially Significant. The Proposed Project would have the potential to directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource.</p>	<p>MM GEO-1</p> <p>Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the Proposed Project Owner/Developer shall submit to and receive approval from the City, a Paleontological Resource Impact Mitigation Monitoring Program. The Paleontological Resource Impact Mitigation Monitoring Program shall include the provision of a qualified professional paleontologist (or his or her trained paleontological monitor representative) during on- and off-site subsurface excavation that exceeds 5 feet in depth below the pre-grade surface. Selection of the paleontologist shall be subject to approval of the City of Perris Planning Manager and no grading activities shall occur at the site or within off-site Project improvement areas until the paleontologist has been approved by the City.</p> <p>Monitoring shall be restricted to undisturbed subsurface areas of older Quaternary alluvium, which might be present below the surface. The paleontologist shall be prepared to quickly salvage fossils as they are unearthed to avoid construction delays. The paleontologist shall also remove samples of sediments which are likely to contain the remains of small fossil invertebrates and vertebrates. The paleontologist shall have the power to temporarily halt or divert grading equipment to allow for removal of abundant or large specimens.</p> <p>Collected samples of sediments shall be washed to recover small invertebrate and vertebrate fossils. Recovered specimens shall be</p>	<p>Less Than Significant.</p>

Table ES-1. Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	<p>prepared so that they can be identified and permanently preserved. Specimens shall be identified and curated and placed into an accredited repository (such as the Western Science Center or the Riverside Metropolitan Museum) with permanent curation and retrievable storage.</p> <p>A report of findings, including an itemized inventory of recovered specimens, shall be prepared upon completion of the steps outlined above. The report shall include a discussion of the significance of all recovered specimens. The report and inventory, when submitted to the City of Perris Planning Division, will signify completion of the program to mitigate impacts to paleontological resources.</p>	
Section 4.7, Greenhouse Gas Emissions		
<p>Threshold 1: Generation of Greenhouse Gas Emissions Potentially Significant. Short-term Project emissions would exceed the 10,000 MT CO₂e threshold. This impact would be potentially significant without mitigation.</p>	<p>MM GHG-1 On-Site Renewable Energy Generation. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the Proposed Project Owner/Developer shall provide documentation (e.g., building plans) that design of Buildings 1 and 2 would include installation of solar panels to offset estimated Project electricity use by at least 25 percent.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant.</p>
<p>Threshold 2: Conflict with Applicable Plan Potentially Significant. The Proposed Project would exceed the SCAQMD Tier 3 threshold in the short-term without mitigation and would, therefore, result in a potentially significant impact related to statewide emissions reduction goals.</p>	<p>Refer to mitigation measure MM GHG-1, above and mitigation measure MM TR-1, below.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant.</p>

Table ES-1. Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials		
<p>Threshold 1: Transportation, Use, and Disposal of Hazardous Materials</p> <p>Potentially Significant. With compliance with applicable regulations, operation of the Proposed Project would result in a less than significant impact related to a significant risk to the public or the environment through the potential routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. The Proposed Project would have the potential to encounter unknown contaminated soils during construction through earth-moving activities.</p>	<p>MM HAZ-1</p> <p>Prior to any excavation or soil removal action on a known contaminated site, or if contaminated soil or groundwater (i.e., with a visible sheen or detectable odor) is encountered, complete characterization of the soil and/or groundwater shall be conducted. Appropriate sampling shall be conducted prior to disposal of the excavated soil. If the soil is contaminated, it shall be properly disposed of, according to Land Disposal restrictions. If site remediation involves the removal of contamination, then contaminated material will need to be transported off site to a licensed hazardous waste disposal facility. If any implementing development projects require imported soils, proper sampling shall be conducted to make sure that the imported soil is free of contamination.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant.</p>
<p>Threshold 2: Accidental Releases</p> <p>Potentially Significant. The Proposed Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment during operation. The Proposed Project would have the potential to encounter unknown contaminated soils during construction through earth-moving activities.</p>	<p>Refer to mitigation measure MM HAZ-1, above.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant.</p>
<p>Threshold 3: Hazards to Nearby Schools</p> <p>No Impact. The Project Site is not located within a quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.</p>	<p>No mitigation required.</p>	<p>No Impact.</p>

Table ES-1. Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Threshold 4: Hazardous Materials Sites Less Than Significant. Though the Project Site was identified on the DTSC Hazardous Waste Tracking System (HWTS) for disposal of hazardous wastes in 2010, 2011, and 2013, based on the returned compliance status of the violations and absence of reported records for releases, further environmental investigation or cleanup, these listings are not considered an environmental concern. A less than significant impact would occur.</p>	<p>No mitigation required.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant.</p>
<p>Threshold 5: Hazards from Nearby Airports Less Than Significant. Development of the Proposed Project was found to minimize the effect and magnitude of velocity and magnitude of turbulence compared to existing conditions for the Airport and a less than significant impact would occur. Additionally, the Proposed Project would not result in excessive noise for people residing or working on the Project Site. As previously indicated, on April 10, 2025, ALUC issued a determination of consistency with the 2011 Perris Valley ALUCP and the 2014 March ARB/IPA ALUCP. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in a significant impact related to aviation hazards.</p>	<p>No mitigation required.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant.</p>

Table ES-1. Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Threshold 6: Emergency Response or Evacuation Plans</p> <p>Less Than Significant. The Proposed Project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.</p>	No mitigation required.	Less Than Significant.
<p>Threshold 7: Wildland Fires</p> <p>No Impact. The Proposed Project would not expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving wildland fires.</p>	No mitigation required.	No Impact
Section 4.9, Hydrology and Water Quality		
<p>Threshold 1: Water Quality Standards</p> <p>Less Than Significant. The Proposed Project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality.</p>	No mitigation required.	Less Than Significant.
<p>Threshold 2: Groundwater Supplies</p> <p>Less Than Significant. The Proposed Project would not substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the Proposed Project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin.</p>	No mitigation required.	Less Than Significant.

Table ES-1. Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Threshold 3: Site Drainage and Hydrology (Erosion and Siltation; Stormwater Runoff; Stormwater Drainage System Capacity and Polluted Runoff; and Flood Flows)</p> <p>Less Than Significant. The Proposed Project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would: result in a substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site; substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite; create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or impede or redirect flood flows.</p>	<p>No mitigation required.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant.</p>
<p>Threshold 5: Conflict with Water Quality Control Plan or Sustainable Groundwater Management Plan</p> <p>Less Than Significant. The Proposed Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of a Water Quality Control Plan or Sustainable Groundwater Management Plan.</p>	<p>No mitigation required.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant.</p>

Table ES-1. Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Section 4.10, Land Use and Planning		
<p>Threshold 1: Physical Division of Established Community</p> <p>No impact. The Proposed Project would develop a vacant lot and would not physically divide an established community. Further, the Proposed Project does not include any new roadways or structures that would physically divide the existing community. Therefore, no impact would occur.</p>	<p>No mitigation required.</p>	<p>No impact.</p>
<p>Threshold 2: Conflict with Applicable Land Use Plans, Policies, and Regulations</p> <p>Less Than Significant. Because neither a general plan amendment, specific plan amendment, nor zone change is required for the Proposed Project to be developed, referral to ALUC is voluntary and optional, and any determination by ALUC is merely advisory. Here, the City of Perris referred the Proposed Project to ALUC for its review, in ALUC's advisory capacity. On April 10, 2025, ALUC issued a determination of consistency with the 2011 Perris Valley ALUCP and the 2014 March ARB/IPA ALUCP. Therefore, the Proposed Project would not result in a significant impact related to aviation hazards.</p>	<p>No mitigation required.</p>	<p>Less Than Significant.</p>

Table ES-1. Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Section 4.11, Noise		
<p>Threshold 1: Exceedance of Noise Standards Potentially Significant. The Proposed Project would result in less than significant impacts related to permanent increases in ambient noise level, construction noise and vibration, and aircraft noise exposure. Operational impacts are potentially significant without mitigation.</p>	<p>MM NOI-1: HVAC Equipment Shielding. Prior to issuance of a certificate of occupancy for Building 1 or Building 2, the Proposed Project Owner/Developer shall demonstrate that noise from all HVAC equipment has been reduced by installation of acoustical shielding around all new rooftop HVAC equipment. Shielding shall be sufficient to reduce noise from HVAC equipment to no more than 68 dBA CNEL at 50 feet. The acoustical shielding shall include a parapet wall of sufficient height to fully shield the equipment or acoustical shielding which complements the proposed building elevations and also fully shields the equipment.</p>	Less Than Significant.
<p>Threshold 2: Excessive Groundborne Vibration or Noise Less than Significant. As shown in Table 4.11-9, vibration levels from construction equipment would be reduced to 0.5 PPV or below less than 25 feet from the construction area. Pile driving and other high impact construction activities are not anticipated for Project construction. Therefore, impacts related to vibration during construction would be less than significant.</p>	No mitigation required.	Less Than Significant.
<p>Threshold 3: Aircraft Noise Less than Significant. Following construction and compliance with City building requirements, the Proposed Project would not expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels associated with airports. Therefore, implementation of the Proposed Project would be less than significant.</p>	No mitigation required.	Less Than Significant.

Table ES-1. Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Section 4.12, Recreation		
<p>Threshold 1: Physical Deterioration of Recreational Facilities</p> <p>Less Than Significant. The Proposed Project would not result in the physical deterioration of recreational facilities.</p>	No mitigation required.	Less Than Significant.
<p>No Impact. The Proposed Project would not necessitate the expansion of recreational facilities.</p>	No mitigation required.	No Impact.
Section 4.13, Transportation		
<p>Threshold 1: Circulation System Performance</p> <p>Less Than Significant. The Proposed Project would not conflict with regional or local programs, plans, ordinances, or policies addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities.</p>	No mitigation required.	Less Than Significant.
<p>Threshold 2: Induction of Substantial Vehicle Miles Traveled</p> <p>Potentially Significant. Without mitigation, the Proposed Project would have a potentially significant VMT impact.</p>	<p>MM TR-1: Prior to the issuance of an occupancy permit, property owner associations and/or building occupants shall be required to implement a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Plan to discourage single-occupancy vehicle trips for employees and encourage alternative modes of transportation such as carpooling, transit, walking, and biking. The TDM Plan should include an ongoing monitoring program to ensure the Plan is implemented on an ongoing basis.</p>	Less Than Significant.
<p>Threshold 3: Hazardous Design Features</p> <p>Less Than Significant. The Proposed Project would not substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous</p>	<p>MM TR-2: Prior to issuance of building permit, the Project Proponent/Developer shall prepare a Truck Traffic Management Plan (TTMP). The TTMP shall include transportation design features to physically discourage trucks from utilizing certain routes that are not designated truck routes. These design features could</p>	Less Than Significant.

Table ES-1. Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment).	include pork chops, reduced curb radii, or other physical improvements to prohibit trucks from utilizing non-designated truck routes.	
Threshold 4: Inadequate Emergency Access Less Than Significant. The Proposed Project would not result in inadequate emergency access.	No mitigation required.	Less Than Significant.
Section 4.14, Tribal Cultural Resources		
Threshold 1: Tribal Cultural Resources Potentially Significant. The Proposed Project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a Tribal Cultural Resource.	Refer to mitigation measure MM CUL-1, above	Less Than Significant.
Section 4.15 Utilities and Service Systems		
Threshold 1: New or Expanded Utilities Facilities Less Than Significant. The Proposed Project would not require new or expanded utilities.	No mitigation required.	Less Than Significant.
Threshold 2: Water Supply Availability Less Than Significant. Sufficient water supplies would be available to serve the Proposed Project and reasonably foreseeable future development during, normal, dry, and multiple-dry years.	No mitigation required.	Less Than Significant.
Threshold 3: Wastewater Treatment Capacity Less Than Significant. There is adequate capacity to treat the wastewater generated by the Proposed Project.	No mitigation required.	Less Than Significant.
Threshold 4: Solid Waste Generation Less Than Significant. The Proposed Project would not generate solid waste in	No mitigation required.	Less Than Significant.

Table ES-1. Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Impact	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
excess of State or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure.		
Threshold 5: Compliance with Solid Waste Regulations Less Than Significant. The Proposed Project would comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste.	No mitigation required.	Less Than Significant.