

Chapter 4 Environmental Analysis

Sections 4.1 through 4.15 in this chapter contain a discussion of the potential environmental effects from implementation of the proposed Perris Airport Logistics Center Project (referred to in this Environmental Impact Report (EIR) as the Proposed Project or Project), including the current environmental setting, regulatory setting, method of analysis, thresholds of significance, impacts (including cumulative), and mitigation measures.

Scope of the Environmental Impacts Analysis

In accordance with Appendix G of the Guidelines for Implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA Guidelines), the potential environmental effects from the Proposed Project are analyzed for the following environmental issue areas:

- 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
- Utilities and Service Systems

Format of the Environmental Impact Analysis

The following subsections compose each of the 15 environmental issue area sections in Sections 4.1 through 4.15 of this Draft EIR.

Environmental Setting

This subsection describes the current environmental setting of each environmental issue area. According to Section 15125 of the CEQA Guidelines, an EIR must include a description of the existing physical environmental conditions in the Proposed Project vicinity to provide the “baseline conditions” against which project-related impacts are compared. Normally, the baseline conditions are the physical conditions that exist when the Notice of Preparation of a Draft EIR is published. The Notice of Preparation for the Proposed Project was published on October 20, 2023, and the baseline conditions contained in this Draft EIR are generally taken from this time period. However, the CEQA Guidelines and applicable case law recognize that the date for establishing an environmental baseline cannot always be rigid. Physical environmental conditions may vary over a range of time periods; thus, the use of environmental baselines that differ from the publication date of the Notice of Preparation is reasonable and appropriate when conducting the environmental analyses. Some sections rely on a variety of data to establish an applicable baseline.

For example, in Sections 4.2, Air Quality; 4.3, Biological Resources; 4.4, Cultural Resources; 4.13, Transportation; and 4.14, Tribal Cultural Resources, available data were months and sometimes several years old. Therefore, projections regarding how those conditions might have changed were incorporated into the Draft EIR sections and corresponding technical reports.

Regulatory Setting

This subsection provides a summary of regulations, plans, policies, and laws that are relevant to each environmental issue area at the federal, state, regional, and local levels.

Method of Analysis

This subsection provides a description of the method used to analyze the potential impacts of the Proposed Project on the evaluated environmental issue areas.

Thresholds of Significance

This subsection identifies the criteria used to determine if potential environmental effects are significant. The thresholds of significance used in this analysis were primarily based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines. However, in some cases, thresholds were developed specifically for this analysis or were adapted from standards adopted by other agencies or entities. This subsection defines the type, amount, or extent of impact that would be considered a significant, adverse change in the environment. Some thresholds of significance, such as those used in Sections 4.2, Air Quality; 4.11, Noise; and 4.13, Transportation, are quantitative, while others, such those used in Section 4.1, Aesthetics, are qualitative. The discussion in Section 4.8, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, is largely based on the Wind Study (refer to Appendix F) conducted for the Proposed Project, which analyzes the differences in wind impacts between the Proposed Project, existing conditions, and alternatives. The thresholds of significance are intended to assist the reader in understanding how and why this Draft EIR reaches a conclusion of no impact, a less than significant impact, a potentially significant impact, or an impact that is significant and unavoidable.

Project Impacts and Mitigation

This subsection describes the potential environmental impacts of the Proposed Project and, based on the thresholds of significance, concludes if the environmental impacts would be significant, potentially significant, less than significant, or if no impact would occur. Each impact criterion is addressed in its own subsection. This format is designed to assist the reader in quickly identifying the subject of each impact analysis and for use in Table ES-1, Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures, which will form the basis of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program. For each impact criterion, applicable standards of significance are identified and potential impacts are discussed in the Impact Analysis subsection. Mitigation measures are also included and discussed when applicable.

Impact Analysis. The analysis of environmental impacts considers both the construction and operational phases associated with implementation of the Proposed Project. As required by Section 15126.2(a) of the CEQA Guidelines, direct, indirect, long-term, short-term, on-site, and off-site impacts are addressed, as appropriate, for the environmental issue area being analyzed. This EIR uses the following terms to describe the level of significance of impacts identified during the course of the environmental analysis:

- **No Impact:** “No impact” refers to implementation of the Proposed Project having no impact on environmental conditions.
- **Less than Significant:** “Less than significant” refers to two conditions:
 - Impacts resulting from implementation of the Proposed Project that are not likely to exceed the defined standards of significance.
 - Potentially significant impacts before implementation of mitigation measures. If implementation of the specified mitigation measures would reduce the potentially significant impact to a level that does not exceed the defined standards of significance, the impact is considered less than significant.
- **Potentially Significant:** “Potentially significant” refers to impacts resulting from implementation of the Proposed Project that may exceed defined standards of significance before mitigation is considered.
- **Significant and Unavoidable:** “Significant and unavoidable” refers to impacts resulting from implementation of the Proposed Project that cannot be eliminated or reduced to below the defined standards of significance or a less than significant level through implementation of feasible mitigation measures.

A “significant effect” is defined by Section 15382 of the CEQA Guidelines as “a substantial, or potentially substantial, adverse change in any of the physical conditions within the area affected by the Proposed Project including land, air, water, minerals, flora, fauna, ambient noise, and objects of historical or aesthetic significance. An economic or social change by itself shall not be considered a significant effect on the environment . . . [but] may be considered in determining whether the physical change is significant.”

Significance of Impact. This subsection identifies the level of significance of Project impacts before mitigation measures are implemented.

Mitigation Measures. Section 15126.4 of the CEQA Guidelines requires an EIR to “describe feasible measures which could minimize significant adverse impacts.” The CEQA Guidelines define “feasibility” as capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, social, technological, legal, or other considerations. The Mitigation Measures subsection discusses mitigation measures that could reduce the severity of impacts identified in the Impact Analysis subsection.

Significance After Mitigation. This subsection identifies the level of significance of Project impacts after mitigation measures are implemented.

Cumulative Impacts

CEQA requires that EIRs discuss cumulative impacts in addition to project impacts. In accordance with CEQA, the discussion of cumulative impacts must reflect the severity of the impacts and the likelihood of their occurrence; however, the discussion need not be as detailed as the discussion of environmental impacts attributable to the Proposed Project alone. Further, the discussion should be guided by the standards of practicality and reasonableness (CEQA Guidelines Section 15130[b]). According to Section 15355 of the CEQA Guidelines, “cumulative impacts” are defined as follows:

Two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable or which compound or increase other environmental impacts.

- (a) The individual effects may be changes resulting from a single project or a number of separate projects.
- (b) The cumulative impact from several projects is the change in the environment, which results from the incremental impact of the project when added to other closely related past, present, and reasonably foreseeable probable future projects. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant projects taking place over a period of time.

Section 15130(a) of the CEQA Guidelines further states that a “cumulative impact consists of an impact which is created as a result of the combination of the Proposed Project evaluated in the EIR together with other projects causing related impacts.”

In addition, Section 15130(a) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that EIRs discuss the cumulative impacts of a project when the Proposed Project’s incremental effect is cumulatively considerable. As further clarified by Section 15065 of the CEQA Guidelines, “cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of an individual project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects. Therefore, the discussion of cumulative impacts in an EIR evaluates if the impacts of the Proposed Project would be significant when considered in combination with past, present, and future reasonably foreseeable projects, and if the Proposed Project would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to those impacts. The CEQA Guidelines indicate that, where a lead agency is examining a project with an incremental effect that is not cumulatively considerable, it need not consider the effect significant but shall briefly describe the basis for its conclusion. The CEQA Guidelines allow for a project’s contribution to be rendered less than cumulatively considerable with implementation of mitigation.

The geographic scope of the cumulative impact analysis varies depending on the specific environmental issue area being analyzed. The geographic scope defines the geographic area within which projects may contribute to a specific cumulative impact. Therefore, past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects within the defined geographic area for a given cumulative issue must be considered.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15130(b) presents the following two possible approaches for considering past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects and indicates that either could be used:

1. A list of past, present, and probable future projects producing related or cumulative impacts, including, if necessary, those projects outside the control of the agency
2. A summary of projections contained in an adopted local, regional, or statewide plan, or related planning document, that describes or evaluates conditions contributing to the cumulative effect

This Draft EIR uses the first approach. Existing development is included as part of the existing environmental baseline when evaluating project impacts and is not included in Table 4-1, Cumulative Projects. Active projects within approximately one mile of the Proposed Project Site are listed in Table 4-1. Collectively, those cumulative projects are in various stages of development, including the planning phase, design stage, or construction phase.

Table 4-1. Cumulative Projects

No.	Name/Applicant	Description	Quantity	Jurisdiction
1	Mapes and Trumble Industrial	High-Cube Fulfillment Center Warehouse	396.000 TSF	Perris
2	Perris Multifamily Residential (DPR 20-00008)	Mulfamily (Low-Rise)	287 DU	Perris
3	Pulte Residential / TTM 30850	SFDR	496 DU	Perris
4	Perez Indus / DPR 16-00016	Industrial	2.500 TSF	Perris
5	Pharmacy / DPR 20-00022	Industrial	15.000 TSF	Perris
6	South Perris Industrial Project	Industrial	784.000 TSF 3,448.734 TSF 2,300.000 TSF	Perris
7	Riverwoods	Single Family Housing Elementary School Park	663 DU 600 STU 12.0 AC	Perris
8	Go Fresh Gas Station	Gasoline/Conven. Mkt./Retail Store/ Car Wash Convenient Store Retail Store Car Wash Tunnel	16 VSP 3.960 TSF 1.406 TSF 2.505 TSF	Perris
9	Tract 37803	Residential	145 DU	Perris
10	Villa Verona Apt – Tract 37181 / DPR 16-00002	Multi-family Housing	360 DU	Perris

Table 4-1. Cumulative Projects

No.	Name/Applicant	Description	Quantity	Jurisdiction
11	Senior Housing / DPR 17-00005	Multi-family Housing	141 DU	Perris
12	GVSP – Tract 37262	Single Family Housing	191 DU	Perris
13	GVSP – Tract 37716	Multi-family Housing	97 DU	Perris
14	GVSP – Tract 37722	Single Family Housing	116 DU	Perris
15	GVSP – Tract 37818	Multi-family Housing	227 DU	Perris
16	GVSP – Tract 37818	Single Family Housing	138 DU	Perris
17	GVSP – Tract 37818	Multi-family Housing	236 DU	Perris
18	GVSP – Tract 37223	Single Family Housing	235 DU	Perris
19	Airport Industrial	Industrial	650.000 TSF	Perris
20	Perris Valley Town Center (West Side)	Retail Fast-Food with Drive-Through	28.000 TSF 2.200 TSF	Perris
21	Perris Valley Town Center (East Side)	Shopping Center Fast-Food with Drive-Through High Turnover Restaurant Gas Station	644.866 TSF 10.500 TSF 15.1520 TSF 16 VFP	Perris
22	Weinerschnitzel / CUP 17-05083	Fast-Food Restaurant	2.000 TSF	Perris
23	Burge Indus 2	Industrial	19.000 TSF	Perris
24	Perris Plaza – Build-out	Commercial	173.000 TSF	Perris
25	Wilson Industrial / DPR 19-00007	High-Cube Warehouse	303.000 TSF	Perris
26	Arco Expansion	Commercial	3.869 TSF	Perris
27	Rados / DPR 07-0119	High-Cube Warehouse	1,200.000 TSF	Perris
28	Rider 2/4	High-Cube Warehouse	1,373.449 TSF	Perris
29	Sunwest Enterprises	SFDR	61 DU	Perris
30	Pacific Ave	PUD	131 DU	Perris
31	Sunwest Enterprises	SFDR	57 DU	Perris
32	Jason Keller/John Ford	SFDR	189 DDU	Perris
33	Jason Keller/John Ford	SFDR	122 DU	Perris
34	Rastogi Family LTD / John Ford	SFDR	75 DU	Perris
35	Sterling Villa Senior Housing	Senior Adult Housing – Attached	429 DU	Perris
36	Burge Indus 1	Industrial	18.000 TSF	Perris
37	Pulliam Indus	Industrial	16.000 TSF	Perris
38	Hillwood Ethanac	High-Cube Transload Warehouse High-Cube Cold Storage Warehouse	362.348 TSF 50.000 TSF	Perris
39	SP260A2	SP Proposal for APN 329-110-003/026/028/01	2,025 DU	Menifee

Table 4-1. Cumulative Projects

No.	Name/Applicant	Description	Quantity	Jurisdiction
40	United Carports Warehouse (DEV2022-009)	Warehouse	58.643 TSF	Menifee
41	Trumble Retail (CUP2016-290)	Hotel Quality Restaurant Fast-Food with Drive-Through Gas Station	108 RM 5.500 TSF 3.00 TSF 12 VFP	Menifee
42	Paragon Framing (CUP2018-126)	Office/Storage	10.454 TSF	Menifee
43	Trumble/Watson Warehouse (DEV2022-019)	Warehouse	327.631 TSF	Menifee
44	TR 38132 & 38133 (SPA DEV2021-005)	Single Family Residential	322 DU	Menifee
45	MR-27 LLC Rancon (TTM 34118)	Multi-family (Low-Rise)	85 DU	Menifee
46	Motte Country Plaza (PP2018-300)	Gas Station	12 VFP	Menifee
47	Forterra Pipe (PP2018-199)	Storage Yard Expansion	20.700 TSF	Menifee
48	Menifee Commerce Center (PP2019-005)	Warehouse	1,464.650 TSF	Menifee
49	Menifee Commerce Center II (DEV2022-014)	Warehouse	1,139.478 TSF	Menifee
50	Nova Battery Storage (DEV2022-015)	Redevelopment of IEEC Plant		Menifee
51	McLaughlin Warehouses (DEV2022-016)	Warehouse	491.467 TSF	Menifee
52	Goetz/Ethanac Commercial (PP PLN21-0319)	Gas Station Retail	14.290 TSF	Menifee
53	Corsica Business Park (DEV2022-010)	Business Park	276.682 TSF	Menifee
54	Capstone Industrial (PLN21-0370)	Warehouse	700.037 TSF	Menifee
55	DEV2022-017	Warehouse	551.685 TSF	Menifee
56	Northern Gateway Commerce Center II (PP PLN21-0281)	High-Cube Warehouse	1,312.601 TSF	Menifee
57	Ethanac/Evans Warehouse (DEV2022-018)	Warehouse	137.896 TSF	Menifee
58	Ethanac Square (MJMOD PLN21-0104)	Gas Station	3.800 TSF	Menifee
59	Ethanac/Barnett Warehouse (PP PLN21-0290)	Warehouse	250.000 TSF	Menifee
60	Mapes and Sherman Warehouse	High-Cube Fulfillment Center Warehouse	277.578 TSF	Menifee
61	Cimarron Ridge	Residential	756 DU	Menifee

Table 4-1. Cumulative Projects

No.	Name/Applicant	Description	Quantity	Jurisdiction
62	DEV2022-001	Single Family Residential	96 DU	Menifee
63	Valley Blvd. Tract Map	Single Family Residential	68 DU	Menifee
64	TR/PP Di Capri	Condominiums	61 DU	Menifee
65	Coronado Condos	Condominiums	73 DU	Menifee
66	Vista Ridge	Condominiums	30 DU	Menifee
67	McCall-Encanto Gas Station	Gas Station with Convenient Stoe Fast-Food Restaurant with Drive- Through	6 VFP 3.900 TSF	Menifee
68	McLaughlin Village	Condominiums	126 DU	Menifee
69	Legado	Residential	1,022 DU	Menifee
70	Underwood	Residential	543 DU	Menifee
71	Cypress and Sands Apartments	Residential	136 DU	Menifee
72	Beyond Menifee	Mixed-Use	17.3 AC	Menifee
73	Stoneridge	High-Cube Cold Storage High-Cube Fulfillment High-Cube Warehouse Manufacturing Warehousing Industrial Park Free-Standing Discount Store Commercial Retail	1,695.355 TSF 2,966.872 TSF 2,966.872 TSF 847.678 TSF 427.759 TSF 641.639 TSF 100.000 TSF 21.968 TSF	County
74	TTM/TR37358	Residential Lots	154 DU	County
75	TR36712	Single Family Lots	74 DU	County
76	TTM37728	228 Lot Schedule a Tentative Map	228 DU	County
77	SP00344/TR35045	Residential with Park/Open Space/ School/Ba	796 DU	County
78	Ellis/Sherman Warehouses	High-Cube Fulfillment High-Cube Cold Storage	1,374.688 TSF 242.592 TSF	County
79	TR31687	Single Family Residential	65 DU	County
80	TR36635	Residential, 6.0 Acres Park/Basin	283 DU	County
81	TR36665	Residential Lots with 14 Open Space Lots	587 DU	County
82	TR37134	Single Family Residential	73 DU	County
83	McCanna Hills / TTM 33978	SFDR	63.000 DU	County
84	PPT220047	Warehousing	192.249 TSF	County
85	Patterson & Harvill Warehouse	Warehousing & Cold Storage	100.190 TSF	County
86	PPT190028	Warehousing	197.856 TSF	County
87	Dedeaux Harvill Truck Terminal	Truck Terminal	55.700 TSF	County

Table 4-1. Cumulative Projects

No.	Name/Applicant	Description	Quantity	Jurisdiction
88	Harvill & Water Logistics	High-Cube Fulfillment Center Warehouse High-Cube Cold Storage Warehouse	304.376 TSF 130.447 TSF	County
89	Placentia Truck Drop Lot	Truck Trailer Storage	8.060 AC	County
90	28840 Rider Street	Animal Production Facility	54.450 TSF	County
91	Barker Logistics	High-Cube Fulfillment Center Warehouse	699.630 TSF	County
92	Harvill & Cajalco Warehouse	General Light Industrial & Truck Yard	99.770 TSF	County
93	Patterson & Cajalco Warehouse	Warehousing & Cold Storage	107.968 TSF	County
94	Rider & Patterson Business Center	High-Cube Fulfillment Center Warehouse	591.203 TSF	County
95	Mead Valley Commerce Center	High-Cube Cold Storage High-Cube Fulfillment Center Waterhouse Active Park	150.526 TSF 852.984 TSF 14.940 AC	County

Source: Urban Crossroads 2024.

Notes: AC = Acres; DU = Dwelling Units; SFDR = Single Family Dwelling Residential; STU = Students; TSF = Thousand Square Feet; VSP/VFP = Vehicle Fueling Positions

Conclusion

This subsection summarizes if each of the Proposed Project’s significant environmental effects discussed and analyzed in the impact analysis has or has not been reduced to below a level of significance through mitigation. This subsection includes a discussion supported by a synopsis of the rationale for the conclusion. Finally, this subsection also discusses why an impact could not be mitigated or otherwise reduced to a less than significant level.

This page intentionally left blank.