

Comments for the Draft Environmental Report
For the World Logistics Center

April 7, 2013

City of Moreno Valley
14177 Frederick Street
Moreno Valley, CA 92553

Attn: John Terrell
Mark Gross

RECEIVED
APR 08 2013
CITY OF MORENO VALLEY
Planning Division

Re: Comments for the Draft Environmental Impact Report for the World Logistics Center

To whom it may concern:

I oppose this project because a 41 million square foot warehousing complex is not economically feasible without freight rail and additional highway infrastructure to support its shipping and receiving demands. Plus the Lead Agency has not disclosed how much it will cost in tax dollars for this project. Without knowing that amount, neither the public nor the Lead Agency can determine the economic feasibility. It creates unavoidable health consequences as well as traffic and infrastructure burdens that cannot be effectively mitigated.

In direct reference to the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR), section 4.0 there is reference that a "new Specific Plan will be adopted to govern development of the WLC." What is the schedule release date of this Specific Plan for public review and comment? And how does this proposed project conform to the overall regional goals for the Inland Empire?

The DEIR states there will be a separate zoning amendment of the 1104 acres of open space. When will the hearing be scheduled and what is the position of the FNSJWL on this rezoning map?

Section 4.1 Existing Policies and Regulations references the rezoning of the area within the project boundaries. What will be the allowable uses and restrictions of this area for manufacturing and industrial uses? Who will police the daily activity and what will be the Lessor/Lessee obligation to disclose to the City what their operations entail?

In direct reference to section 4.1.2 Existing Policies and Regulations, Objective 2.5; this states "promote a minimum of Industrial uses which provide a sound and diversified economic base and ample employment opportunities for citizens of Moreno Valley with establishment of Industrial activities that have good access to the regional transportation system, accommodating the personal needs of workers and business visitors, and which meets service needs of local businesses." But how is this accomplished if our community already experiences the Level of Service for traffic circulation of an E or F level rating?

Comments for the Draft Environmental Report
For the World Logistics Center

To designate residential traffic arteries within communities as truck routes does not improve this LOS rating it makes it worst.

Who will pay for the upkeep of our community infrastructure of the traffic routes that become designated as truck routes, the tax payer or will there be a special assessment for the occupant in the commercial building that is using those truck routes to support their business?

Section 2.5.4 of the same 4.1.2 as noted above references "design industrial developments to discourage access through residential areas." What streets will be specifically designated as Not a Truck Route and what will the penalties be for those who choose to violate those restrictions. Who will be responsible for infrastructure repairs when unauthorized/overweight vehicles damage residential streets?

Currently, as a resident who lives on Shubert Street off Redlands Blvd., our street does become a used route for all vehicles when traffic is diverted off Redlands Blvd. to Eucalyptus or Dreacaea. What measures will be put in place to ensure the diesel trucks are NOT using our neighborhood streets?

Objective 2.10 of the same 4.1.2 as noted above shows consistent exemplary design is contrary to the installation of sound walls along existing residential neighborhoods as well as displaying inadequate setbacks and streetscape obligations to be provided by the developer. How will this be handled?

Policy 2.10.4 of the same 4.1.2 as noted above Landscape buffers and transitions will be a very important part of setting the esthetics benchmark for the development. Will uniformity be a requirement for each parcel so to not detract from an adjacent property? Will the landscape tree and shrub count include enough elements and separation to absorb the diesel particulates to reduce the exposure of diesel toxins to the neighbor/neighborhood?

Policy 2.10.11 of the same 4.1.2 as noted above to screen and buffer non-residential projects from adjacent residential properties does not clearly identify the minimum setback requirements to reduce the exposure of diesel particulates to the residential neighborhood adjacent to the commercial building nor does it address the requirements of the No Idling Restrictions. These measures not being clearly addressed will affect the quality of life for any person subjected to the impacts of this project.

My concern with this very topic is that cities and counties adopt design standards for Residential neighborhoods with details of maximum rooflines, minimum number of units, setback requirements, colors & materials, walls & fence design standards, lighting restrictions by ordinances, maximum lot coverage, minimum space between structures, watercourse and drainage design to protect the natural and forms, reverse frontage treatments for landscape street medians and parkways, minimum landscape requirements, drainage plan and flood control. What is the design criteria for this project so that the same development standards are applied to the commercial project that would be applicable to a residential project? This DEIR may reference proposed placement of buildings and proposed line of sight based on a specific location, but how do we know this will be the standards of what becomes the finished product?

Comments for the Draft Environmental Report
For the World Logistics Center

Policy 2.10.5 of the same 4.1.2 as noted above freeways are the only road identified to have landscape buffers. Why aren't the residential neighborhood streets adjacent to the project also included in this buffer requirement?

Table 3.A of the Moreno Highland SP (Current Land Use Designation) states the developer owns or controls 46% of an area being planned so how does the developer or the City have any right to override the remaining 54% of the land designation that is owned by other private, none supportive parties?

How does warehouses sustain a pleasant "living and working environment" when the output is toxic to our air we breathe, stifles our flow of traffic, deteriorates our infrastructure and completely changes the economics and esthetics of the community? What is pleasant about any of these facts?

The Noise Assessment for the World Logistics Center dated January 24, 2013 identifies residents of Site 9 along Shubert Street which was included in this referenced noise study as being a quiet residential area. What actions and traffic restrictions will be put in place to maintain the current quality of life I experience as a property owner on Shubert Street?

According to the historical opinion of our past governing body and according to our Community General Plan, specifically noted on page 7-12, Scenic resources contribute to the overall desirability of a community. The distinctive physical setting of Moreno Valley creates much of the city's appeal as a place in which to live. Thus Moreno Valley's visual resources are also of economic value to the Community. So if it has been the opinion for many years, what is the economic value that is being placed on warehouse verses the current expired General Plan? What research has been put in place to validate the economic decision of warehouses instead of the currently expired General Plan and when will that comparison be made available to the general public for review?

Many qualities that once promoted a positive livable environment will become dramatically altered when this project becomes reality for this community. We will struggle with the health challenges each of us within the region will have to face which will diminish our quality of life. The road ways that are already congested with the daily demands of our region as of today will become even more of a difficult encounter when diesel trucks are added to the community. Our region already has recorded data of being amongst the worst air quality in the state. The 22,000 additional trucks per day is a nuisance that can be avoided in an area that cannot support that demand. Fact is that 200 vehicles are equivalent to 1 diesel truck when it comes to the health impact on the region. The health impacts alone are overwhelming to try and comprehend and for our local leaders to overlook these facts willfully put our community in harm's way.

In closing, I fully support the currently expired General Plan because it develops the east side area in a way that makes the most practical sense to our community. Many of us homeowners read this General Plan to see the vision of the community leadership that aided us in making the decision to buy here in Moreno Valley instead of elsewhere. I support the plan that will attract businesses to our city for it to prosper. As a vested homeowner in this east side community, I respectfully request the reconsideration of these unavoidable impacts and consider choosing a sustainable master plan that provides a livable environment for all. Warehouses are of the poorest economic choice that could be considered for this

Comments for the Draft Environmental Report
For the World Logistics Center

area and as I see it, it only makes economic sense for one entity and we the people who make up this community deserve better than that!

Respectfully,



Tracy Hodge

Homeowner in Moreno Valley

13097 Shubert St.
Moreno Valley, Ca. 92555