

From: amoraj@verizon.net02
To: [Mark GrossV](#)
Date: Tue, 09 Apr 2013 12:49:18
Subject: Official DEIR Comments for the World Logistic Center
Attachment(s): 0

I apologize for not including my personal info:

Amora Johnson
13301 McGehee Dr.
Moreno Valley, CA 92555

There are no attachments, there's only the comments as written below.
Thank you for your time.

-----Original Message-----

From: amoraj@verizon.net
Date: Apr 9, 2013 12:38:03 PM
Subject: Official DEIR Comments for the World Logistic Center
To: markg@moval.org

-----Original Message-----

From: amoraj@verizon.net
Date: Apr 8, 2013 2:27:02 PM
Subject: Official DEIR Comments for the World Logistic Center
To: markg@moval.org

"Official DEIR Comments forthe World Logistics Center"

I am opposed to this project because of Environment, Aesthetic, Safety, Health and reasons.

It is incompatible with the current general plan which I read before I bought the and built a house on it. The plan would be to sell the property as part of our portfolio retirement funds. Having the warehouses built will impact the environment, too, California State wildlife sanctuary.

I would not have bought and built on it if I had known the general plan was going to be changed.

I oppose this project because it is not environmentally sound as what happened in the study at the Mira Loma warehousing location – this will be worse as human health and the wildlife area will both be affected.

To have the designation as a wildlife area, the State of California must have studied prior to all these proposed changes. With more pollution because of the diesel truck traffic as a result of the proposed warehouses, there won't be any more wildlife.

I oppose this project because the adverse health effects of diesel particulate pollution from 41 million square feet of warehousing trucks are not fully known. Research has been available that has linked pollution during pregnancy to increased autism risk. The majestic mountains that surround our city keep pollution trapped here. Why has an alternative site that is not surrounded by mountains been identified with a correct map?

I oppose this project because a 41million square foot warehousing complex is not economically feasible without freight rail. Additionally the Lead Agency has not disclosed how many taxdollars that will be needed for this project. Without knowing that amount neither the public nor the Lead Agency can determine the economic feasibility of this project. The City that is threatening to turn off the streetlights because they are broke, how can the Lead Agency determine whether the infrastructure costs to the taxpayers are worth it if they are not disclosed? How does the City propose to pay for infrastructure when they claim they cannot afford to pay for streetlights? How does this City intend to keep a positive community environment when they threaten to turn off public utilities needed for a project? How does the City propose to pay for developer required infrastructure?

I oppose this project because I don't think the employment numbers are correct. In a previous project from this developer which is Sketchers promised 2500 jobs, but the building was only designed for 300 because it is so modern and electronically advanced. Warehouse electronics are just like computer technology, it's outdated soon as it's finished. That means that each warehouse constructed will have fewer employees than the one before. How can the City or the developer properly estimate the number of jobs? How can the residents trust the City or the developer when they falsify employment numbers?

00__substg1.0_5FF70102*00000000n__substg1.0_6001001F*ÄE:002__FF60102*00000000