January 26, 2022

Mr. Alfredo Garcia
CITY OF PERRIS
Planning Division
135 North "D" Street
Perris, CA 92570

## Subject: SWC Rider-Redland's Warehouse Project (DPR \#21-00003) Scoping Agreement and VMT Analysis Review \#4, City of Perris

Dear Mr. Garcia,

## Introduction

RK ENGINEERING GROUP, INC. (RK) has reviewed the scoping agreement and VMT analysis \#4 for the SWC Rider - Redland's Warehouse Project (DPR \#21-00003). The project would include approximately 133,000 square feet of warehouse fulfillment center within the Perris Valley Commerce Center Specific Plan (PVCC SP). The project is located on the southwest corner of Redlands Avenue and Rider Street in the City of Perris. The project will have one access on Rider Street and one access on Redlands Avenue. The scoping agreement was prepared by Webb and Associates and is dated $12 / 23 / 2021$.

RK has reviewed the scoping agreement and VMT analysis \#4 and it is acceptable as revised. The traffic consultant has responded to our previous January 18, 2022 comment letter.

## Comments

RK has the following comments on the scope of work and VMT analysis:
VMT Scoping Form for Land Use Projects:

1. The VMT Analysis and Scoping Agreement is acceptable from a technical standpoint.
2. Figure 2, Project Trip Distribution is acceptable for trucks as revised.
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## Conclusions

RK has reviewed the Scoping Agreement and VMT Analysis \#4 for the SWC Rider Redland's Warehouse Project (DPR \#21-00003). Based upon this review, RK feels that the VMT Analysis and Scoping Agreement are acceptable as revised.

RK appreciates this opportunity to work with the City of Perris on this project and if you have any questions, please contact me at 949-293-9639.

Sincerely,


Robert Kahn, P.E.
Founding Principal
Registered Civil Engineer 20285
Registered Traffic Engineer 0555
Attachment

XC: Kenneth Phung, City of Perris
Stuart McKibben, City of Perris


John Pourkazemi, Tri-Lake Consultants
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## CITY OF PERRIS <br> VMT SCOPING FORM FOR LAND USE PROJECTS

This Scoping Form acknowledges the City of Perris requirements for the evaluation of transportation impacts under CEQA. The analysis provided in this form should follow the City of Perris TIA Guidelines, dated May 12, 2020.
I. Project Description

Tract/Case No. DPR 21-00003

Project Name: SWC Rider-Redlands Warehouse (Chartwell)

Project Location: 6-acre site on southwest corner of Rider Street and Redlands Avenue

Project Description: 132 ksf warehouse with 2 driveways, to be constructed on vacant property
(Please attach a copy of the project Site Plan)

Current GP Land Use: Industrial
Proposed GP Land Use: Industrial
Current Zoning: Light Industrial - PVCC SP
Proposed Zoning: Light Industrial - PVCC SP
If a project requires a General Plan Amendment or Zone change, then additional information and analysis should be provided to ensure the project is consistent with RHNA and RTP/SCS Strategies.
II. VMT Screening Criteria
A. Is the Project $100 \%$ affordable housing?
B. Is the Project within $1 / 2$ mile of qualifying transit?
C. Is the Project a local serving land use?
D. Is the Project in a low VMT area?
E. Are the Project's Net Daily Trips less than 500 ADT?

| YES |  | NO | X |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| YES |  | NO | X |
| YES |  | NO | X |
| YES | X | NO |  |
| YES | X | NO |  |

Attachments: $\square$
Attachments: $\square$
Attachments: $\square$
Attachments: $\square$
Attachments: $\square$

## Low VMT Area Evaluation:

| Citywide VMT Averages $^{\mathbf{1}}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Citywide Home-Based VMT $=$ |  |  |  | 15.05 | VMT/Capita |
| Citywide Employment-Based VMT $=$ | 11.62 | VMT/Employee |  |  |  |


| Project TAZ VMT Rate for Project TAZ ${ }^{1}$  Type of Project  <br> 3814 13.16 VMT/Capita Residential:  <br>  9.95 VMT/Employee Non-Residential: X |
| :--- |

Trip Generation Evaluation:

| Source of Trip Generation: ITE 10th Edition Trip Generation |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Project Trip Generation: | 226 | Average Daily Trip | DT) |  |  |
| Internal Trip Credit: | YES | NO | X | \% Trip Credit: |  |
| Pass-By Trip Credit: | YES | NO | X | \% Trip Credit: |  |
| Affordable Housing Credit: | YES | NO | X | \% Trip Credit: |  |
| Existing Land Use Trip Credit: | YES | NO | X | Trip Credit: |  |
| Net Project Daily Trips: | 226 | Average Daily Trips (ADT) |  | Attachments: |  |
| Does project trip generation warrant an LOS evaluation outside of CEQA? |  |  | YES | NO | X |

## III. VMT Screening Summary

A. Is the Project presumed to have a less than significant impact on VMT?

A Project is presumed to have a less than significant impact on VMT if the Project satisfies at least one (1) of the VMT screening criteria.


## B. Is mitigation required?

If the Project does not satisfy at least one (1) of the VMT screening criteria, then mitigation is required to reduce the Project's impact on VMT.

C. Is additional VMT modeling required to evaluate Project impacts?

If the Project requires a zone change and/or General Plan Amendment AND generates 2,500 or more net daily trips, then additional VMT modeling using RIVTAM/RIVCOM is required. If the project generates less than 2,500 net daily trips, the Project TAZ VMT Rate can be used for mitigation purposes.

## IV. MITIGATION



| VMT Reduction Mitigation Measure: |  | Estimated VMT <br> Reduction (\%) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. |  | $0.00 \%$ |
| 2. |  | $0.00 \%$ |
| 3. |  | $0.00 \%$ |
| 4. |  | $0.00 \%$ |
| 5. |  | $0.00 \%$ |
| 6. |  | $0.00 \%$ |
| 7. |  | $0.00 \%$ |
| 8. |  | $0.00 \%$ |
| 9. |  | $0.00 \%$ |
| 10. | Total VMT Reduction (\%) | $0.00 \%$ |

(Attach additional pages, if necessary, and a copy of all mitigation calculations.)
E. Mitigated Project TAZ VMT Rate:
F. Is the project pressumed to have a less than significant impact with mitigation?


If the mitigated Project VMT rate is below the Citywide Average Rate, then the Project is presumed to have a less than significant impact with mitigation. If the answer is no, then additional VMT modeling may be required and a potentially significant and unavoidable impact may occur. All mitigation measures identified in Section IV.D. are subject to become Conditions of Approval of the project. Development review and processing fees should be submitted with, or prior to the submittal of this Form. The Planning Department staff will not process the Form prior to fees being paid to the City.

| Prepared By |  |  | Developer/Applicant |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Company: <br> Contact: <br> Address: <br> Phone: <br> Email: <br> Date: | Albert A Webb Associates |  | Company: <br> Contact: <br> Address: <br> Phone: <br> Email: <br> Date: | Chartwell Real Estate Development |  |
|  | Nicholas Lowe |  |  | Henry Pyle |  |
|  | 3788 McCray Street, Riverside, CA |  |  | 1010 Brioso Dr, Costa Mesa, CA 92627 |  |
|  | 951-207-0343 |  |  | 949-701-5128 |  |
|  | nick.lowe@webbassociates.com |  |  | henry@chartwellred.com |  |
|  | 2022-05-05 |  |  | 2022-05-05 |  |
| Approved by: |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Perris Development Serivces Dept. |  | Date | Perris Public Works Dept. |  | Date |



| Developerowner | $\bigcirc$ KExNotes |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| site Legeno |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  | Stie plan general notes |
|  |  |
| PROJECT MEORMATON |  |
|  | IMPROVEMENT STANDARDS. 2. CONCRETE MOW STRIP PER ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS TO BE PROVIDED AT ALL GLAZING/STOREFRONT LOCATIONS <br> BE PROVIDED AT ALL GLAZS WHERE ADJACENT TO LANDSCAPING. 3. CONCRETE SPLASH BLOCK PER ARCHITECTURAL DETAILS TO BE PROVIDED AT ALL ROOF DRAIN/DOWN SPOUT TERMINATIONS AT NON-CONCRETE AREAS. 4. BRASS LAMB'S TONGUE TO BE PROVIDED AT ALL ROOF DRAIN OVERFLOWS THAT DAYLIGHT AT FACE OF BUILDING WALL. 15. GATES, FENCES, AND WALLS MAY BE SUBJECT TO DEFERRED SUBMITTAL REQUIREMENTS. GENERAL |
|  | (emen |
|  | Vicinit Map |
|  | ERoderst. |
|  |  |

## Table 1: Trip Generation Rates

Warehousing

| Vehicle Type | $\begin{gathered} \text { PCE } \\ \text { Factor }{ }^{1} \end{gathered}$ | Estimated Mix ${ }^{2}$ | Units ${ }^{3}$ | Daily | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | In | Out | Total | In | Out | Total |
| Trip Generation Rates (classification, non-PCE) ${ }^{4}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Passenger Cars ${ }^{5}$ | - | - | KSF | 1.11 | 0.121 | 0.030 | 0.15 | 0.035 | 0.115 | 0.15 |
| 2-axle Trucks | - | 16.7\% |  | 0.100 | 0.0017 | 0.0016 | 0.003 | 0.0026 | 0.0024 | 0.005 |
| 3-axle Trucks | - | 20.7\% |  | 0.124 | 0.0022 | 0.0020 | 0.004 | 0.0032 | 0.0030 | 0.006 |
| 4-axle Trucks | - | 62.5\% |  | 0.375 | 0.0065 | 0.0060 | 0.013 | 0.0098 | 0.0090 | 0.019 |
| Total |  | 100\% |  | 1.71 | 0.131 | 0.039 | 0.17 | 0.050 | 0.130 | 0.18 |
| Calculated Trip Generation Rates (PCE) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Passenger Cars ${ }^{5}$ | 1 | - | KSF | 1.11 | 0.121 | 0.030 | 0.15 | 0.035 | 0.115 | 0.15 |
| 2-axle Trucks | 1.5 | 16.7\% |  | 0.151 | 0.0026 | 0.0024 | 0.005 | 0.0039 | 0.0036 | 0.008 |
| 3-axle Trucks | 2 | 20.7\% |  | 0.249 | 0.0043 | 0.0040 | 0.008 | 0.0065 | 0.0060 | 0.012 |
| 4-axle Trucks | 3 | 62.5\% |  | 1.13 | 0.0195 | 0.0180 | 0.038 | 0.0293 | 0.0270 | 0.056 |
| Total |  | 100\% |  | 2.64 | 0.147 | 0.054 | 0.20 | 0.074 | 0.152 | 0.23 |

${ }^{1}$ PCE factors per San Bernardino County Transportation Authority
${ }^{2}$ Truck mix per High-Cube Warehouse Vehicle Trip Generation Analysis, ITE (2017); Warehouse Truck Trip Study, SCA QM (2014)
${ }^{3} \mathrm{KSF}=1,000$ square feet gross flo or area
${ }^{4}$ ITE Trip Generation M anual 1tth Ed + Supplement - Land Use 150, Warehousing
${ }^{5}$ P assenger car rates per ITE vehicle trip generation rates less ITE truck trip generation rates.

## Table 2: Project Trip Generation

Chartwell Rider/Redlands Warehouse

| Vehicle Type |  | Units ${ }^{2}$ | Daily | AM Peak Hour |  |  | PM Peak Hour |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Factor ${ }^{1}$ |  |  | In | Out | Total | In | Out | Total |
| Proposed Project Trip Generation (classification, non-PCE) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Passenger Cars | - | 132 KSF | 147 | 16 | 4 | 20 | 5 | 15 | 20 |
| 2-axle Trucks | - |  | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3-axle Trucks | - |  | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4-axle Trucks | - |  | 50 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Total |  |  | 226 | 17 | 5 | 22 | 6 | 16 | 22 |
| Passenger Car Equivalent (PCE) Project Trip Generation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Passenger Cars | 1 | 132 KSF | 147 | 16 | 4 | 20 | 5 | 15 | 20 |
| 2-axle Trucks | 1.5 |  | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3-axle Trucks | 2 |  | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4-axle Trucks | 3 |  | 150 | 3 | 3 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 6 |
| Total |  |  | 349 | 19 | 7 | 26 | 8 | 18 | 26 |

[^0]Figure 1: Project Trip Distribution - Passenger Cars


Figure 2: Project Trip Distribution - Trucks



[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ PCE factors per San Bernardino County Transportation Authority
    ${ }^{2} \mathrm{KSF}=1,000$ square feet gross flo or area

