

SENT VIA E-MAIL:

August 07, 2025

[cassadzadeh@riversideca.gov](mailto:cassadzadeh@riversideca.gov)

Candice Assadzadeh, Senior Planner

City of Riverside

Community & Economic Development Department Planning Division

3900 Main Street, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor

Riverside, CA 92522

**Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the Proposed  
Massachusetts Point Project (Proposed Project)  
(SCH No.: 2024120391)**

South Coast Air Quality Management District (South Coast AQMD) staff appreciates the opportunity to comment on the above-mentioned document. The City of Riverside is the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Lead Agency for the Proposed Project. To provide context, South Coast AQMD staff has provided a brief summary of the project information and prepared the following comments, organized by topic of concern.

**Summary of Project Information in the Draft EIR**

Based on the Draft EIR, the Proposed Project site encompasses approximately 14.42 acres<sup>1</sup> and consists of demolishing the existing structures and constructing two light industrial buildings for a total of 199,850 square feet (sf) of warehouse and office uses on approximately 10.21 acres.<sup>2</sup> Building 1 would consist of 99,900 sf with 17 dock doors along the southern side of the building, and Building 2 would consist of 99,950 sf with 22 dock doors along the northern side of the building.<sup>3</sup> The Proposed Project assumes 20 percent (%) of the warehouses for cold storage.<sup>4</sup> The Proposed Project site is located at 2626 Kansas Avenue, 2069 Massachusetts Avenue, and 1989 Massachusetts Avenue.<sup>5</sup> Based on the review of the aerial photograph, the nearest sensitive receptor (e.g., residence) is approximately 680 feet northeast of the Proposed Project site. Construction of the Proposed Project is anticipated to take approximately 14 months, with operations beginning in 2027.<sup>6</sup>

**South Coast AQMD Comments**

*Incorrect Land Use Type Used in CalEEMod*

According to the CalEEMod detailed report provided in Appendix B – Air Quality, Energy, and GHG Report, the land use type selected for the unrefrigerated portion of the warehouses is

---

<sup>1</sup> Draft EIR, p. 3-1.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 3-25.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 3-25 and 3-27.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.* p. 3-45.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* p. 3-1.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*

categorized as General Heavy Industry.<sup>7</sup> However, based on the CalEEMod User Guide, the General Heavy Industry land use type is defined as: “Heavy industrial facilities usually have a high number of employees per industrial plant and are generally limited to the manufacturing of large items.”<sup>8</sup>

This classification does not accurately reflect the Proposed Project, which involves the development of two warehouse buildings with 20% of cold storage. The appropriate land use category for this project in CalEEMod should therefore be Unrefrigerated Warehouse and Refrigerated Warehouse, which more accurately represent the expected operational characteristics and associated emission factors.

Use of the incorrect land use category may lead to underestimation of construction and operational emissions in the environmental impact analysis. To ensure a more accurate assessment of air quality impacts, the Lead Agency is recommended to revise the CalEEMod inputs accordingly, rerun the model using the appropriate land use classification, and incorporate the updated results into the Final EIR.

#### *Potentially Underestimated Construction Emissions*

According to Section 5.9: Hazards and Hazardous Materials of the Draft EIR, its Phase I Environmental Site Assessment found that the Proposed Project site contains volatile organic compounds (VOCs) at concentrations that exceed their applicable regulatory screening thresholds<sup>9</sup>, specifically:

- At 2626 Kansas Avenue, elevated concentrations of trichloroethene (TCE) have been identified in shallow soil vapor in the northwest portion of the site; tetrachloroethene (PCE) and TCE have been detected in the south-central and southeastern exterior areas; and 1,1-dichloroethene (1,1-DCE) has been detected in groundwater monitoring wells on the northwest portion of the site.
- At 2069 and 1989 Massachusetts Avenue, PCE and TCE have also been detected.

The Lead Agency has proposed Mitigation Measure HAZ-1, which requires preparation of a Soil Management Plan (SMP) and a Health and Safety Plan (HSP), both of which must be reviewed and approved by the Santa Ana Regional Water Quality Control Board prior to issuance of any grading or excavation permits.<sup>10</sup> However, the Draft EIR does not evaluate the potential air quality impacts associated with site cleanup and remediation activities during construction.

Cleanup activities will likely involve the use of heavy-duty, diesel-fueled trucks for soil export and result in emissions from truck hauling activities and vehicle trips by workers that will be required to conduct cleanup activities. Additionally, cleanup activities will likely require the use of additional equipment that may be different from typical equipment for grading and site preparation for construction. Based on the emission calculations from the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod) detailed report, the Lead Agency used the default one-way truck trip length of 20 miles to quantify the Proposed Project’s construction emissions from hauling

---

<sup>7</sup> Appendix B – Air Quality, Energy, and GHG Report. CalEEMod Detailed Report.

<sup>8</sup> CalEEMod User Guide. P. 23.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.* p. 5.9-18.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.* p. 5.9-26.

construction materials and importing soil. According to Section 5.19: Utilities and Service Systems of the Draft EIR, it is identified that Badlands Landfill, Lamb Canyon Landfill, the El Sobrante Landfill, and Mid-Valley Sanitary Landfill are the municipal waste landfills that could serve the Proposed Project.<sup>11</sup> If cleanup activities include the removal and disposal of contaminated soil, depending on the type of contamination, these landfills may not accept the contaminated soil. In that case, contaminated soil may need to be transported to a permitted hazardous waste disposal facility located outside Riverside County, which could require a one-way trip significantly longer than 20 miles.

To ensure an accurate quantification of construction-related emissions, including the cleanup activities, particularly for regional criteria pollutants and greenhouse gases, the Lead Agency is recommended to revise the CalEEMod<sup>12</sup> model inputs to reflect the actual distance to a known and permitted hazardous waste disposal facility expected to be used by the project. The selected trip length should be clearly disclosed and justified in the Final EIR. Should the Lead Agency elect not to revise the default 20-mile haul distance, a detailed rationale supported by substantial evidence in the administrative record must be provided to demonstrate the appropriateness of the default assumption in the context of the project-specific conditions.

*Unsupported Truck Trip Distance Assumption Used in Emissions Modeling*

Accurately estimating truck trip lengths is a key parameter when quantifying emissions from mobile sources, especially diesel particulate matter (DPM), oxides of nitrogen (NOx), and greenhouse gas (GHG). The mischaracterization of average trip length, for example, can lead to a significant underestimation of the project's air quality impacts. According to the Draft EIR, the truck emissions are calculated with the truck trip length as the weighted average of 15.3 miles for 2-axle, 14.2 miles for 3-axle, and 40 miles for 4-axle trucks.<sup>13</sup> However, the analysis lacks critical information regarding the supporting basis for determining the trip origins and destinations and whether the assumed distances are reflective of actual or anticipated routing patterns of the facility's current or future truck fleet.

As such, the Final EIR should include a clear and defensible rationale for the use of the truck trip length assumption. The rationale should be supported by documentation such as empirical data from fleet operations, transportation logistics studies, regional freight movement data, or other sources that demonstrate the applicability and appropriateness of the selected distances. Additionally, if any truck trips associated with the Proposed Project will include port-related activities, the Final EIR should explain this detail, and the modeled trip lengths should accurately reflect the mileage between the project site and the relevant port(s), such as the Ports of Los Angeles or Long Beach, located approximately 65-70 miles one-way from the Proposed Project site.

Therefore, it is recommended that the Lead Agency either revise the trip distance assumptions to more accurately reflect realistic operational conditions or provide additional evidence substantiating that the selected distances are representative of actual or reasonably foreseeable truck travel patterns associated with the Proposed Project. Failure to provide supporting evidence

---

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.* p. 5.19-16.

<sup>12</sup> CalEEMod free of charge available at <https://www.caleemod.com/>

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.* p. 5.3-22.

to validate these assumptions may compromise the accuracy of the emission estimates, conclusion, and the overall integrity of the air quality analysis presented in the Final EIR.

### *Truck Idling Duration and Emissions Modeling*

Appendix C – Health Risk Assessment indicates that a default assumption of 15 minutes of idling per truck per day, including Transport Refrigeration Unit (TRU) trucks, was used to estimate DPM emissions for the operational health risk assessment.<sup>14</sup> While this assumption may be consistent with regulatory idling limits, it may not accurately reflect actual operating conditions for a facility of the Proposed Project's scale. The Proposed Project is anticipated to generate approximately 342 truck trips per day, with 20% of all heavy-duty diesel trucks assumed to be equipped with a TRU,<sup>15</sup> representing a substantial volume of heavy-duty vehicle activity. For a high-throughput logistics or distribution facility, it is reasonable to expect that individual trucks may experience extended periods of idling due to on-site queuing, security checks, staging, loading, and unloading operations, particularly during peak hours or in constrained circulation areas. As such, a 15-minute idling duration may underestimate actual on-site idling behavior and, consequently, DPM emissions, which are a key contributor to localized health risks.

Although the California Air Resources Board (CARB) limits diesel truck idling to five minutes as set forth in the Airborne Toxic Control Measure (ATCM), this regulation provides exemptions for trucks equipped with engines that meet the optional low-NOx idle emission standard, typically applicable to model year 2008 and newer trucks. These vehicles, often referred to as “clean idle” certified, are permitted to idle longer than five minutes when situated more than 100 feet from sensitive land uses such as homes and schools.<sup>16</sup> Furthermore, CARB’s EMFAC2021 Volume III Technical Document (Table 4.4.2-5) indicates that heavy-duty trucks may idle for up to five hours at a single location under certain conditions.<sup>17</sup>

Accurate characterization of idling activity is essential to fully assess a project’s potential health risk impacts, particularly for nearby sensitive receptors. Therefore, to ensure the HRA provides a conservative and health-protective estimate of potential exposure, the Lead Agency is recommended to either: 1) revise the operational emissions modeling in the Final EIR to assume a minimum of 30 minutes of idling per truck per day, unless site-specific data or operational constraints justify a shorter duration; or 2) provide empirical evidence, such as facility-specific queuing and processing time studies, vehicle circulation modeling, or comparable industry data, to substantiate the 15-minute assumption as representative of expected operations of the Proposed Project.

### *Inconsistency in Cancer Risk Results Presented in Draft EIR and Its Appendices*

The health risk assessment for the Proposed Project includes evaluation of both short-term and long-term DPM emissions associated with construction and operational activities. The estimated cancer risk results are presented in the Draft EIR and its technical appendices. However, upon staff

---

<sup>14</sup> Appendix C – Health Risk Assessment, p. 23.

<sup>15</sup> Appendix C – Health Risk Assessment, p. 22.

<sup>16</sup> CARB. Airborne Toxic Control Measure to Limit Diesel-Fueled Commercial Motor Vehicle Idling available at <https://ww2.arb.ca.gov/our-work/programs/atcm-to-limit-vehicle-idling>

<sup>17</sup> CARB. EMFAC2021 Volume III Technical Document. Page 161. Table 4.4.2-5 available at [EMFAC2021 Volume III Technical Document](#)

review, inconsistencies were identified between the Draft EIR, Appendix C - Health Risk Assessment, and Appendix B - Air Quality, Energy, and Greenhouse Gas Report. Specifically, the Draft EIR and Appendix C both show cancer risks of 0.63 in one million for construction and 5.59 in one million for operation.<sup>18,19</sup> In contrast, Appendix B shows 0.54 in one million for construction and 3.55 in one million for operation.<sup>20</sup>

To ensure transparency, accuracy, and consistency across all CEQA documents, the Lead Agency is recommended to reconcile these discrepancies and include the updates in the Final EIR to reflect the correct and consistent cancer risk values throughout the CEQA document and all supporting appendices.

*Additional Recommended Air Quality and Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Measures and Project Design Features for Consideration*

CEQA requires that all feasible mitigation measures that go beyond what is required by law be utilized to minimize or eliminate any significant adverse air quality impacts. To further reduce the Proposed Project's air quality impacts, South Coast AQMD recommends incorporating the following mitigation measures and project design considerations into the Final EIR.

Mitigation Measures to Reduce Operational Air Quality Impacts from Mobile Sources

1. Require zero-emission (ZE) or near-zero emission (NZE) on-road haul trucks, such as heavy-duty trucks with natural gas engines that meet the CARB's adopted optional NOx emissions standard at 0.02 grams per brake horsepower-hour (g/bhp-hr), if and when feasible.

*Note: Given CARB's clean truck rules and regulations, aiming to accelerate the utilization and market penetration of ZE and NZE trucks, such as the Advanced Clean Trucks Rule and the Heavy-duty Low NOx Omnibus Regulation, ZE and NZE trucks will become increasingly more available for use.*

2. Require a phase-in schedule to incentivize the use of cleaner operating trucks to reduce any significant adverse air quality impacts.

*Note: South Coast AQMD staff are available to discuss the availability of current and upcoming truck technologies and incentive programs with the Lead Agency.*

3. Limit the daily number of trucks allowed at the Proposed Project to levels analyzed in the Final EIR. If higher daily truck volumes are anticipated to visit the site, the Lead Agency should commit to re-evaluating the Proposed Project through CEQA prior to allowing this higher activity level.

---

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.* p. 5.3-28.

<sup>19</sup> Appendix C – Health Risk Assessment. p. 31 and 32.

<sup>20</sup> Appendix B – Air Quality, Energy, and GHG Report. p. 27.

4. Provide electric vehicle (EV) charging stations or, at a minimum, provide electrical infrastructure, and electrical panels should be appropriately sized. Electrical hookups should be provided for truckers to plug in any onboard auxiliary equipment.

Mitigation Measures to Reduce Operational Air Quality Impacts from Other Area Sources

1. Maximize the use of solar energy by installing solar energy arrays.
2. Use light-colored paving and roofing materials.
3. Utilize only Energy Star heating, cooling, and lighting devices and appliances.

Design Considerations for Reducing Air Quality and Health Risk Impacts

1. Clearly mark truck routes with trailblazer signs so that trucks will not travel next to or near sensitive land uses (e.g., residences, schools, daycare centers, etc.).
2. Design the Proposed Project such that truck entrances and exits are not facing sensitive receptors, and trucks will not travel past sensitive land uses to enter or leave the Proposed Project site.
3. Design the Proposed Project such that any truck check-in point is inside the Proposed Project site to ensure no trucks are queuing outside.
4. Design the Proposed Project to ensure that truck traffic inside the Proposed Project site is as far away as feasible from sensitive receptors.
5. Restrict overnight truck parking in sensitive land uses by providing overnight truck parking inside the Proposed Project site.

Lastly, the South Coast AQMD also suggests that the Lead Agency conduct a review of the following references and incorporate additional mitigation measures as applicable to the Proposed Project in the Final EIR:

1. State of California – Department of Justice: Warehouse Projects: Best Practices and Mitigation Measures to Comply with the California Environmental Quality Act<sup>21</sup>
2. South Coast AQMD 2022 Air Quality Management Plan,<sup>22</sup> specifically:
  - a) Appendix IV-A – South Coast AQMD’s Stationary and Mobile Source Control Measures
  - b) Appendix IV-B – CARB’s Strategy for South Coast

---

<sup>21</sup> State of California – Department of Justice, Warehouse Projects: Best Practices and Mitigation Measures to Comply with the California Environmental Quality Act available at <https://oag.ca.gov/system/files/media/warehouse-best-practices.pdf>

<sup>22</sup> South Coast AQMD, 2022 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) available at <http://www.aqmd.gov/home/air-quality/clean-air-plans/air-quality-mgt-plan>

c) Appendix IV-C – SCAG’s Regional Transportation Strategy and Control Measure

3. United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA): Mobile Source Pollution - Environmental Justice and Transportation.<sup>23</sup>

*Rule 2305 – Warehouse Indirect Source Rule – Warehouse Actions and Investments to Reduce Emissions (WAIRE) Program*

Since the Proposed Project consists of developing a total of 199,850 sf warehouses, once the warehouses are occupied, the Proposed Project’s warehouse owners and operators will be required to comply with South Coast AQMD Rule 2305 – Warehouse Indirect Source Rule – WAIRE Program<sup>24</sup> and Rule 316 – Fees for Rule 2305.<sup>25</sup> Rule 2305 and Rule 316 aim to reduce regional and local emissions of NOx and particulate matter (PM), including DPM, so as to reduce adverse public health impacts on communities located near warehouses. Rule 2305 applies to owners and operators of warehouses greater than or equal to 100,000 square feet. Under Rule 2305, operators are subject to an annual WAIRE Points Compliance Obligation that is calculated based on the annual number of truck trips to the warehouse. WAIRE Points can be earned by implementing actions in a prescribed menu in Rule 2305, implementing a site-specific custom plan, or paying a mitigation fee. Warehouse owners are only required to submit limited information reports, but they can opt to earn WAIRE Points on behalf of their tenants if they so choose, because certain actions to reduce emissions may be better achieved at the warehouse development phase, for instance, the installation of solar and charging infrastructure. Rule 316 is a companion fee rule for Rule 2305 to allow South Coast AQMD to recover costs associated with Rule 2305 compliance activities. Therefore, the Lead Agency is recommended to review Rule 2305 to determine the potential WAIRE Points Compliance Obligation for future operators and explore whether additional project requirements, design features/enhancements, and CEQA mitigation measures can be identified and implemented at the Proposed Project that may help future warehouse operators meet their compliance obligation. For questions concerning Rule 2305 implementation and compliance, please call (909) 396-3140 or email [waire-program@aqmd.gov](mailto:waire-program@aqmd.gov). For implementation of guidance documents and compliance and reporting tools, please visit South Coast AQMD’s WAIRE Program webpage.

*South Coast AQMD Air Permits and Role as a Responsible Agency*

According to the Draft EIR, the Proposed Project would utilize two diesel fire pumps and two emergency generators,<sup>26</sup> for which air permits from the South Coast AQMD will be required. The Final EIR should include a discussion about the South Coast AQMD rules that may be applicable to the Proposed Project. Those rules may include, for example, Rule 201 – Permit to Construct,<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> United States Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA), Mobile Source Pollution - Environmental Justice and Transportation available at <https://www.epa.gov/mobile-source-pollution/environmental-justice-and-transportation>

<sup>24</sup> South Coast AQMD. Rule 2305 available at <https://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/rule-book/reg-xxiii/r2305.pdf>

<sup>25</sup> South Coast AQMD. Rule 316 available at <https://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/rule-book/reg-iii/r316.pdf>

<sup>26</sup> Ibid. p. 5.3-22.

<sup>27</sup> South Coast AQMD. Rule 201 available at <https://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/rule-book/reg-ii/rule-201.pdf>

Rule 203 – Permit to Operate,<sup>28</sup> Rule 401 – Visible Emissions,<sup>29</sup> Rule 402 – Nuisance,<sup>30</sup> Rule 403 – Fugitive Dust,<sup>31</sup> Rule 461 – Gasoline Transfer and Dispensing,<sup>32</sup> Rule 1110.2 – Emissions from Gaseous and Liquid Fueled Engines,<sup>33</sup> Rule 1113 – Architectural Coatings,<sup>34</sup> Rule 1166 – Volatile Organic Compound Emissions From Decontamination of Soil,<sup>35</sup> Regulation XIII – New Source Review,<sup>36</sup> Rule 1401 – New Source Review of Toxic Air Contaminants,<sup>37</sup> Rule 1470 – Requirements for Stationary Diesel-Fueled Internal Combustion and Other Compression Ignition Engines,<sup>38</sup> etc.

In addition, it is important to note that since air permits from South Coast AQMD are required, South Coast AQMD's role under CEQA is as a Responsible Agency. CEQA Guidelines Section 15096 sets forth specific procedures for a Responsible Agency, including making a decision on the adequacy of the CEQA document for use as part of the process for conducting a review of the Proposed Project and issuing discretionary approvals. Also, as set forth in CEQA Guidelines Section 15096(h), the Responsible Agency is required to make Findings in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 for each significant effect of the project and issue a Statement of Overriding Considerations in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15093, if necessary. Lastly, as set forth CEQA Guidelines Section 15096(i), the Responsible Agency may file a Notice of Determination.

CEQA Guidelines Section 15096 sets forth specific procedures for a Responsible Agency, including making a decision on the adequacy of the CEQA document for use as part of the process for conducting a review of the Proposed Project and issuing discretionary approvals. Moreover, it is important to note that if a Responsible Agency determines that a CEQA document is not adequate to rely upon for its discretionary approvals, the Responsible Agency must take further actions listed in CEQA Guideline Section 15096(e), which could have the effect of delaying the implementation of the Proposed Project. In its role as CEQA Responsible Agency, the South Coast AQMD is obligated to ensure that the CEQA document prepared for this Proposed Project contains a sufficient project description and analysis to be relied upon in order to issue any discretionary approvals that may be needed for air permits.

For these reasons, the final CEQA document should be revised to include a discussion about any and all new stationary and portable equipment requiring South Coast AQMD air permits, provide the evaluation of their air quality and greenhouse gas impacts, and identify South Coast AQMD as a Responsible Agency for the Proposed Project as this information will be relied upon as the basis for the permit conditions and emission limits for the air permit(s). Please contact South Coast AQMD's Engineering and Permitting staff at (909) 396-3385 for questions regarding what types

---

<sup>28</sup> South Coast AQMD. Rule 203 available at <https://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/rule-book/reg-ii/rule-203.pdf>

<sup>29</sup> South Coast AQMD. Rule 401 available at <https://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/rule-book/rule-iv/rule-401.pdf>

<sup>30</sup> South Coast AQMD. Rule 402 available at <https://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/rule-book/rule-iv/rule-402.pdf>

<sup>31</sup> South Coast AQMD. Rule 403 available at <https://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/rule-book/rule-iv/rule-403>

<sup>32</sup> South Coast AQMD. Rule 461 available at <https://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/rule-book/rule-iv/rule-461.pdf>

<sup>33</sup> South Coast AQMD. Rule 1110.2 available at [https://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/rule-book/reg-xi/r1110\\_2.pdf](https://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/rule-book/reg-xi/r1110_2.pdf)

<sup>34</sup> South Coast AQMD. Rule 1113 available at <https://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/rule-book/reg-xi/r1113.pdf>

<sup>35</sup> South Coast AQMD. Rule 1166 available at <https://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/rule-book/reg-xi/rule-1166.pdf>

<sup>36</sup> South Coast AQMD. Regulation XIII available at: <https://www.aqmd.gov/home/rules-compliance/rules/scaqmd-rule-book/regulation-xiii>

<sup>37</sup> South Coast AQMD. Rule 1401 available at <https://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/rule-book/reg-xiv/rule-1401.pdf>

<sup>38</sup> South Coast AQMD. Rule 1470 available at <https://www.aqmd.gov/docs/default-source/rule-book/reg-xiv/rule-1470.pdf>



of equipment would require air permits. For more general information on permits, please visit South Coast AQMD's webpage at <https://www.aqmd.gov/home/permits>.

### Conclusion

As set forth in Public Resources Code Section 21092.5(a) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15088(a-b), the Lead Agency shall evaluate comments from public agencies on the environmental issues and prepare a written response at least 10 days prior to certifying the Final EIR. As such, please provide South Coast AQMD written responses to all comments contained herein at least 10 days prior to the certification of the Final EIR. In addition, as provided by CEQA Guidelines Section 15088(c), if the Lead Agency's position is at variance with recommendations provided in this comment letter, detailed reasons supported by substantial evidence in the record to explain why specific comments and suggestions are not accepted must be provided.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments. South Coast AQMD staff are available to work with the Lead Agency to address any air quality questions that may arise from this comment letter. Please contact Danica Nguyen, Air Quality Specialist, at [dnguyen1@aqmd.gov](mailto:dnguyen1@aqmd.gov) should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

*Sam Wang*

Sam Wang

Program Supervisor, CEQA IGR

Planning, Rule Development & Implementation

SW:DN

RVC250625-03

Control Number

**From:** [Casas, Yesenia](#)  
**To:** [Assadzadeh, Candice](#)  
**Cc:** [Vega, Jaqueline](#)  
**Subject:** [EXTERNAL] PR-2024-001666  
**Date:** Monday, July 21, 2025 12:13:16 PM  
**Attachments:** [Outlook-pzpkutrfr.png](#)  
[SLAS14AD4M25072111140.pdf](#)  
[ALUC application 5-13-24.pdf](#)

---

**CAUTION: This email originated from outside the City of Riverside. It was not sent by any City official or staff. Use caution when opening attachments or links.**

Hello,

Thank you for transmitting the above referenced project to ALUC for review. Please note that the proposed project is located within zone E of March Air Reserve airport influence area, and although the city of Riverside is consistent with the compatibility plan for the March Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan, review by the ALUC is still required because the project proposes a legislative actions (Change of Zone).

Attached is an application, please contact ALUC planner Jackie Vega cc'd here for any questions regarding your application.

Best regards,  
Yesenia Casas  
Executive Assistant I



**Riverside County Airport Land Use Commission**  
4080 Lemon Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Riverside, Ca 92501  
(951)955-5132  
[Ycasas@rivco.org](mailto:Ycasas@rivco.org)  
[www.rcaluc.org](http://www.rcaluc.org)

### Confidentiality Disclaimer

This email is confidential and intended solely for the use of the individual(s) to whom it is addressed. The information contained in this message may be privileged and confidential and protected from disclosure. If you are not the author's intended recipient, be advised that you have received this email in error and that any use, dissemination, forwarding, printing, or copying of this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error please delete all copies, both electronic and printed, and contact the author immediately.

[County of Riverside California](#)



Sierra Club – San Gorgonio Chapter – Box Springs Group  
R-NOW – Riverside Neighbors Opposing Warehouses

SENT VIA EMAIL  
August 11, 2025

Candice Assadzadeh – Senior Planner  
Donesia Gause – City Clerk  
City of Riverside  
Email: cassadzadeh@riverside.ca.gov; city\_clerk@riversideca.gov

RE: Public comment for the Massachusetts Point Project, SCH# 2024120391 - DEIR

Dear City of Riverside Planning Staff,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the Massachusetts Point Project ('The Project'), SCH # 2024120391.

The Project aims to demolish an existing building to develop two ~99,900 sq.ft. warehouses on the property adjacent to Roberta Street and Kansas Avenue in the Hunter Industrial Park neighborhood of Riverside. The community census tract 06065030502 on which the project occurs is in the 99<sup>th</sup> percentile for cumulative impact score in CalEnviroScreen4.0- it is literally a top 1% Environmental Justice (EJ) neighborhood in the state.<sup>1</sup> The project is within an industrial zone, adjacent to a Homeless Service Campus, and is within an employment emphasis and housing emphasis overlay subdistrict. The project requires an overlay zone change to industrial emphasis subdistrict, a development agreement, design review, and an EIR.

In our review, the Sierra Club Box Springs Group and R-NOW appreciate that this project is an industrial infill project and therefore has lower potential impacts than projects that are greenfield development. However, we remain concerned that project objectives and analysis are biased towards an industrial warehouse project that is incompatible with the overlay zone goals, local and regional air quality, and perpetuate a legacy of industrial harm to this community.

1. Environmental Justice was not included as its own topic area to be analyzed as an environmental impact in the draft EIR, despite the community status as a 99<sup>th</sup> percentile community in CalEnviroScreen4.0 and similar designation in the General Plan EJ element. Our NOP comment letter and the California Department of Justice asked for an analysis relative to the Warehouse Best Practice Document. Environmental Justice was instead

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://oehha.ca.gov/calenviroscreen/report/calenviroscreen-40>

treated as a piecemeal set of objectives and best practices do not appear to be addressed substantively in the DEIR. Additionally, please compare the project to the Office of the Attorney General's Warehouse Projects: Best Practices document<sup>2</sup>.

2. The Cumulative Impacts Project list omitted tens of millions of square feet of regional warehouses that are approved and under environmental review that were submitted as part of our comment letter on the project. This project's impacts are not limited to a 2-mile radius of the project. There are over 4,000 warehouses already in the Inland Empire with over 1,000 in Riverside County. There are 13,000 acres of warehouses approved or under environmental review. The Cumulative Impacts of these projects are not limited to the local streets of the neighborhood in which they are located, as indicated by the scope of the air quality, greenhouse gas, jobs, and other analyses. Please include a more comprehensive analysis of the regional impacts of warehouses on transportation, jobs, air quality, and greenhouse gas emissions. Here is a partial list of warehouse projects that are nearby to include.
  - a. World Logistics Center – 40.4M square feet – Approved – Moreno Valley
  - b. Bloomington Business Park – 2.4M square feet – Approved – San Bernardino County
  - c. West Valley Logistics Center – 2.1M - Fontana
  - d. Sycamore Hills Distribution Center – 600,000 sq. ft. - Riverside
  - e. Moreno Valley Business Park Building 5 – 425,000 sq.ft. – Moreno Valley
  - f. Harvest Landing Retail Project – 5.7M square ft. – Perris
  - g. Beaumont Pointe – 5.0M square ft. – Beaumont
  - h. The District at Jurupa Valley – 1.5M sq. ft. – Jurupa Valley
  - i. Agua Mansa Logistics Center – 1.2M sq.ft. – Colton
  - j. Merwin Property Project – 1.0M sq.ft. -Moreno Valley
  - k. Crystal Windows HQ project – 400,000 sq.ft. – Moreno Valley
  - l. All the projects along Old 215
    - i. Old 215 Business Park
    - ii. Cottonwood and Edgemont Project
    - iii. Bay & Day Commerce Center
    - iv. Old 215 Industrial Park Project
    - v. Moreno Valley Business Center Project
    - vi. First Industrial Warehouse at Day Street Project
3. The Project land-use analysis handwaves away the problems of the overlay zone. The site is within the Employment and Housing Emphasis overlay zones. The problem with ignoring this overlay zone is that adjacent land-uses in these overlay zones become less probable as the industrial zone expands and erodes the adjacent land-use compatibility. Warehouses and industrial uses beget warehouses and industrial uses; people don't want to live next to these land uses. The project undermines the existing overlay zone and plan; it is less likely that the overlay zone will ever be implemented if the first project approved in the overlay zone is nonconforming.
4. While the City of Riverside Good Neighbor Policy does not preclude housing near industrial zones, it does preclude building warehouses within certain setbacks of residential zoning. Current proposed guidelines would also add a cumulative impact standard that might impact

---

<sup>2</sup> <https://oag.ca.gov/system/files/media/warehouse-best-practices.pdf>

the suitability of the parcel splitting shenanigans involved in keeping the two buildings in this project just below the 100,000 square foot threshold<sup>3</sup>.

5. Table 5.14-6 indicates that the City of Riverside is jobs-rich, with more than the 1.5 jobs per dwelling unit considered housing-rich. There is no indication that the City of Riverside is on-track to add 43,000+ units. In the last 4 years, the City has added just over 600 constructed units per year<sup>4</sup>. At the current pace of construction, the City will add about 15,000 units by 2050. Thus, the 2050 projections in Connect SoCal 2024 are aspirational and not based on actual trends in unit construction of over 20,000 units. The assertion that this area needs more warehouse jobs is absurd and unsupported in the present. The City of Riverside is not jobs-poor and certainly doesn't need more low-density warehouse jobs when that is the largest sector of employment in the region.

## Summary

Thank you again for the opportunity to provide comments on the Project. Please keep the Sierra Club Box Springs Group and R-NOW notified of all documents and meetings related to the Massachusetts Point Project.

Sincerely,

Michael McCarthy, PhD  
Sierra Club - Box Springs Group - Co-Conservation Chair  
R-NOW – Vice-Chair  
Email: mikem@radicalresearch.llc

P.O. Box 1325  
Moreno Valley, CA 92556-1325

---

<sup>3</sup> <https://riversideca.legistar.com/LegislationDetail.aspx?ID=7508406&GUID=3590D12D-A435-43D3-BB52-8D292F48AAEB&Options=&Search=>

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.hcd.ca.gov/planning-and-community-development/housing-element-implementation-and-apr-dashboard>