



June 8, 2023

Ms. Pam Steele MIG INC. 1650 Spruce Street, Suite 106 Riverside, California 92507

#### **RE:** Brew Harley Knox Industrial Project Transportation Study Screening Assessment Project No. 19619

Dear Ms. Steele:

Ganddini Group, Inc. is pleased to provide this transportation study screening analysis for the proposed Brew Harley Knox Industrial Project in the City of Perris. We trust the findings of this analysis will aid the City of Perris in assessing whether preparation of a transportation study will be required for the proposed project.

#### **PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The 4.01-acre project site (APN 302-090-021) is located on the south side of Harley Knox Boulevard between Indian Avenue and Perris Boulevard within the Perris Valley Commerce Center Specific Plan (PVCC SP). in the City of Perris, California. The project site is currently undeveloped and zoned Commercial (C). The proposed project also involves a Specific Plan Amendment to redesignate the project site zoning from Commercial (C) to Light Industrial (LI). The project location map is shown on Figure 1.

The proposed project (DPR 22-00036) involves construction of a 59,974 square foot industrial warehouse building. Based on the existing raised median along Harley Knox Boulevard, the two vehicular access driveways proposed at Harley Knox Boulevard are assumed to provide right in/right out only access, including one passenger car only access driveway and one truck only access driveway. The proposed site plan is illustrated on Figure 2. Figure 2 also exhibits truck turning templates in/out of the truck only access.

#### **TRIP GENERATION**

#### Proposed Trip Generation

Table 1 shows the project trip generation forecast based on rates obtained from the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) *Trip Generation Manual* (11th Edition, 2021). Based on review of the ITE land use description, trip generation rates for ITE Land Use Code 150 (Warehousing) were determined to adequately represent the land use for the proposed project and were selected for calculation of the project trip generation forecast. The number of trips generated is determined by multiplying the trip generation rates and directional distributions by the land use quantity.

As shown in Table 1, the proposed project is forecast to generate approximately 103 daily vehicle trips, including 10 vehicle trips during the AM peak hour and 10 vehicle trips during the PM peak hour.

#### <u>Truck Trips</u>

The project trip generation was also calculated in terms of Passenger Car Equivalent (PCE) trips. The percentage of truck trips was obtained from the ITE *Trip Generation Manual* (11th Edition, 2021). The truck mix by axle type was determined based on South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) recommendations for warehousing facilities without cold-storage. Truck trips were converted to PCE trips based on the following factors: 1.5 for 2-axle trucks, 2.0 for 3-axle trucks, and 3.0 for trucks with four or more axles.

As also shown in Table 1, the proposed project is forecast to generate approximately 159 daily PCE trips, including 12 PCE trips during the AM peak hour and 12 PCE trips during the PM peak hour.

#### Zoning Amendment Trip Comparison

The project site is currently zoned Commercial (C) with a floor to area ratio (FAR) of 0.75 per Table 4-0.1 of the PVCC SP. Under the current land use and zoning designation, the buildout potential for the current commercial zoning at the site could be developed with up to 115,907 square feet (Site Area x FAR). Table 2 shows the potential commercial buildout trips are based on ITE trip generation rates for Land Use Code 821 (Shopping Plaza 40-150 TSF). As shown in Table 2, the potential commercial development is forecast to generate approximately 7,826 daily trips, including 201 trips during the AM peak hour and 602 trips during the PM peak hour.

Table 2 shows the difference in vehicle and passenger car equivalent trips between the currently zoned and proposed land uses. As shown in Table 2 the proposed project is forecast to result in a net decrease of approximately 7,667 fewer daily PCE trips compared to the currently zoned commercial buildout potential, including 189 fewer PCE trips during the AM peak hour and 590 fewer PCE trips during the PM peak hour.

#### TRIP DISTRIBUTION AND ASSIGNMENT

The project proposes two vehicular access driveways on Harley Knox Boulevard. Because of the median on Harley Know Boulevard, both driveways will provide right in/right out only access with one passenger car only access driveway and one truck only access driveway.

Figure 3 to Figure 6 show the forecast directional distribution patterns for the project generated trips for both automobiles and trucks. The project trip distribution patterns are based on review of existing volume data, surrounding land uses, City of Perris truck routes, and the local and regional roadway facilities in the project vicinity.

Figure 7 shows the project-generated AM and PM peak hour intersection turning movement volumes at the proposed project driveways based on the trip generation shown in Table 1 and trip distribution patterns shown on Figures 3 to 6.

#### CRITERIA FOR THE PREPARATION OF TRAFFIC IMPACT ANALYSES

According to the City of Perris Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for CEQA (May 12, 2020) ["City TIA Guidelines"], certain types of projects, because of their size, nature, or location, are exempt from the requirement of preparing a traffic impact analysis.



#### Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) Analysis Screening Analysis

The project VMT impact has been assessed in accordance with guidance from the City TIA Guidelines. The transportation guidelines provide a framework for "screening thresholds" for certain projects that are expected to cause a less than significant impact without conducting a detailed VMT study.

The project requirements for evaluation of transportation impacts under CEQA was assessed using the City of Perris VMT Scoping Form for Land Use Projects as appended to the City of Perris TIA Guidelines and included in Attachment A of this letter. As documented in the VMT Scoping Form, the proposed project satisfies the following VMT screening criteria:

| А. | Is the project 100% affordable housing?                | No  |
|----|--|-----|
| В. | Is the project within half mile of qualifying transit? | No  |
| C. | Is the project a local serving land use?               | No  |
| D. | Is the project in a low VMT area <sup>1</sup> ?        | Yes |
| E. | Are the project's net daily trips less than 500 ADT?   | Yes |

Therefore, the proposed project is presumed to have a less than significant impact on VMT since it satisfies one or more of the VMT screening criteria established by the City of Perris (the project site is in a low VMT area and has net daily trips less than 500 ADT). No additional VMT modeling or mitigation measures are required.

#### Level of Service (LOS) Analysis Screening Analysis

As noted in the project Scoping Form (see Attachment A), the project is exempt from Level of Service evaluation outside of CEQA since the project does not exceed the City-established trip generation threshold of 50 peak hour trips.

#### **TRANSPORTATION SETTING**

As stated previously, the proposed project is located on the south side of Harley Knox Boulevard between Indian Avenue and Perris Boulevard within the Perris Valley Commerce Center Specific Plan (PVCC SP).

#### Harley Knox Boulevard

This six-lane divided roadway trends in an east-west direction and is classified as a Primary Arterial (six-lane divided roadway with 94-foot roadway and 128-foot right-of-way) on the City of Perris General Plan Circulation Element in the study area. On-street parking is not permitted on either side of the roadway. There are currently no designated bicycle facilities in the project vicinity. Sidewalks are provided along the north side of the roadway where the adjacent property is developed. Harley Knox Boulevard provides direction access to the Interstate-215 freeway and is a designated truck route from Interstate-215 to Redlands Avenue.

#### Access Management Requirements

The Perris Valley Commerce Center Amendment No. 12 Specific Plan (February 2022) Table 5.0-1, Roadway Design Requirements and Intersection Spacing, provides roadway and driveway design requirements. According to this Standard, a Primary Arterial requires intersection spacing of 1,320 feet and commercial/industrial spacing as determined by the City Engineer

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> See Attachment B: The WRCOG VMT Screening Tool was developed from the Riverside Transportation Analysis Model (RIVTAM) travel forecasting model to measure VMT performance for individual jurisdictions and for individual traffic analysis zones (TAZs).



The distance between the east and west project driveways is 525 feet. The distance between the project east driveway and Indian Avenue is approximately 1,355 feet, and the distance between the project west driveway and Perris Boulevard is approximately 750 feet. While the proposed project driveway spacing does not meet the PVCC SP spacing requirements, spacing between the two driveways is maximized within the project frontage and provides separate access points for cars and trucks. Additionally, project east and west driveways are restricted to right turns in/out only with the raised median on Harley Knox Boulevard. With no median break and restricted movement at the project driveways, the potential conflicting movements such as left turns are prohibited and will not occur at these driveways. As such, the general intent of the PVCC spacing requirements is met such that no turning conflicts or queuing concerns are anticipated to occur between the project driveways.

#### SITE ACCESS

Based on the existing raised median along Harley Knox Boulevard, the two vehicular access driveways proposed at Harley Knox Boulevard are assumed to provide right in/right out only access, including one passenger car only access driveway and one truck only access driveway.

#### **Gate Stacking Analysis**

As the truck access is proposed to be a gated entry, the vehicle stacking length has been evaluated for the gated ingress location. Adequate vehicle stacking allows vehicles a place to wait for the gate to open without blocking traffic in the public right-of-way. The vehicle stacking area is measured from the gate to the edge of sidewalk.

The gate queueing analysis was performed based on procedures outlined in the ITE *Transportation and Land Development* (1988). The methodology estimates the number of queueing vehicles at the service point based on a Poisson distribution algorithm for estimating the effect of surges and random arrivals. Analysis inputs include the number of inbound vehicles, the number of gated access locations, the number of service lanes per access, service rate capacity of the gate, and the confidence interval used for the analysis. The length of necessary stacking space is then based on the design vehicle length multiplied by the expected number of vehicles per service lane.

Table 3 summarizes the parking gate access analysis, and a detailed worksheet is provided in Attachment C. As shown in Table 3, the truck gate entrance provides approximately 79.6 feet of storage length, which is sufficient to accommodate the forecast queue length of 74 feet (approximately one truck).

#### Vehicle Turning/Swept Path Movement

Truck turning/swept paths exhibit for a typical service truck (WB-67) circulating the project are provided in Attachment D.

#### Recommendations

Since the passenger car driveway is right -in/out, a high percentage of the outbound vehicles are expected to perform an eastbound U-turn at the intersection of Perris Boulevard at Harley Knox Boulevard. A R73-2 (CA) sign may be installed for the eastbound left turn lane. The feasibility for trucks to perform a U-turn movement at this location will depend on the size of the truck. Turning movement analysis shows that the movement should be feasible for intermediate semitrailer trucks with 33-foot trailers (WB-40 design vehicle) or smaller; larger trucks will make a left-turn or through movement at Perris



All on-site and off-site roadway design, traffic signing and striping, and traffic control improvements relating to the proposed project shall be constructed in accordance with applicable State/Federal engineering standards and to the satisfaction of the City of Perris.

#### CONCLUSION

The proposed project is forecast to generate approximately 103 daily vehicle trips, including 10 vehicle trips during the AM peak hour and 10 vehicle trips during the PM peak hour, which equates to approximately 159 daily PCE trips, including 12 PCE trips during the AM peak hour and 12 PCE trips during the PM peak hour.

The proposed site is currently zoned Commercial (C), and the project involves a Specific Plan Amendment to redesignate zoning from commercial to industrial (LI). As previously stated, the proposed industrial project is forecast to generate fewer trips than a comparable size commercial project.

The proposed project satisfies the City-established VMT screening criteria for projects in a low VMT area and with net daily trips less than 500 ADT; therefore, the project is exempt from preparation of a detailed VMT analysis and may be presumed to result in a less than significant VMT impact.

The project is exempt from Level of Service evaluation outside of CEQA based on the project trip generation.

We appreciate the opportunity to assist you on this project. Should you have any questions or if we can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to call at (714) 795-3100 x 103.

Sincerely, GANDDINI GROUP, INC.

Perrie Ilercil, P.E. (AZ) Senior Engineer



Giancarlo Ganddini, PE, PTP Principal



#### Table 1 Project Trip Generation

| Land | Use: | Warehousing |
|------|------|-------------|
|------|------|-------------|

Size: 59.974 TSF

| TRIP GENERATION RATES PER TSF <sup>1</sup>      |                     |       |              |       |       |              |       |       |  |
|---|---------------------|-------|--------------|-------|-------|--------------|-------|-------|--|
|   |                     | A     | AM Peak Hour |       |       | PM Peak Hour |       |       |  |
| Vehicle Type                                    | Source <sup>2</sup> | In    | Out          | Rate  | In    | Out          | Rate  | Rate  |  |
| All Vehicles                                    | ITE 150             | 77%   | 23%          | 0.170 | 28%   | 72%          | 0.180 | 1.710 |  |
| Trucks Only                                     | ITE 150             | 52%   | 48%          | 0.020 | 52%   | 48%          | 0.030 | 0.600 |  |
| Passenger Car (88.2% AM, 83.3% PM, 64.9% Daily) |                     | 0.116 | 0.035        | 0.151 | 0.042 | 0.108        | 0.150 | 1.110 |  |
| Truck (11.8% AM, 16.7% PM, 35.1% Daily)         |                     | 0.010 | 0.010        | 0.020 | 0.016 | 0.014        | 0.030 | 0.600 |  |
| Truck Mix:                                      | SCAQMD              |       |              |       |       |              |       |       |  |
| 2-Axle Trucks (16.7%)                           |                     | 0.002 | 0.001        | 0.003 | 0.003 | 0.002        | 0.005 | 0.100 |  |
| 3-Axle Trucks (20.7%)                           |                     | 0.002 | 0.002        | 0.004 | 0.003 | 0.003        | 0.006 | 0.124 |  |
| 4+ Axle Trucks (62.6%)                          |                     | 0.007 | 0.006        | 0.013 | 0.010 | 0.009        | 0.019 | 0.376 |  |

| VEHICLE TRIPS GENERATED       |    |              |       |    |              |       |       |  |
|-------------------------------|----|--------------|-------|----|--------------|-------|-------|--|
|                               | A  | AM Peak Hour |       |    | PM Peak Hour |       |       |  |
| Vehicle Type                  | In | Out          | Total | In | Out          | Total | Daily |  |
| Passenger Car                 | 7  | 2            | 9     | 3  | 6            | 9     | 67    |  |
| Trucks <sup>3</sup>           |    |              |       |    |              |       |       |  |
| 2-Axle Trucks                 | 0  | 0            | 0     | 0  | 0            | 0     | 6     |  |
| 3-Axle Trucks                 | 0  | 0            | 0     | 0  | 0            | 0     | 7     |  |
| 4+ Axle Trucks                | 0  | 1            | 1     | 0  | 1            | 1     | 23    |  |
| Subtotal                      | 0  | 1            | 1     | 0  | 1            | 1     | 36    |  |
| Total Vehicle Trips Generated |    | 3            | 10    | 3  | 7            | 10    | 103   |  |

| PCE <sup>3</sup> TRIPS GENERATED |                         |              |     |       |              |     |       |       |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------|-----|-------|--------------|-----|-------|-------|
|                                  |                         | AM Peak Hour |     | Р     | PM Peak Hour |     |       |       |
| Vehicle Type                     | PCE Factor <sup>4</sup> | In           | Out | Total | In           | Out | Total | Daily |
| Passenger Car                    | 1.0                     | 7            | 2   | 9     | 3            | 6   | 9     | 67    |
| Trucks <sup>3</sup>              |                         |              |     |       |              |     |       |       |
| 2-Axle Trucks                    | 1.5                     | 0            | 0   | 0     | 0            | 0   | 0     | 9     |
| 3-Axle Trucks                    | 2.0                     | 0            | 0   | 0     | 0            | 0   | 0     | 14    |
| 4+ Axle Trucks                   | 3.0                     | 0            | 3   | 3     | 0            | 3   | 3     | 69    |
| Subtotal                         |                         | 0            | 3   | 3     | 0            | 3   | 3     | 92    |
| Total PCE Trips Generated        |                         |              | 5   | 12    | 3            | 9   | 12    | 159   |

Notes:

1. TSF = Thousand Square Feet

2. ITE = Institute of Transportation Engineers *Trip Generation Manual* (11th Edition, 2021); ### = ITE Land Use Code. SCAQMD = South Coast Air Quality Management District recommendations for non-cold storage warehouse.

3. Truck vehicle totals rounded up to whole values for a conservative analysis of small industrial projects that have a small percentage of trucks by axle. Truck PCE totals rounded up to a whole value after PCE factor applied to unrounded by axle totals.

4. PCE = passenger car equivalent. PCE factors are based on the County of Riverside Transportation Analysis Guidelines (December 2020), "Appendix C – Analysis Input Parameters"



 Table 2

 Trip Generation Comparison (Proposed Project Minus Zoned Land Use)

| Trip Generation Rates                     |                     |                       |     |              |       |     |              |       |       |
|---|---------------------|-----------------------|-----|--------------|-------|-----|--------------|-------|-------|
|   |                     | Land Use              |     | AM Peak Hour |       |     | PM Peak Hour |       |       |
| Land Use                                  | Source <sup>1</sup> | Variable <sup>2</sup> | In  | Out          | Total | In  | Out          | Total | Daily |
| Shopping Plaza (40-150k without Supermark | ITE 821             | TSF                   | 62% | 38%          | 1.73  | 49% | 51%          | 5.19  | 67.52 |
| Warehousing                               | ITE 150             | TSF                   | 77% | 23%          | 0.17  | 28% | 72%          | 0.18  | 1.71  |

|   | Trips Generated |               |      |              |       |      |              |       |        |
|---|-----------------|---------------|------|--------------|-------|------|--------------|-------|--------|
|   |                 |               | A    | AM Peak Hour |       | P    | PM Peak Hour |       |        |
| Land Use  | Source          | Quantity Unit | In   | Out          | Total | In   | Out          | Total | Daily  |
| COMMERCIAL TRIPS <sup>3</sup>                     |                 |               |      |              |       |      |              |       |        |
| Shopping Plaza (40-150k without Supermark         | ITE 821         | 115.907 TSF   | 124  | 77           | 201   | 295  | 307          | 602   | 7826   |
| PROPOSED INDUSTRIAL TRIPS                         |                 |               |      |              |       |      |              |       |        |
| Warehousing (Vehicle Trips)                       | ITE 150         | 59.974 TSF    | 7    | 3            | 10    | 3    | 7            | 10    | 103    |
| Warehousing (PCE <sup>4</sup> Trips) <sup>5</sup> |                 |               | 7    | 5            | 12    | 3    | 9            | 12    | 159    |
| Difference in PCE Trips Generated                 |                 |               | -117 | -72          | -189  | -292 | -298         | -590  | -7,667 |

Notes:

1. ITE = Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation Manual (11th Edition, 2021); ### = Land Use Code. All rates based on General Urban/Suburban setting.

2. TSF = Thousand Square Feet.

3. Current buildout potential is based on the maximum permissible commercial floor-area-ratio (FAR) for Commercial (C) zoning. Site Area x FAR = Commercial Square Footage

4. PCE = passenger car equivalent.

5. See Table 2.

Table 3Gate Stacking Minimum Queue Requirements

| Gate / Peak Hour | Demand<br>Flow<br>(veh/hr) <sup>1</sup> | Service<br>Lanes | Service Rate<br>Capacity<br>(veh/hr/ln) | Utilization<br>Factor | Queue<br>Length<br>(feet) <sup>2</sup> | Storage<br>Length<br>(feet) | Adequate<br>Storage<br>Provided |
|------------------|---|------------------|---|-----------------------|--|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Entering         |   |                  |   |                       |  |                             |                                 |
| AM Peak Hour     | 1                                       | 1                | 113                                     | 0.01                  | 74                                     | 80                          | YES                             |
| PM Peak Hour     | 1                                       | 1                | 113                                     | 0.01                  | 74                                     | 80                          | YES                             |

Notes:

1. See Table 1. AM and PM peak hour inbound demand for trucks is less than one, so the demand was rounded up to one.

2. Based on Transportation and Land Development (Institute of Transportation Engineers, 1988) "Applications of Queuing Analysis" methodology with service rate capacities from *Entrance-Exit Design and Control for Major Parking Facilities* (Crommelin, 1972); see Attachment C.



Legend # Study Intersection

Figure 1 Project Location Map





Ν

ganddini

### Figure 2 Site Plan



Figure 3 Project Passenger Cars Trip Distribution (Outbound)



### Figure 4 Project Passenger Cars Trip Distribution (Inbound)









ganddin



# Figure 7 Project Peak Hour Intersection Turning Movement Volumes



### ATTACHMENT A

### VMT SCOPING FORM FOR LAND USE PROJECTS



#### CITY OF PERRIS VMT SCOPING FORM FOR LAND USE PROJECTS

| This Scoping Form ackno<br>City of Perris TIA Guidelir | wledges the City of Perris requiremennes, dated May 12, 2020. | ts for the ev       | aluation of  | transportatio        | n impacts une  | der CEQA. The analysis p | provided in this form shou | ld follow the |
|--|---|---------------------|--------------|----------------------|----------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|---------------|
| I. Project Description                                 | <u>ו א א א א א א א א א א א א א א א א א א א</u>                |                     |              |                      |                |                          |                            |               |
| Tract/Case No.   | DPR 22-00036  |                     |              |                      |                |                          |                            | ]             |
| Project Name:  | Brew Harley Knox Industrial P                                 | roject              |              |                      |                |                          |                            | ]             |
| Project Location:                                      | South of Harley Knox Boulevard b                              | etween Ind          | lian Avenue  | e and Perris         | Boulevard i    | n the City of Perris     |                            | ]             |
| Project Description:                                   | 59,974 square foot industrial ware                            | house               |              |                      |                |                          |                            | 1             |
|  | (Please attach a copy of the project                          | Site Plan)          |              |                      |                |                          |                            | -             |
| Current GP Land Use:                                   | rrent GP Land Use: PVCC SP - Commercial (C)                   |                     |              | Proposed G           | 6P Land Use:   | PVCC SP - Light Ir       | ndustrial (LI)             | ]             |
| Current Zoning:  | PVCC SP - Commercial (C)                                      |                     | 1            | Propo                | osed Zoning:   | PVCC SP - Light Ir       | ndustrial (LI)             | 1             |
|  | If a project requires a General Plan A                        | mendment o          | or Zone char | ige, then addi       | itional inform | nation and analysis shou | ld be provided to ensure   | -             |
| II. VMT Screening Cri                                  | the project is consistent with RHNA a                         | nd RTP/SCS          | Strategies.  |                      |                |                          |                            |               |
|  |   |                     |              |                      |                | 1                        |                            |               |
| A. Is the Project 100% at                              | fordable housing?   | YES                 |              | NO                   | ~              | Attachments:             |                            |               |
| B. Is the Project within 1                             | L/2 mile of qualifying transit?                               | YES                 |              | NO                   | <b>/</b>       | Attachments:             |                            |               |
| C. Is the Project a local s                            | erving land use?  | YES                 |              | NO                   | <b>~</b>       | Attachments:             |                            |               |
| D. Is the Project in a low                             | v VMT area?   | YES                 | <b>v</b>     | NO                   |                | Attachments:             | В                          |               |
| E. Are the Project's Net                               | Daily Trips less than 500 ADT?                                | YES                 | <b>v</b>     | NO                   |                | Attachments:             | Table 1                    |               |
| Low VMT A  | rea Evaluation:   |                     |              |                      |                |                          |                            | 1             |
|  | r   |                     | 1            |                      |                | 1                        |                            |               |
|  | Citywi<br>Citywide Home-Based                                 | de VMT Ave<br>VMT = | erages       | VMT/Capita           | 3              | WRCOG                    |                            |               |
|  | Citywide Employment-Based                                     | VMT =               | 16.9         | VMT/Emplo            | oyee           |                          |                            |               |
|  | Project TAZ   | VMT R               | ate for Proj | ect TAZ <sup>1</sup> | т              | ype of Project           | 7                          |               |
|  | 1810  |                     | VMT/Ca       | pita                 | Re             | esidential:              |                            |               |
|  |   | 16.7                | VMT/Em       |                      | Non-Re         | esidential:              |                            |               |
|  | PER TALEST VVKCOG VIMT TOO                                    | ior baselli         | ne year (2   | UZS); see A          | Muachment      |                          |                            |               |
| Trip Genera  | tion Evaluation:  |                     |              |                      |                |                          |                            | 1             |
| So   | urce of Trip Generation: ITE 11th I                           | Edition, 20         | )21. ITE 1   | 50 (vehicle          | s trips); PC   | CE factors from RC       | Guidelines                 |               |
|  | Project Trip Generation:                                      | 103/159             | Avera        | ige Daily Trip       | s (ADT)        | ]                        |                            |               |
|  | Internal Trip Credit:   | YES                 |              | NO                   | ~              | % Trip Credit:           |                            |               |
|  | Pass-By Trip Credit:  | YES                 |              | NO                   | ~              | % Trip Credit:           |                            |               |
|  | Affordable Housing Credit:                                    | YES                 |              | NO                   | <b>/</b>       | % Trip Credit:           |                            |               |
|  | Existing Land Use Trip Credit:                                | YES                 |              | NO                   |                | Trip Credit:             |                            |               |
|  | Net Project Daily Trips:                                      | 103/159             | Avera        | age Daily Trip       | s (ADT)        | Attachments:             | Table 1                    |               |
| Does projec  | t trip generation warrant an LOS eva                          | luation outs        | ide of CEQA  | <b>\?</b>            | YES            | NO                       | <b>v</b>                   |               |
|  |   |                     | A            | <u> </u>             |                |                          |                            |               |

| III. VIVIT Screening S                | ummary   |   |                      |                          |                    |              |                       |                 |            |  |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------|-----------------------|-----------------|------------|--|
| A Is the Project procur               | nod to have a  | loss than significant impact on VMT       | 2                    |                          |                    |              |                       | 1               |            |  |
| A. Is the Project presur              | ned to have a  | less than significant impact on vivil     | r<br>Dir i           | Vac Crit                 | aria D and C       |              |                       |                 |            |  |
| A Project is presumed                 | to have a les  | s than significant impact on VIVIT if the | e Project            | res. Crit                |                    |              |                       |                 |            |  |
| satisfies at least one                | 1) of the vivi   | screening criteria.                       |                      |                          |                    |              |                       |                 |            |  |
|                                       |  |   |                      |                          |                    |              |                       | 1               |            |  |
| B. Is mitigation require              | d?   |   |                      |                          |                    |              |                       |                 |            |  |
| If the Project does no                | t satisfy at lea   | ist one (1) of the VMT screening criter   | ia, then             | No.                      |                    |              |                       |                 |            |  |
| mitigation is required                | to reduce the  | Project's impact on VMT.                  |                      |                          |                    |              |                       |                 |            |  |
|                                       |  |   |                      |                          |                    |              |                       |                 |            |  |
| C. Is additional VMT me               | odeling requir   | red to evaluate Project impacts?          |                      | YES                      |                    | NO           | <ul> <li>✓</li> </ul> |                 |            |  |
|                                       |  |   |                      |                          |                    |              |                       |                 |            |  |
| If the Project requires               | s a zone chang   | ge and/or General Plan Amendment A        | ND generates 2,      | 500 or more net dail     | y trips, then ad   | ditional V   | MI modeling           | using RIVIAI    | M/RIVCOM   |  |
| is required. If the pro               | is required. If the project generates less than 2,500 het daily thps, the Project TAZ vivit Kate can be used for hintigation purposes. |   |                      |                          |                    |              |                       |                 |            |  |
| IV. MITIGATION                        |  |   |                      |                          |                    |              |                       |                 |            |  |
|                                       |  |   |                      |                          |                    |              |                       |                 |            |  |
| A. Citywide Average VI                | VIT Rate (Thre   | shold of Significance) for Mitigation     | Purposes:            |                          |                    |              |                       | 1               |            |  |
|                                       |  |   |                      |                          | I                  |              |                       | 1               |            |  |
| B Unmitigated Project                 | TA7 VMT Rat  | e.  |                      |                          |                    |              |                       | 1               |            |  |
| b. ommingated i roject                |  |   |                      |                          |                    |              |                       | J               |            |  |
| C Porcontago Poductio                 | n Required to  | Achieve the Citywide Average VMT          |                      |                          | 0/                 |              |                       | 1               |            |  |
| C. Percentage Reductio                | n Required to  | Achieve the Citywide Average vivit        | •                    |                          | %                  |              |                       | J               |            |  |
|                                       |  |   |                      |                          |                    |              |                       |                 |            |  |
| D. VIVIT Reduction Milti              | gation Measu   | ires:                                     |                      |                          |                    |              |                       |                 |            |  |
|                                       |  |   |                      |                          |                    |              |                       | ,               |            |  |
|                                       | Source of VI   | MT Reduction Estimates:                   |                      |                          |                    |              |                       |                 |            |  |
|                                       |  |   |                      |                          |                    |              |                       | ,               |            |  |
|                                       | Project Loca   | tion Setting                              |                      |                          |                    |              |                       |                 |            |  |
|                                       |  |   |                      |                          |                    |              |                       |                 |            |  |
|                                       |  | VMT Reduction M                           | itigation Measu      | · • ·                    |                    | Estima       | ted VMT               |                 |            |  |
|                                       |  | VIVIT Reduction IVI                       | ligation weasu       | le.                      |                    | Reduc        | tion (%)              |                 |            |  |
|                                       | 1.   |   |                      |                          |                    | 0.           | 00%                   |                 |            |  |
|                                       | 2.   |   |                      |                          |                    | 0.           | 00%                   | 1               |            |  |
|                                       | 3.   |   |                      |                          |                    | 0.           | 00%                   | 1               |            |  |
|                                       | 4.   |   |                      |                          |                    | 0.           | 00%                   | 1               |            |  |
|                                       | 5.   |   |                      |                          |                    | 0.           | 00%                   |                 |            |  |
|                                       | 6.   |   |                      |                          |                    | 0.           | 00%                   |                 |            |  |
|                                       | 7.   |   |                      |                          |                    | 0.           | 00%                   |                 |            |  |
|                                       | 8.   |   |                      |                          |                    | 0.           | 00%                   |                 |            |  |
|                                       | 9.   |   |                      |                          |                    | 0.           | 00%                   |                 |            |  |
|                                       | 10.  |   |                      |                          |                    | 0.           | 00%                   |                 |            |  |
|                                       | Total VMT B  | Reduction (%)                             |                      |                          |                    | 0.           | 00%                   |                 |            |  |
|                                       | (Attach addi   | tional pages if possesany and a copy      | of all mitigation    | calculations )           |                    |              |                       | I               |            |  |
|                                       | Actacit adul   | tional pages, in necessary, and a copy    | or an integation     | calculations.)           |                    |              |                       |                 |            |  |
| F Mitigated Project TA                | 7 VMT Rate   |   |                      |                          |                    |              |                       | 1               |            |  |
| L. Witigated Project TA               | z vivii kate.  |   |                      |                          |                    |              |                       | 1               |            |  |
| Le the project process                |  | loss than significant impact with mi      | tigation             |                          |                    |              |                       | 1               |            |  |
| r. is the project pressu              | med to have a  | a less than significant impact with mi    | ligation             |                          |                    |              |                       |                 |            |  |
|                                       |  |   |                      |                          |                    |              |                       | ]               |            |  |
| If the mitigated Project VI           | VIT rate is below  | w the Citywide Average Rate, then the Pro | oject is presumed    | to have a less than sig  | nificant impact w  | vith mitigat | tion. If the answ     | ver is no, then | additional |  |
| VMT modeling may be red               | quired and a po  | tentially significant and unavoidable imp | act may occur. All   | mitigation measures i    | dentified in Secti | on IV.D. ar  | e subject to be       | come Conditio   | ons of     |  |
| Approval of the project. D            | evelopment re  | view and processing fees should be subm   | nitted with, or prio | r to the submittal of th | nis Form. The Pla  | anning Dep   | artment staff v       | vill not proces | s the Form |  |
| prior to fees being paid to the City. |  |   |                      |                          |                    |              |                       |                 |            |  |
|                                       |  | Prepared By                               |                      |                          | Devel              | oper/App     | licant                |                 |            |  |
| Company:                              | Ganddini   | Group, Inc.                               |                      | Company:                 | MIG, INC.          |              |                       |                 |            |  |
| Contact:                              | Perrie Iler  | cil                                       |                      | Contact:                 | Ms Pam St          | eele         |                       |                 |            |  |
| Address:                              | 555 Parkcer  | ter Dr, Ste 225, Santa Ana CA 92705       |                      | Address:                 | 1650 Spruce        | St. Ste. 1   | 106, Riverside        | e CA 92507      |            |  |
| Phone:                                | 714-795-3  | 3100*103                                  |                      | Phone:                   | 951-787-92         | 222          |                       |                 |            |  |
| Email:                                | perrie@ga  | anddini.com                               |                      | Email:                   | pams@mig           | gcom.co      | m                     |                 |            |  |
| Date:                                 | 2023-032   | 7   |                      | Date:                    |                    |              |                       |                 |            |  |
|                                       |  |   | Approved             | by:                      |                    |              |                       |                 |            |  |
|                                       |  |   |                      |                          |                    |              |                       |                 |            |  |
|                                       |  |   |                      |                          |                    |              |                       |                 |            |  |
|                                       |  |   |                      |                          |                    |              |                       |                 |            |  |

Date

Perris Development Serivces Dept.

Perris Public Works Dept.

Date

Page 2 of 2

### **ATTACHMENT B**

VMT SCREENING TOOL RESULTS

|   | WRCOG VMT Tool Powered by Feh   | nr & Peers           | User's Gu | uide  |                   |                  |
|---|---|----------------------|-----------|---|-------------------|------------------|
| + | Harley Knox Blvd & Perris Blvd, F 🗙 🔍   |                      |           |   |                   |                  |
|   | Show search results for Harley Knox   |                      |           |   |                   |                  |
|   | Complete #1-4, Then Click "Run"   | ×                    |           |   |                   |                  |
|   | VMT. Please consult with the jurisdiction to verify metric to use for your analysis.*   | which                |           |   |                   |                  |
|   | PA VMT Per Worker   | -                    |           | (2 of 4)                                    | ••                | Harley Knox Blvd |
|   | #3. Select the Baseline Year. The year available for<br>analysis are from 2018 to 2045.*  | or                   |           | OBJECTID<br>Assessor Parcel<br>Number (APN) | 1<br>302090021    |                  |
|   | 2023  | -                    |           | Traffic Analysis<br>Zone (TAZ)              | 1810              |                  |
|   | #4. Select the Threshold (% reduction from base   | line                 |           | Community<br>Region                         | PERRIS            |                  |
|   | year). Note each jurisdiction may have adopted a<br>different metric by which they measure VMT. Please<br>consult with the jurisdiction to verify which metric to | a<br>ase<br>c to use | K         | Inside a Transit<br>Priority Area<br>(TPA)  | Yes               |                  |
|   | for your analysis.*   |                      |           | TAZ VMT                                     | 16.7              |                  |
|   | Below City Baseline (0%)  | -                    |           | Jurisdiction<br>VMT                         | 16.9              |                  |
|   |   | _                    |           | % Difference                                | -1.04%            |                  |
|   | Help Run  |                      |           | VMT Metric                                  | PA VMT Per Worker |                  |
|   |   |                      |           | Threshold                                   | 16.9              |                  |
|   |   |                      |           | Community<br>Zoom to                        | 0                 |                  |

### ATTACHMENT C

**GATE STACKING ANALYSIS** 

#### Table C-1 Gate Stacking Analysis<sup>1</sup>

| PROJECT:         Brew Harley Knox Industrial Building           LOCATION:         Project Truck Access Gate | 3       | DATE: 2023-0608<br>JN: 19619 |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|---------|------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
|   | AM      | PM                           |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gate Distribution: 100%   | INBOUND | INBOUND                      |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | 80 ft   | 80 ft                        |  |  |  |  |  |
| DEMAND RATE (q) (veh/hr)  | 1       | 1                            |  |  |  |  |  |
| SERVICE RATE (Q) (veh/hr/channel) <sup>2</sup>  | 113     | 113                          |  |  |  |  |  |
| NO. OF SERVICE POSITIONS (N)  | 1       | 1                            |  |  |  |  |  |
| NO. OF STORAGE LANES (N1)   | 1       | 1                            |  |  |  |  |  |
| PROBABILITY OF NOT EXCEEDING (P) <sup>3</sup>   | 0.05    | 0.05                         |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | P'=95%  | P'=95%                       |  |  |  |  |  |
| UTILIZATION FACTOR (q/(N*Q))  | 0.01    | 0.01                         |  |  |  |  |  |
| LENGTH OF SERVICE VEHICLE (L) FEET  | 73.5    | 73.5                         |  |  |  |  |  |
| TRAFFIC INTENSITY (q/Q)   | 0.009   | 0.009                        |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q(M) VALUE <sup>5</sup>   | 0.01    | 0.01                         |  |  |  |  |  |
| NO. OF VEHICLES BEING SERVED (N)  | 1.00    | 1.00                         |  |  |  |  |  |
| NO. OF VEHICLES IN QUEUE (M)  | -1.36   | -1.36                        |  |  |  |  |  |
| M = ((LN(P) - LN(Q(M))/LN(p)) - 1   | ~0      | ~0                           |  |  |  |  |  |
| TOTAL NUMBER OF VEHICLES (N+M)  | 1.00    | 1.00                         |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | ~1      | ~1                           |  |  |  |  |  |
| NO. OF VEHICLES IN EACH LANE  | 1.00    | 1.00                         |  |  |  |  |  |
| PER LANE ((N+M)/N1) <sup>6</sup>  | 1       | 1                            |  |  |  |  |  |
| LENGTH OF QUEUE (L) FEET  | 74      | 74                           |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes:

1. Source: Transportation and Land Development (Institute of Transportation Engineers, 1988).

2. Service rates obtained from Entrance-Exit Design and Control for Major Parking Facilities (Crommelin, 1972).

- 3. P' = confidence interval; probability that queue will not exceed the calculated value.
- 4. Vehicle length based on truck-trailer combination length of 65 feet.
- 5. Q(M) = interpolated table values based on number of service channels (N) and utilization factor (q/NQ) per Table 8-11 (p.231) of *Transportation And Land Development*.
- 6. Fractional vehicles are rounded up.



## ATTACHMENT D

### TRUCK TURNING/SWEPT PATH MOVEMENT EXHIBIT

