

12.0 COMMENTS AND RESPONSES

12.1 INTRODUCTION

In accordance with Sections 15088, 15089 and 15132 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, the City of Cypress has prepared the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the proposed General Plan Update. The Comments and Responses section, combined with the Draft EIR, comprise the Final EIR.

The following is an excerpt from the CEQA Guidelines, Section 15132, Contents of Final Environmental Impact Report.

“The Final EIR shall consist of:

- (a) The Draft EIR or a version of the draft.*
- (b) Comments and recommendations received on the Draft EIR either verbatim or in summary.*
- (c) A list of persons, organizations and public agencies commenting on the Draft EIR.*
- (d) The responses of the Lead Agency to significant environmental points raised in the review and consultation process.*
- (e) Any other information added by the Lead Agency.”*

Comments regarding the Draft EIR for the General Plan Update were received during the 45-day public review period, which was open from February 13, 2001 to March 29, 2001.

This Comments and Responses section includes all of the above-required components and shall be attached to the revised Draft EIR to make up the Final EIR. All correspondence from those agencies or individuals commenting on the Draft EIR is reproduced on the following pages. The individual comments on each letter have been consecutively numbered for ease of reference. Following each comment letter are responses to each numbered comment. A response is provided for each comment raising significant environmental issues. Added or modified text is shaded (example), while deleted text will have a strike out (example) through the text. In addition, text excerpted from the Draft EIR, for ease of commentor reference, will be included in a box, as the example below shows.

“Text from Draft EIR”

12.2 LIST OF COMMENTORS

Written comments on the Draft EIR were received from the following agencies and/or individuals:

- A. State of California, Governor's Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse.
- B. Metré Anthony, Assistant Planner, City of Cerritos.
- C. Joan S. Golding, Executive Officer, Airport Land Use Commission for Orange County.
- D. Jeffrey M. Smith, AICP, Senior Planner, Southern California Association of Governments.
- E. Joseph W. Wright, Associate Planner, City of Anaheim.
- F. Sandy Hesnard, Environmental Planner, State of California, Department of Transportation, Aeronautics Program.
- G. Robert F. Joseph, Chief, Transportation Planning Branch B, State of California, Department of Transportation, District 12.

Letter A – State Clearinghouse – 1 page

A. RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FROM STATE OF CALIFORNIA, GOVERNOR'S OFFICE OF PLANNING AND RESEARCH, STATE CLEARINGHOUSE, DATED FEBRUARY 22, 2001.

The comment letter identifies that the Draft EIR was received by the State Clearinghouse, the time period for the 45-day public review, and which State Agencies the Draft EIR was distributed to for comments.

No environmental issues are raised in this comment letter; therefore, no response is necessary.

Letter B – City of Cerritos – 1 page

**B. RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FROM METRÉ ANTHONY, ASSISTANT PLANNER,
CITY OF CERRITOS, DATED FEBRUARY 7, 2001.**

No environmental issues are raised; therefore, no response is necessary.

Letter C – ALUC – Page 1 of 8

Letter C – ALUC – Page 2 of 8

Letter C – ALUC – Page 3 of 8

Letter C – ALUC – Page 4 of 8

Letter C – ALUC – Page 5 of 8

Letter C – ALUC – Page 6 of 8

Letter C – ALUC – Page 7 of 8

Letter C – ALUC – Page 8 of 8

C. RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FROM JOAN S. GOLDING, EXECUTIVE OFFICER, AIRPORT LAND USE COMMISSION FOR ORANGE COUNTY, DATED MARCH 8, 2001.

C1. No environmental issues are raised; therefore, no response is necessary.

C2. In this comment, the Airport Land Use Commission (ALUC) has noted the name change for the Army Airfield at Los Alamitos. The facility recently changed the name from Armed Forces Reserve Center, Los Alamitos to Joint Forces Training Center (JFTC), Los Alamitos. The Joint Forces Training Center, Los Alamitos was the name for the Army Airfield used throughout the General Plan and General Plan EIR.

The ALUC's Airport Environs Land Use Plan (AELUP), dated November 16, 1995, refers to the facility as the Armed Forces Reserve Center. The Cypress General Plan and General Plan EIR is more current than the AELUP and uses the latest name for the Army Airfield.

C3. The information regarding recent airfield operations will be added to the text on pages 4.5-6 and 4.5-7, which is part of the Environmental Setting section of Section 4.5, Noise, of the Draft EIR. The text on pages 4.5-6 and 4.5-7 will be modified to read as follows:

Aircraft Operations. The Joint Forces Training Center (JFTC) Los Alamitos Airfield is situated along the southern boundary of the City and is the only airport within the vicinity of Cypress. The Airfield is primarily a helicopter training base. Approximately 91 percent of total operations are by helicopters, with the remainder being light twin-engine fixed-wing aircraft and occasional operations by transient military and civil support aircraft. It is worth noting that during a recent operations years at JFTC, Los Alamitos the airfield was visited 12 times by C-5 transports, which is the largest aircraft in the military fleet, and two times by Air Force One, which is a Boeing 747 aircraft.

Land uses within the Airport Environs Land Use Plan (AELUP) include residential, vacant, agricultural, and business park uses. Exhibit 4.5-1, *Joint Forces Training Center (JFTC) Los Alamitos Airfield Impact Zones*, also shows the noise contours for the JFTC Los Alamitos Airfield, which extend over the Cypress Business Park and a residential neighborhood on the City's eastern border. A copy of the most current AELUP is on file at the City of Cypress, Community Development Department.

The comment regarding recent airfield operations does not change the impact analysis and mitigation measures included on pages 4.5-23 and 4.5-24 of the Draft EIR.

C4. Exhibit 4.5-1, *Joint Forces Training Center (JFTC) Los Alamitos Airfield Impact Zones*, will be revised to reflect the map provided by the ALUC. The revised exhibit will be included in the Final EIR.

C5. No environmental issues are raised in this comment; therefore, no response is necessary.

However, it is worth noting that the City of Cypress has a copy of the AELUP, including Appendix B, on file at the Community Development Department and available to the public. In addition, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) forms attached to the ALUC's comment letter will become part of the Final EIR, which also be on file at the Community Development Department and available to the public.

Letter D – SCAG – 1 page

**D. RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FROM JEFFREY M. SMITH, AICP, SENIOR PLANNER,
INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVIEW, SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF
GOVERNMENTS, DATED MARCH 12, 2001.**

No environmental issues are raised; therefore, no response is necessary.

Letter E – City of Anaheim – 1 page

**E. RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FROM JOSEPH W. WRIGHT, ASSOCIATE PLANNER,
CITY OF ANAHEIM, DATED MARCH 21, 2001.**

No environmental issues are raised; therefore, no response is necessary.

Letter F – Caltrans Aeronautics – 1 page

F. RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FROM SANDY HESNARD, ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNER, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, AERONAUTICS PROGRAM, DATED MARCH 27, 2001.

F1. The City of Cypress' condition of approval will be modified to include the suggested language. COA-E21, which appears on pages 2-39 and 4.10-14 of the Draft EIR will be modified to read as follows:

COA-E21 The developer shall comply with all requirements of the FAA should any portions of the development encroach within 100 to 1 imaginary surface surrounding the JFTC Los Alamitos. Encroachment within the 50 to 1 approach surface will require approval by the FAA. A Notice of Proposed Construction or Alteration (Form 7460-1) may be required by the FAA in accordance with the Federal Aviation Regulations Part 77.

Letter G – Caltrans – Page 1 of 2

Letter G – Caltrans – Page 2 of 2

G. RESPONSES TO COMMENTS FROM ROBERT F. JOSEPH, CHIEF, TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BRANCH B, STATE OF CALIFORNIA, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION, DISTRICT 12, DATED MARCH 28, 2001.

- G1. No environmental issues are raised; therefore no response is necessary.
- G2. The City acknowledges Caltrans' comment regarding the circulation policy; however this comment raises no environmental issues. As noted in Section 3.0, Project Description, of the Draft EIR, one of the City's objectives for the General Plan Update was to delete redundant and/or completed goals and policies. The City of Cypress has achieved that objective and does not intend to restate the same policy in several elements. In addition, Policy CIR-1.3 pertains mainly to circulation and the reduction of trip lengths.
- G3. Refer to Response G2. As with Policy CIR-1.3, Policy CIR-1.5 specifically relates to plans and programs related to Circulation Element.
- G4. The City acknowledges Caltrans' comment regarding the circulation policy; however this comment raises no environmental issues.
- G5. The City acknowledges Caltrans' comment regarding the circulation policy; however this comment raises no environmental issues. The City also acknowledges that Caltrans has regulatory authority over certain types of development that may directly or indirectly impact State Transportation facilities, and would coordinate with Caltrans, as appropriate.