



CITY of CYPRESS

5275 Orange Avenue, Cypress, California 90630

Phone 714-229-6700 www.cypressca.org

Governor's Office of Planning & Research

March 9, 2023

MAR 09 2023

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE

Scott Shelley
Branch Chief, Regional-IGR-Transit Planning
Caltrans, District 12
1750 East 4th Street
Santa Ana, CA 92705

Subject: Response to Comments on Goodman Commerce Center Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) and Notice of Public Hearing

Dear Branch Chief Shelley:

The City of Cypress (City) is transmitting a hard copy of the California Department of Transportation's (Caltrans) comment letter and corresponding responses included as part of the Final Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) prepared for the Goodman Commerce Center project (project). Please see the enclosed hard copy of the comment letter and corresponding responses. A notice will be provided when the public hearing for the proposed project is scheduled.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (714) 229-6720.

Sincerely,

City of Cypress

Alicia Velasco, AICP
Planning Director

Enclosures: Hard copy of comment letter and corresponding responses

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

DISTRICT 12
 1750 EAST 4TH STREET, SUITE 100
 SANTA ANA, CA 92705
 PHONE (657) 328-6000
 FAX (657) 328-6522
 TTY 711
www.dot.ca.gov/caltrans-near-me/district12



*Making Conservation
 a California Way of Life.*

Comment Letter S-2

February 27, 2023

Ms. Alicia Velasco
 Planning Director
 City of Cypress
 5275 Orange Ave.
 Cypress, CA. 90630

File: LDR/CEQA
 SCH: 2023010204
 12-ORA-2023-02209
 I-605, PM 1.408
 SR-22, PM 0.932
 I-405, PM 20.553
 SR-39, PM 10.649

Dear Ms. Velasco,

Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the review of the Mitigated Negative Declaration (MND) for the Goodman Commerce Center Project. The Developer proposes to construct the proposed project on an approximately 18.6-acre site located at 5757 Plaza Drive in the City of Cypress. The proposed project includes demolition of the existing building on the project site and the construction of two new warehouse buildings totaling approximately 390,268 square feet in size. The project site is currently developed with an approximately 336,643-square-foot two-story warehouse and office building. The existing building would be demolished and replaced with two new warehouse buildings. Building 1, which would be located on the eastern half of the project site and would be approximately 204,909 square feet in size, and Building 2, which would be located on the western half of the site and approximately 185,359 square feet in size. Both warehouses would include 10,000 square feet of office space that would be evenly split between the first and second floors. Both buildings would be two stories and a maximum of approximately 47 feet, 6 inches in height. Each building would include 25 loading docks that would face the interior of the project site. The proposed project would also include the installation of a sidewalk along the Plaza Drive frontage.

The project site is located north of the intersection of Plaza Drive and McDonnell Drive in the southern part of the City. Local access to the project site is 5757 Plaza Drive, Cypress, California and is approximately 2.2 miles west of State Route

S-2-1

39 (SR-39), approximately 2.8 miles east of Interstate 605 (I-605), and approximately 2.2 miles north of State Route 22 (SR-22) and Interstate 405 (I-405). State Routes 39 and 22, as well as Interstates 605 and 405 are owned and operated by Caltrans. Therefore, Caltrans is a responsible agency on this project, and has the following comments:

S-2-1
cont.

Transportation and System Planning

1. Please consider providing adequate wayfinding signage to nearby transit stops within the proposed project. Connectivity of first and last mile mobility options and transit services help integrate a complete multimodal transportation network.
2. Please Consider encouraging or incentivizing the use of transit among both construction workers of the proposed development and future employees. Increasing multimodal transportation will lead to a reduction to congestion, Vehicle Miles Traveled, and improve air quality.
3. Please consider the installation of a Class II or Class IV bike lane around the warehousing facility. Applicant should work with City of Cypress to enhance the bicycle and pedestrian environment, specifically on Katella Ave and Valley View street, where there is no bicycle facility at present.

S-2-2

S-2-3

S-2-4

Freight Operations and Planning

4. According to the Traffic Report, “the Project is anticipated to generate 930 fewer two-way trips per day with a net reduction of 167 AM peak hour trips and net reduction of 168 PM peak hour trips (in PCE).” (Pg. 1.1-9). Please explain how this reduction was calculated, despite the project resulting in a net increase in warehousing space of 141,645 sq. ft. (390,268 sq. ft. (new) – 248,623 sq. ft. (old)). (See below)

S-2-5

TABLE 5: TRIP GENERATION COMPARISON

Land Use	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour			Daily
	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total	
Proposed Project							
Passenger Cars:	25	3	28	8	27	35	498
Total Truck Trips (PCE):	10	15	25	9	10	19	458
Total Trips (PCE)	35	18	53	17	37	54	956
Fully Occupied Existing Use							
Passenger Cars:	148	23	171	31	134	165	1,230
Total Truck Trips (PCE):	37	12	49	18	39	57	656
Total Trips (PCE)	185	35	220	49	173	222	1,886
Variance							
Passenger Cars:	-123	-20	-143	-23	-107	-130	-732
Total Truck Trips (PCE):	-27	3	-24	-9	-29	-38	-198
Total Trips (PCE)	-150	-17	-167	-32	-136	-168	-930

S-2-5
cont.

5. Please provide electric charging stations for trucks. Electric charging infrastructure provides trucks or transport refrigeration units access to power without running their engines, thus reducing greenhouse and heat emissions. In addition, the project would be preparing for the inevitable shift to alternative energy-fueled vehicles, per the governor's executive order N-79-20, which phases out sales of gas-powered trucks by 2035.
6. Please ensure that the project does not worsen truck parking shortages in the region. Potential options include providing on-site parking or contributing to a regional truck parking solution.
7. Please consider on-site truck parking facilities for drivers such as restrooms, lighting, trash facilities, drinking water, showers, and food or vending machines.
8. The number of parking spaces should be based on peak operating time of the development.

S-2-6

S-2-7

S-2-8

S-2-9

9. Coordination with short haul railroad operators to transport between distribution centers and warehouses, or ports and railyards can assist in creative solutions and efficiencies that can reduce air and/or noise pollution or parking/congestion concerns.

S-2-10

Caltrans' mission is to provide a safe, sustainable, equitable, integrated, and efficient transportation system to enhance California's economy and livability. Please continue to coordinate with Caltrans for any future developments that could potentially impact State transportation facilities. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact Julie Lugaro at Julie.lugaro@dot.ca.gov.

Sincerely,



Scott Shelley
Branch Chief, Regional-IGR-Transit Planning
Caltrans, District 12



2.1.2 California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) (S-2)

Letter Code: S-2

Commenter: Scott Shelley, Branch Chief, Regional-IGR-Transit Planning, Caltrans, District 12

Date: February 27, 2023

Response to Comment S-2-1

This comment is introductory and provides a brief overview of project-related information contained in the Draft IS/MND. No response is necessary.

Response to Comment S-2-2

This comment recommends the installation of wayfinding signage to nearby transit stops. This comment does not relate to the adequacy of the analysis contained in the Draft IS/MND. No response is necessary.

Response to Comment S-2-3

This comment recommends encouraging or incentivizing the use of transit to reduce congestion and vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and improve air quality. Potential impacts related to transportation, including congestion and VMT, are discussed in Section 4.17, Transportation, of the IS/MND. As discussed in Section 4.17, the proposed project would not result in any significant impacts related to congestion or VMT, and no mitigation measures are required. Potential impacts related to air quality are discussed in Section 4.3, Air Quality, of the IS/MND. As discussed in Section 4.3, all potential air quality impacts, including those related to transportation, would be less than significant without mitigation. Therefore, no revisions to the analysis in the Draft IS/MND are warranted.

Response to Comment S-2-4

This comment requests the installation of a Class II or Class IV bicycle lane around the proposed warehouse buildings and that the applicant work with the City of Cypress (City) to enhance the bicycle and pedestrian environment along Katella Avenue and Valley View Street. As described on page 4.17-3 of the Draft IS/MND, the proposed project would include the installation of sidewalks on the project site's frontage along Plaza Drive, which would provide a pedestrian connection to nearby bus stops on Katella Avenue. Therefore, the proposed project would be consistent with the City's General Plan circulation policies, and no mitigation measures would be required.

Response to Comment S-2-5

This comment requests clarification on how the net reduction of 167 AM and 168 PM net peak hour trips was calculated despite the proposed project resulting in an increase in approximately 141,645 square feet of warehousing space. As described on page 33 of the *Goodman Commerce Center Traffic Analysis* (Traffic Analysis) (Urban Crossroads, January 2023), which was included as Appendix F to the Draft IS/MND, the proposed project would replace an existing building that consists of 248,623 square feet of warehousing use and 88,020 square feet of office use. As shown in Table 4-2 of the Traffic Analysis, these existing uses are estimated to generate 220 AM peak hour trips and 222 PM peak hour trips, which includes 134 and 127 trips from the office use, respectively. Therefore, although the proposed project would result in an increase in warehouse space, it would



also result in a decrease in office space, thereby resulting in an overall decrease in vehicle trips. Therefore, no revisions to the analysis in the Draft IS/MND are warranted.

Response to Comment S-2-6

This comment requests that electric charging stations for trucks be provided. The proposed project's loading docks would be required to have electrical hookups and the trucks would be required to have the ability to run their accessories from that electricity source. Therefore, no revisions to the analysis in the Draft IS/MND are warranted.

Response to Comment S-2-7

This comment requests that the proposed project either include on-site parking or contribute to a regional truck parking solution. This comment does not relate to the adequacy of the analysis contained in the Draft IS/MND. No response is necessary.

Response to Comment S-2-8

This comment requests that on-site truck parking facilities, such as restrooms, lighting, trash facilities, drinking water, showers, and food or vending machines, be provided. This comment does not relate to the adequacy of the analysis contained in the Draft IS/MND. No response is necessary.

Response to Comment S-2-9

This comment states that the number of parking spaces should be based on peak operating time of the development. At this time, a specific operator has not yet been identified for the proposed project. Therefore, it is not possible to determine when the peak operating time would be. Further, parking-related impacts, such as insufficient parking supply to meet demand, are not considered impacts under CEQA.¹ This comment does not relate to the adequacy of the analysis contained in the Draft IS/MND. No response is necessary.

Response to Comment S-2-10

This comment states that coordination with short haul railroad operators can assist in creative solutions and efficiencies that can reduce air and/or noise pollution or parking/congestion concerns. As stated above, comments related to parking on the project site do not relate to the adequacy of the analysis contained in the Draft IS/MND, and no response is necessary.

As stated in Response S-2-3, all potential air quality impacts, including those related to transportation, would be less than significant without mitigation. Additionally, potential impacts related to noise are discussed in Section 4.13, Noise, of the Draft IS/MND. As discussed in Section 4.13, all potential impacts related to noise, including those related to transportation, would be less than significant without mitigation. Therefore, no revisions to the analysis in the Draft IS/MND are warranted.

¹ *Taxpayers for Accountable School Bond Spending v. San Diego Unified School Dist.* (2013) 215 Cal.App.4th 1013.