

If applicable, describe any of the project's areas of controversy known to the Lead Agency, including issues raised by agencies and the public.

Areas of controversy associated with the proposed project are made known through comments received during the Notice of Preparation (NOP) process, as well as input solicited during public scoping meetings and an understanding of the community issues in the region. The EIR scoping process and comments received in response to the NOP identified areas of known controversy for the proposed project, including issues related to air quality, biological resources, cultural and tribal cultural resources, greenhouse gas emissions, public services and recreation, transportation, and utilities and service systems. Public comments received during the NOP scoping period as well as the main areas of controversy raised in the comments are summarized in Section 1, Introduction, of the EIR.

Provide a list of the responsible or trustee agencies for the project.

The California Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW) is a trustee agency for the proposed project. Additionally, the California Geological Survey (CGS) and California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CalFire) are trustee agencies for the proposed project. The Board of Forestry and Fire Protection (Board), which is a government-appointed body within the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CalFire), is responsible for reviewing the Safety Element under Government Code section 65302.5. The Board reviews the Safety Element and responds to the City with its findings regarding the uses of land and policies in State Responsibility Areas (SRAs) or Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (VHFHSZs) that will protect life, property, and natural resources from unreasonable risks associated with wildfires, and the methods and strategies for wildfire risk reduction and prevention within SRAs or VHFHSZs (Gov. Code, Section 65302.5, subd. (b)(3)). Additionally, CGS is responsible for reviewing the Safety Element and providing findings regarding the policies and land uses included in the Safety Element.

2045 General Plan Update

Identify the project's significant or potentially significant effects and briefly describe any proposed mitigation measures that would reduce or avoid the effect.

Mitigation Measure AQ-1: Requires the adoption of a new general plan policy that requires construction health risk assessments (HRAs). This would reduce Air quality impacts to less than significant.

Mitigation Measure AQ-2: Requires operational health risk assessments and appropriate measures to reduce impacts to be implemented. This would reduce Air quality impacts to less than significant.

Mitigation Measure BIO-1: Requires pre-construction bird surveys to be conducted and all avoidance and minimization measures recommended by a qualified biologist to be implemented. This would reduce impacts to less than significant.

Mitigation Measure BIO-2: Requires construction activities to occur outside of bat maternity season. When this is not possible, a special-status bat habitat assessment survey shall be conducted by a qualified biologist. Emergency surveys shall be conducted during bat maternity season and any roosting sites documented in these reports shall be avoided or otherwise relocated through the implementation of a bat mitigation and/or management plan. This would reduce impacts to less than significant.

Mitigation Measure BIO-3: Requires pre-construction surveys for Crotch's bumblebee to be conducted and necessary avoidance measures to be implemented. This would reduce impacts to less than significant.

Mitigation Measures CUL-1: Requires the submittal of a report to the city identifying any historical age features proposed to be altered or demolished. If significant historical resources are identified on a development site and compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for the Treatments of Historic Properties and or avoidance is not possible, appropriate site-specific mitigation measures shall be established and undertaken. This impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure CUL-2: Requires the submittal of an Archaeological Resources Assessment prepared by a qualified archaeologist who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards in either Prehistoric or Historic Archaeology. If the Phase I archaeological survey identifies resources that may be affected, the applicant shall also conduct Phase II testing and evaluation. If resources are determined significant or unique through Phase II testing and site avoidance is not possible, the qualified professional shall identify appropriate site-specific mitigation measures in the Phase II evaluation and these must be implemented. This would reduce impacts to less than significant.

Mitigation Measure CUL-3: Requires work to be halted in the event that archaeological resources are discovered on site during ground disturbing activities. This would reduce impacts to less than significant.

Mitigation Measure CUL-4: Requires work to be halted in the event that cultural resources of Native American origin are identified during ground disturbance during construction of a project implemented under TO2045. Requires the implementation of a mitigation plan to avoid the resource to the extent feasible. This would reduce impacts to less than significant.

Mitigation Measure GHG-1: Requires the City to adopt CEQA GHG Emissions thresholds of significance by the end of 2024 that is consistent with the CEAP for use in future CEQA GHG emissions analyses through 2030. This impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure GHG-2: Requires the City to adopt the Thousand Oaks qualified CEAP by the end of 2024 to outline how Thousand Oaks will meet the State's 2030 goal of 40 percent below 1990 emissions levels and 2045 goal of carbon neutrality. This impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure NOI-1: Requires revisions to Policy N-3.2 of TO2045. This impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure NOI-2: Requires the City to implement a developer fair share mitigation program to fund the following measures for projects operated on the following roadway segments in the city: Moorpark Road between Hillcrest Drive and Thousand Oaks Boulevard and Hillcrest Drive between Lynn Road and Moorpark Road.

Mitigation Measure NOI-3: Requires the preparation of a groundborne noise and vibration analysis to assess and mitigate potential noise and vibration impacts related to construction activities. This impact would be reduced to less than significant.

Mitigation Measure PAL-1: Requires the retention of a paleontologist to determine the project's potential to significantly impact paleontological resources according to SVP (2010) standard. Requires the incorporation of all findings and recommendations made by the paleontologist. This impact would be reduced to less than significant.

Mitigation Measure TRA-1: Requires the project applicant to implement project-level VMT reduction strategies for individual projects that exceed the City's recommended threshold below the VMT average based on project-specific VMT analysis. Impacts would remain significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measure UTIL-1: Requires the project applicant to provide a Will-Serve letter from the water provider that would serve the proposed development that demonstrates the water provider has determined adequate water supplies exist to serve the proposed development. This impact would be reduced to less than significant.