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**Case 7B: General Plan Update, EIR, Housing Element Update**

(1) **Application of FAR and densities in Mixed-Use land use designations**

In the updated General Plan designation, residential designations are characterized by densities in units per acre (e.g., Neighborhood Low Medium has a residential density range of more than 6 and up to 10 du/ac). Commercial designations are characterized by floor area ratio (FAR) (e.g., Commercial Town has a FAR limit of 1.0).

Mixed-Use allows for both types of use and has a residential density range of more than 20 and up to 30 du/ac and a FAR limit of 1.0 for the non-residential portion. This is highlighted on page 55.

On page 50, for FAR calculations, it states that “FAR is the ratio between the total gross floor area of all buildings on a lot and total land area of that lot.” When we are evaluating “the total gross floor area of all buildings on a lot,” is this for both residential and non-residential gross floor area on the lot, or does this only apply to non-residential gross floor area on the lot?

From these descriptions, I can’t tell if the intent is to evaluate the FAR with or without consideration of the residential gross floor area for mixed-use parcels.

For clarity, can I understand the intent on how this would be applied? If a 1.0-acre parcel designated Mixed-Use, this means that a project on this parcel could have up to 30 residential dwelling units and 43,560 square feet of commercial / non-residential floor area (within what is allowable under other city and state standards).

Is this a correct understanding of how consistency with the General Plan would be applied to future mixed-use projects?

**Answer:** Yes, density is used for calculating residential capacity and floor area ratio is used for non-residential uses (commercial). See definition on page 265.

“Floor Area Ratio (FAR) Standards of building intensity for non-residential uses such as office, commercial, industrial, and institutional development are stated as a range (i.e., minimum and maximum) of floor area ratios (FARs). FAR is a measure of the total amount of building space (or “floor area”) compared to the area of the parcel. In the case of mixed-use developments that include residential uses, density standards are applied to the residential component while FAR standards are applied to the non-residential component.”

**Important to note are a couple of points:**

1. The Mixed-Use designation is intended to be entirely flexible to allow 100% residential and 100% commercial, as well as mixed use. Density and FAR are applied depending on the residential and/or commercial make up of a project.
2. Zoning standards are other factors that would need to be considered at the project level when evaluating commercial and residential components of a mixed-use project. Requirements, such as setbacks, maximum building height, parking, common open space, landscaping, also apply which ultimately affects what gets built out. When zoning standards are applied, the combination of maximum FAR and maximum density at the project level would rarely, if ever, be achieved.

(2) Effects of change from “net acre” to “gross acre” for calculating residential density

Page 50 describes residential densities in terms of dwelling units per acre, where the acreage calculation is based on “gross acres.”

The current General Plan, ordinances, and municipal code have long described densities in terms of “net acres,” so the density descriptions in the new land use designations is a change in policy worthy of understanding the impacts.

Going from dwelling units per net acre to dwelling units per gross acres increases the allowable intensity on any given parcel. Although, depending on the specifics of the parcel and the project, this difference between what is allowable under “net” acreage and “gross” acreage may differ.

Net acreage is always less than gross acreage, so for a 1.0-acre parcel with 0.967 net acres, a density of 30 units/net acre would allow for 29 units, while a density of 30 units/gross acre would allow for 30 units. Only when the net acreage is equal to the gross acreage would the allowable intensity of use be identical.

Can you describe the reasoning for changing from “net” acreage to “gross” acreage in this update:
- For individual parcels
- For neighborhoods
- In aggregate citywide and in relation to Measure E baselines

Also, would this difference be greater for currently undeveloped parcels, where the need to dedicate land for streets, parks, rights-of-way, etc. is more likely than for already developed parcels where existing streets are not part of the gross acre calculation?

Answer: Gross is being used instead of net because the land use designations for the proposed land use map are applied on the parcel. Therefore, existing streets are already netted out. The current general plan has the land use designations covering existing rights of way. So going forward, since most development will occur as infill on parcels with established frontages on public roads, gross acreage is being used on a parcel basis. The total capacity of the proposed land use map is consistent with the quantification of land use capacity as presented and received by City Council in October 2017.
3) Details regarding Measure W compliance for land use designations, incorporation of measure language, and CURB line

I am heartened that there are additional changes from the draft plan to align with the voter-approved Measure W. If you can help me with a few questions and follow-ups, I'd appreciate it.

In Exhibit D, Reference #9, can you provide me the visual and/or specifics of these changes? I want to evaluate independently how the CURB line and other Measure W items are added to the Land Use Map as required by Measure W
   o For example, a new policy in the Open Space Element (1.6) and an Appendix C documenting Measure W will be added.
   o Can we see how these will be included, so that we can independently evaluate their incorporation?

**Answer:** Please see the current General Plan map located here for reference to the CURB line and the land use designations to be incorporated into the General Plan 2045 Figure 4.4.
[https://www.toaks.org/home/showpublisheddocument/34379/637599690244030000](https://www.toaks.org/home/showpublisheddocument/34379/637599690244030000)

I want to evaluate how the Planning Area (per Measure W requirements) is added to the Land Use Map. There are properties within the current Planning Area that are not shown on the draft Land Use Map (see specifics below)

In Exhibit D, Reference #10.
For the parcels listed in bullets 1-3, can you help me understand the changes for these parcels:
   o Were these parcels that were designated “Parks, Golf Courses, and Open Space” (PGOS) previously but were not identified as such on the draft Land Use Map before now? Or…
   o Were these parcels recently changed (e.g., acquired by COSCA) since the draft Land Use Map was published, and we are taking this opportunity to designate them as PGOS within the GP update?

**Answer:** Bullet 1- those properties were residential under the current General Plan and are proposed to be “Parks, Golf Courses, and Open Space” due to acquisition by COSCA. Bullets 2 & 3 are parcels that both had portions with a PGCOS designation per the existing General Plan and will be fixed accordingly.

For bullets 4-6, thank you for proactively aligning these designations with their current PGOS designations.

For bullet 7, for me to assess how this change relates to the current land use map and if there are any changes to PGOS designated lands, can you provide a visual to understand these changes:
   o What does the current land use map show
What was shown on the draft map
What is being changed per this bulleted description

Answer: Bullet 7 - The General Plan Parks Gold Courses and Open Space designation will match Existing GP (below). Note blue area in center is proposed as Industrial per City Council Preferred Land Use map endorsement.

Can you also check on a few other properties where it appears the current land use designation is PGOS, yet appear to be changed on the draft Land Use Map?

- Properties inside the City’s Planning Area but outside the Sphere of Influence
  - Rancho Sierra Vista, east of CLU near Norwegian Grade, east of Lang Ranch
  - PGOS lands are no longer shown on the draft Land Use Element map as they lie outside the City’s Sphere of Influence
  - Appears that these were approved via LU 97-219 - Resolution 98-92

  Answer: See previous response. Land Use designations in the Planning Area and outside the Sphere of Influence will be replicated from the existing General Plan map. https://www.toaks.org/home/showpublisheddocument/34379/637599690244030000

- Apartments north of Westlake Blvd on Via Colinas (Hidden Canyon)
  - Portion of open space at southwest of complex is being redesignated to Neighborhood Low Medium
  - This is shown on the LU 97-219 map as PGOS (but I don’t know when that portion was designated as such).

  Answer: This will be included as part of the Land Use map clean up per Measure W.

- Portion south of McCloud Ave, part of 401 Hillcrest Specific Plan (SP 17)
  - PGOS land changed to Mixed Use (changed to PGOS via Resolution No. 97-008, Specific Plan 17 implemented via Ordinance No 1278-NS).
  - It appears there is a swap of a Commercial/Residential portion with a PGOS section on opposite sides of a commercial parcel.
The current PGOS portion is intended to protect four oak trees (Freedom trees) immediately across from Oak Knoll main driveway, so this should not be changed.

**Answer:** This will be included as part of the Land Use map clean up per Measure W.

- **Estella Park – southeast corner of Hillcrest and Erbes**
  - PGOS boundaries appear to have been changed to align with existing Estella Park.
  - PGOS land use designation is broader than the parcel boundaries

**Answer:** The current alignment of the PGCOS boundaries beyond the Estella Park is incorrect and was a mapping error. In 1973, City Council approved amendments to the Land Use Element that include corrections to have Parks, Recreation and Golf Course designation for the existing Estella Park. This change is intended to fix alignment.

Given that several parcels were missed in the finalizing this comprehensive review (e.g., those detailed in bullets 4-6 of Exhibit D, Reference #10), there may be additional parcels that had been designated as PGOS but were redesignated on the Land Use map in error through this update.

These errors may not be caught until a future land use decision is considered, at which time there could be confusion about whether the change was or was not intentional. Given the requirements under Measure W, any change to land use designation of those currently designated as PGOS would require voter approval if a change is intentional. To clarify the City’s intent with respect to lands currently designated as PGOS through previous City decisions, we should add language in the recommendation and approval resolutions that:
  - It is the intention to keep the land use designation of any lands currently designated as PGOS unchanged.
  - Any apparent change in the land use designation of such lands as a result of this update is unintentional.

**Answer:** This language is not needed. The General Plan contains separate policies that acknowledge the requirements of Measure E and W and the terms and extent that they apply to the General Plan.

- This seems especially important since the language of the resolution states that “the Thousand Oaks General Plan 2045... is intended to supersede all previously adopted General Plans and General Plan Elements in their entirety.”
  - I understand the intent, which means we should be all the more careful about what we are replacing through this update.

*(4) Proper identification of SOAR within General Plan and staff report*
Pages 6 and 7 of the staff report identifies the name of the initiative receiving voter approval through Measure W as “Save Our Agricultural Resources.” However, the proper name of the initiative and SOAR is “Save Open-Space and Agricultural Resources.”

Any references to SOAR and its full name should be corrected within the General Plan and for the public.

**Answer:** Comment noted. A supplemental will be prepared to indicate the change.

(5) **Typos of approval resolution**

Policy 1.2 – “Thousand Okas” is spelled incorrectly. (p 8)
Goal LU-3 – “thousand Oaks” should be capitalized. (p 9)

**Answer:** Comment noted. A supplemental will be prepared to indicate the change.

(6) **Recommendation for additional mitigation measure and policy change for cultural and historic resources**

The mitigation measure CUL-1 (with the revised language) starts “If determined necessary based on preliminary review conducted by City staff, the project applicant shall submit a report to the City that identifies any historical age features (i.e., structures over 45 years of age) proposed to be altered or demolished.”

While the mitigation measure focuses on individual projects, the revised language assumes that both the project applicant and City staff are or become aware of historical age features during the preliminary review stage.

However, from a citywide perspective, a broader and ongoing awareness of potentially historic resources throughout the City can help further mitigate these significant identified General Plan impacts.

I recommend that the mitigation measure CUL-1 be augmented to include a regular meeting of the City’s Cultural Heritage Board (recommended annually) to receive information of potentially historic structures and areas within the City. Such a regular forum would allow the public to inform the City of any historical age features including structures over 45 years of age on an ongoing basis.

**Answer:** Comment noted, this is a policy decision for City Council and not a CEQA requirement.

Additionally, a policy addition to the Conservation Element under Goal C-11 is recommended:
11.9 Cultural Heritage Board public meetings.
• Hold regular meetings at least annually to receive information of potentially historic structures and areas within the City’s Planning Area.

**Answer: The City Council is the Cultural Heritage Board. This is a policy consideration for the Council.**

For reference:
• The Thousand Oaks Cultural Heritage Board was first established over 50 years ago through Ordinance No. 265-NS (February 22, 1972)
• The last meeting of the Cultural Heritage Board was nearly twenty years ago (July 13, 2004) to approve CHB Resolution No. 3, approving Timber School Local Historical Landmark.

**(7) Revision in language regarding Civic Arts Plaza history**

On page 185, the first sentence under City Arts Funding reads:
• “The Civic Arts Plaza was originally authorized by the voters in 1987 along with a 1984 advisory initiative (Measure B) stating that City cannot subsidize theatre operations.”

I recommend modifying the first sentence to read “The Civic Arts Plaza was originally authorized in 1987,” as this would be accurate. The original sentence gives an inaccurate history of the Civic Arts Plaza on three counts:
1. While authorized in 1987, the Civics Arts Plaza was not authorized by the voters but by the City Council / Redevelopment Agency.
2. 1984’s Measure B was not an “advisory initiative.”
   - An initiative is a proposed ordinance presented for approval by the voters (see Elections Code §9200)
   - Since an initiative is a proposed ordinance, advisory questions cannot be presented to the voters by initiative, so there can’t be an “advisory initiative”
   - Measure B was an advisory question presented as a Council-sponsored measure, so it wasn’t an initiative.
3) The detail about Measure B that the “City cannot subsidize theatre operations” is selective since it was the only of the three conditions within Measure B that the Council followed through on in approving the Civic Arts Plaza, which included:
   - The site for the facility is donated without cost to the City
   - Only existing or projected redevelopment funds pay for the construction costs
   - A private endowment fund is established to offset any potential operating shortfalls

While Measure B had a condition that the site be donated without cost to the City, the CAP site was acquired via eminent domain at the cost of $17.9 million.

While Measure B had a condition that only existing or projected redevelopment funds pay for the construction costs, the costs reached $64 million – approximately three
times to the cost of the $22 million estimate presented to and rejected by the voters via 1986’s Measure C.

Additionally, there were two other advisory measures – 1984’s Measure A and 1986’s Measure C – relating to the voters’ support for the CAP that were rejected.

The history is offered to present why the current language is inaccurate and should be modified as recommended.

(A separate email will be provided to answer this question.)

(8) Intent of changes for General Plan update

In one of my previous notes (titled (3) Details regarding Measure W compliance for land use designations, incorporation of measure language, and CURB line), I recommended that language be included in the recommending and approval resolutions to ensure that items that are not intended to be changed with this General Plan update are clearly stated as such.

I’m forwarding this note again to ensure clarity for any language we add to the resolutions is comprehensive regarding the General Plan policies that require voter approval for any changes.

My understanding is that several parts of the current General Plan are not intended to be changed; otherwise, any such changes would require voter approval, including:

- Amendment to or repeal of the language of Measure E
- Amendment to or repeal of the language of Measure W
- Land use designations of any lands currently designated “Parks, Golf Courses, and Open Space”
- Modification of the City Urban Restriction Boundary (CURB) line

The other changes with respect to residential, commercial, industrial, or other land use designations are all being considered and fall within the ability of the City to approve such changes without voter approval. I also understand, for clarity, the intent to replace the previous policies with the new policies in their entirety.

However, the General Plan policies in the bulleted items cannot be changed without approval by the voters, so there should be a stated intent that these are not being changed as a result of the GP update.

My recommendation is to add language to the recommendation resolution to read (or to the effect):

WHEREAS, the Thousand Oaks General Plan policies approved by the voters through Measure E (1996) and Measure W (2016) are intended to remain part of the General Plan without modification, including specifically, the language of Measure E, the
language of Measure W, the land use designations of any lands currently designated “Parks, Golf Courses, and Open Space,” and the current boundaries of the City Urban Restriction Boundary (CURB) line; and

WHEREAS, the Thousand Oaks General Plan 2045 was prepared pursuant to Government Code Section 65350, et. seq., and, with the exception of those policies requiring voter approval stated above, is intended to supersede all previously adopted General Plans and General Plan Elements in their entirety; and

Answer: Comment noted, no additional changes necessary. The General Plan contains separate policies that acknowledge the requirements of Measure E and W and the terms and extent that they apply to the General Plan. Both Measures are codified in Title 9, Chapter 2 of the TOMC. The General Plan is the overarching framework for the City and, therefore, identifying and emphasizing two adopted policies that have not been altered over numerous policies that will remain unchanged is not necessary for clarity. Moreover, stating that local measures are an exception to the Government Code is not advisable.

(9) Rationale for certain policies changes

In the Addenda and Errata, several policies have been added, modified, or removed. I have some questions and comments regarding the items highlighted in the Addenda and Errata:

- References #12 through #15 state changes to Land Use policies relating to the Oaks Mall, Janss Marketplace, and the Borchard property in Newbury Park.
  - Can you provide some explanatory rationale for the changes in these references?

Answer:

- Policies for The Oaks and Janss Marketplace have been revised to address the new Housing Element Program 5 to further encourage housing in mixed-use areas.
- The Oaks Policy LU-15.3, reference to prohibition of “new stand-alone big box” is proposed to be removed to remain flexible to shifts in the market in the future.
- Moorpark Road/Janss Marketplace Policy 16.1, revised language is proposed to replace “encourage” with “require” a specific plan for properties along Moorpark Road and W. Hillcrest Drive and Thousand Oaks Boulevard. This change acknowledges that coordination and cooperation by all property owners may be difficult, but it is encouraged.
- Policy LU-16.5 language is proposed to add “Require the preparation of a Specific Plan for the Janss Marketplace” to ensure the property is comprehensively planned.
- For the Borchard property:
  - The bicycle path policy is proposed to allow for bicycle connections throughout the property instead of only in one location. The policy for
mitigation within a floodplain is removed because this will be evaluated at the project level. The policy to provide street connections to Alice Drive, Denise Street, and Michael Drive was removed because street connections are already required per the City’s Municipal Code. The reference to coordination with the VC Watershed Protection District was removed because this is already required and will be conducted at the project level. The policy with a maximum of 3-story buildings within 200 feet was changed to 100 feet of existing single-family neighborhoods because this distance provides ample transition in heights between land uses.

• Reference #16 added a policy to comply with Measure E with an appendix listing the measure language.
  o Thank you
  o Can we review the language to be added in Appendix D to ensure it is the proper language approved by the voters?

**Answer:** The City Council Resolution containing the proposed measure submitted to the voters will be Appendix D.

• Reference #23 added a policy to comply with Measure W with an appendix listing the measure language.
  o Thank you
  o Please correct “Save Our Agricultural Resources” to “Save Open-space and Agricultural Resources”

**Answer:** A supplemental will be prepared with the proposed revision to Attachment 1D.

Although the heading of the new policy is titled “Thousand Oaks City Urban Restriction Boundary,” Measure W also includes protections for lands inside the City designated “Parks, Golf Courses, and Open Space.” Similar to the new policy 1.11 titled “Measure E,” it may be more appropriate to title the new policy “Measure W”

**Answer:** No change. Title is specifically called out in Ordinance NO.1628-NS, Section 3, which is the same as 2013 Open Space Element Chapter 8 title.

  o Also, while Measure W requires that it be part of the Open Space Element, there is no restriction also to include or reference the policy in the Land Use Element. This may be advisable for ease of use, since:
    ▪ The CURB line must be part of the Land Use Element map
    ▪ Measure W places voter approval requirements on changes to land use designations of those lands designated as “Parks, Golf Courses, and Open Space”
  o Can we review the language to be added in Appendix C to ensure it is the proper language approved by the voters?
Answer: Section 3 of Ordinance NO. 1628-NS contains the updated version of Measure W that amends the General Plan out to December 31, 2050. See Chapter 8 of the 2013 Open Space Element for similar applicable language.

- Reference #24 includes Janss House to the list of Historic Resources.
  - In reviewing the list of historic resources in the draft General Plan with those listed in the Environmental Impact Report, more have been left out.
  - Please include the following:
    - Case Study House No. 28
    - Banning Dam (Lake Eleanor Dam)
  - Also, please update the map on page 146

Answer: Noted. A supplemental will be prepared with the proposed revision.

- Reference #33 makes a change from “development” to “developed areas in Thousand Oaks.”
  - This changes the verb tense, so I am assuming the language will be changed to read: “…developed areas in Thousand Oaks do not dominate views in the City.”

Answer: Noted. A supplemental will be prepared with the proposed revision.

- Reference #48 describes the removal of an action to “regularly evaluate the list of the City’s native plants for their viability to response to expected future conditions and look for opportunities to increase their viability.”
  - Can you provide some explanatory rationale for the removal of this proposed action?

Answer: This implementation item was removed upon further consultation with COSCA. The goal of this implementation action was to evaluate native plant resources in open space and increase the viability of native vegetation; however, COSCA believes that opportunities to increase their viability would be limited. COSCA would not regularly evaluate the list mentioned because it includes native and non-native plants.

(10) Measure E analysis

Page 6 of the Staff report and the table included in Attachment #7 appear to be the only references to assessing the compliance with Measure E.

Is there an analysis comparing the current Land Use map and the proposed Land Use map, demonstrating the increases and decreases between the two, so that we can evaluate the proposed map’s compliance with Measure E requirements?

Answer: The current Land Use map was analyzed and the Measure E residential baseline of 81,124 units per the land use designations was presented to City Council on
October 24, 2017. Attachment #7 in the staff report demonstrates that the residential capacity is consistent with Measure E residential baseline. Note that 81,124 units is the maximum capacity of Measure E and minimum capacity pursuant to the Housing Crisis Act of 2019.

(11) Housing Element update

Does Staff anticipate making additional changes to the 2021-2029 Housing Element, given the changes to the Draft General Plan update subsequent to the initial submission of this Housing Element? Some examples are included below:

- There are numerous references to older draft General Plan designations, which have been updated with the new residential land use designations:
  - Neighborhood Low (2-6 du/ac) is now split into Neighborhood Low 1 (2-4.5 du/ac) and Neighborhood Low 2 (4.5-6 du/ac)
  - Neighborhood Medium (10-20 du/ac) is now split into Neighborhood Medium 1 (10-15 du/ac) and Neighborhood Medium 2 (15-20 du/ac)
  - Neighborhood Medium-High is now Neighborhood High

- These references can be found on the following pages:
  o Pages 41, 49, 52, 83, 84, 94, C-1, C-6, C-37, C-61

**Answer:** No, the context and background information of the Housing Element will not be updated as it reflects the designations as they exist at the time of drafting.

- On page 74-75, the description of the Inclusionary Housing Program and Nonresidential Development Linkage Fee Program references the previous program and ordinance. The new ordinance was adopted on October 24, although not yet in full effect.

**Answer:** The language as written in the Housing Element is correct. The Housing Element is not amended after Program are completed. Instead, updated information is provided via the General Plan and Housing Element Annual Progress Report which is submitted to OPR and HCD annually.

- On page 95, under Program 17: New Opportunities in High Resource Areas, the listed LU actions are not worded similarly as that in the General Plan Implementation section, and no notes of any changes to these LU actions are included in the Addenda and Errata.

**Answer:** The wording is verbatim. No changes are needed or proposed.

- On page 96, under Program 18: Neighborhood Improvement Program, the listed LU action is not worded similarly as that in the General Plan Implementation section, and no notes of any changes to this LU action are included in the Addenda and Errata.
Answer: The wording is written verbatim. No changes are needed or proposed.

- The figure for Westlake (Figure D-22 on page D-34) doesn't appear to be rendering correctly.

(12) Additional requests for policy changes based on comments on the General Plan

Comment #2 by Nora Aidukas
- Page A-1, Key Findings
  o “Residents living in the Thousand Oaks/Westlake area have the highest life expectancy across Ventura County (88.7 years). This means that, on average, Thousand Oaks residents live very healthy lives.”
  o I concur with the comment that longer life expectancy does not equate to “liv[ing] very healthy lives” and should better reflect the opportunities that Thousand Oaks residents have to live longer and healthier lives.

Answer: Comment noted, this recommendation can be posed for the Planning Commission’s consideration.

Comment #16 by Nora Aidukas
- Comments regarding visioning statement
  - I agree that “tight-knit” has a connotation of exclusivity (however you may construe that). Also, I think Thousand Oaks is connected to the environment, not surrounded by it.
  - Possible modification to language: "Thousand Oaks—connected to its natural environment through a ring of open space and varieties of mature, native oak trees—is a welcoming community where people of all ages, stages of life, and backgrounds can thrive in a suburban, family-friendly environment. ...” The rest can be revised to flow better.

Answer: Comment noted, this recommendation can be posed for the Planning Commission’s consideration.

Comment #20 by Karen Wilburn
- Comments regarding existing land uses
  - Can there be a comment to indicate that the designations in this figure does not reflect the existing General Plan land use designations to prevent any confusion?

Answer: The Figure 4.1 Existing Land Uses is described existing conditions on the ground and not the current land use designations of the General Plan.

Comment #78 by Nora Aidukas
- Comments regarding appropriate community standards for gateway signs
- I concur with the comment about specifying some standards for such gateway signs in the General Plan if we are calling out gateway signage locations
- I recommend adding a sentence to 10.3 under Goal LU-10 to read (something to the effect of):
  - “Require that such gateway signs connect with the City’s natural environment and do not contribute significantly to light pollution.”

**Answer:** The Municipal Code prohibits animated, flashing and revolving signs in industrial and commercial areas with limited exceptions. Standards for signs will be updated as part of the comprehensive update to the Municipal Code.

Comment #126 by Nora Aidukas
- Comments regarding missing trailheads on Figure 6.1
- Can you respond to me and to Ms. Aidukas regarding her comment? I didn’t see it addressed in the updated plan.

**Answer:** The trails map in Figure 6.1 is accurate. The map displays formally adopted trails maintained by COSCA. There are numerous trails throughout the planning area that have been created by unauthorized public use, and some of these have been in place for many years. There are multiple reasons why these have not been made official. Some exist on private property and others cannot be made to conform to COSCA trail standards. In other cases, there are already formal trails nearby so new trails are considered redundant.

Comment #140 by Nora Aidukas and #146 by Wendy Zimmerman
- Comments regarding use of the word “barren”
- I concur with the comment – the term is used nowhere else in the document and gives a false indication about the properties to which this category is applied.
- Recommend renaming category to “Grassland”

**Answer:** The vegetation communities Figure 7.1 is accurate. The figure uses the vegetation classification system and vegetative communities’ data provided by Ventura County. Barren is coupled with grassland, as it refers to areas of land where plant growth may be sparse, stunted, and or contain limited biodiversity.

(13) Local regulations - EIR

In the September 11 hearing on the draft EIR for the General Plan update, I had asked about the inclusion of and references to local General Plan regulations - specifically, Measures E and W.

However, in the Minor Revisions to the Draft EIR, I do not see any reference to making such revisions. I am repeating them here and would ask if these revisions can be made to the EIR:

Section 4.6.2(d) speaks to local regulations relating to land use and planning.
• It seems that Measure W (SOAR) and Measure E should be listed as part of the existing local regulatory framework relating to designations for parks, golf course, and open space uses (Measure W) and designations for residential and commercial uses (Measure E).

Section 4.9.2(d) references Measure E and Ordinance No. 1280-NS.
· In previous correspondence, I do not believe the language of Ordinance No. 1280-NS accurately reflects the language passed by the City Council and the voters in 1996.
· I would ask that we remove any reference to an ordinance number, keeping with the description as "Measure E" - similar to how Measure E is referenced in the June 2023 Housing Element update.

Section 4.10.2(c) speaks to local regulations relating to parks and open space.
· It seems that Measure W (SOAR) should be listed as part of the existing local regulatory framework relating to designations for parks, golf course, and open space uses.

(A separate email will be provided to answer this question.)