

Table of Contents

14	Other Required Disclosures	14-1
14.1	Significant Unavoidable Impacts	14-1
	14.1.1 No Program	14-1
	14.1.2 Proposed Program Alternatives	14-1
14.2	Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Resources	14-2
	14.2.1 Energy Resources.....	14-2
	14.2.2 Environmental Accidents	14-2
14.3	Growth-Inducing Impacts	14-3
14.4	Energy Requirements and Conservation Measures	14-3

Tables

None

Figures

None

14 Other Required Disclosures

This section addresses other potential impacts as required by CEQA: significant environmental impacts that cannot be avoided if the Proposed Program is implemented, significant irreversible environmental changes that would be caused by the Proposed Program should it be implemented, and growth-inducing impacts of the Proposed Program (see CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2).

14.1 Significant Unavoidable Impacts

Unavoidable impacts are those adverse environmental consequences of an action that cannot be avoided, either by changing the nature of the action or through mitigation if the action is undertaken. Significant impacts from No Program are assumed to be not mitigable in most cases, because an action that is currently unplanned and/or unfunded would be required to resolve the impact. Furthermore, the No Program actions to manage mosquitoes would be undertaken primarily by private businesses and landowners, with limited assistance from CDPH if any.

14.1.1 No Program

Potential exists for substantial adverse effects throughout the Program Area if mosquitoes, vectors of disease and discomfort, are allowed to spread and establish populations throughout urban, rural, and open-space areas. Impacts under the No Program Alternative have the potential to be significant and unavoidable for the following resource topics: urban and rural land uses, ecological health, human health, and public services and hazard response as discussed in Section 15.2.1. In the absence of an organized mosquito control program, unlicensed individuals could begin applying over-the-counter pesticides on their own. Most of these individuals have little or no training in the proper and effective use of these materials, meaning a reasonable possibility exists of over- or under-application as well as the potential for creation of unrecognized resistance issues. This possibility is especially true for the indiscriminate use of aerosol foggers as well as concentrated pesticides that require mixing with water prior to application. Additionally, the health and well-being of sensitive individuals (e.g., asthmatics and chemically sensitive people) and their pets (especially birds and fish) could be affected by the unexpected drift of these pesticides into their yards, open windows, and neighborhood parks. Furthermore, increases in mosquito populations could lead to reductions in local and state revenues for parks, marinas, campgrounds, and other recreational activities and for the businesses that support these activities.

14.1.2 Proposed Program Alternatives

One of the Program alternatives would result in potentially significant impacts to surface and groundwater resources that could not be reduced to less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measures. Under the Chemical Control Alternative, the option to use the mosquito adulticide naled is determined to be a significant and unavoidable impact to water resources. Naled is an OP insecticide and may be used in rotation with pyrethrins or pyrethroids to avoid the development of resistance. Naled is the most commonly used material for this purpose, although it is currently not in use by the District. Naled has low water solubility but is mobile in soils with low organic matter content. It is moderately toxic to mammals, fish, and aquatic invertebrates but degrades readily in water, under sunlight, in soil under aerobic and anaerobic conditions, in air, and on plants. Dichlorvos, a breakdown product of naled, and itself a registered pesticide, may be present in toxic concentrations after naled is no longer detectable and is the reason for the determination of significant impact. However, naled and other OPs are important chemicals that help control resistance of mosquitoes to alternative pesticide products such as pyrethrins and pyrethroids (should significant resistance be detected within the District's Program Area). Due to the toxicity of its breakdown

product dichlorvos but its importance in the District's IMMP, the potential use of naled is significant and unavoidable.

14.2 Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Resources

Irreversible commitments are those that cause either directly or indirectly the use of natural resources to the extent that they cannot be restored or returned to their original condition, including nonrenewable resources. Irreversible decisions can also affect renewable resources such as soils, wetlands, and waterfowl habitats. They are considered irreversible because their implementation would affect a resource that has deteriorated such that renewal takes extensive time or financial resources or because they would destroy a resource.

Irretrievable commitments of natural resources mean the decision would result in loss of production or use of the resources. They represent opportunities foregone for a substantial period of time that the resources cannot be used. Also, irreversible damage can result from environmental accidents associated with a project.

No irreversible or irretrievable commitments of land resources are associated with any of the Program alternatives. For the Program alternatives, potential irreversible and irretrievable impacts are associated with the consumption of energy resources by equipment and vehicles including trucks, ATVs and aircraft, and the potential for environmental accidents associated with the application equipment and vehicles/aircraft.

14.2.1 Energy Resources

Energy resources necessary for this Program would include gasoline to power the vehicles and equipment at present and proposed for use in the District's mosquito control activities. Equipment used for the Program is shown in Table 2-5. The No Program Alternative would result in lower use of energy resources (than the Program alternatives), because the fuel currently used in District vehicles for measures such as surveillance and inspection activities, physical control of habitat, vegetation management, application of mosquitofish, and application of registered chemical treatments would not be used.

14.2.2 Environmental Accidents

The following environmental accidents could occur as a result of the implementation of Program surveillance, control, and pesticide/herbicide applications:

- > Aircraft crash
- > Vehicle crash including fuel spill
- > Misdirected spray from backpacks and truck-mounted equipment
- > Leakage of chemical pesticides from containers/improper disposal of containers

Chapter 8, Public Services and Hazard Response, addresses helicopter/fixed-wing aircraft crashes, and determines that none of the Program alternatives would increase the risk of aircraft crashes. Chapter 8 also analyzes whether the Program would create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment, and determines that no increased risk of fuel spill would occur. Finally, Chapter 8 indicates that under each of the Program alternatives, the District and its registered contractors would practice safe disposal of pesticide products and that properly rinsed empty containers would safely and legally be disposed of at landfills and any unused portions of Program chemicals would be disposed of at permitted hazardous waste collection locations. Adequate landfill and hazardous waste collection capacity exists in locations throughout the Program Area and, therefore, the Program would not exceed the existing capacity to safely dispose of these materials.

14.3 Growth-Inducing Impacts

CEQA Section 21100(b)(5) requires that an EIR discuss the growth-inducing impacts of a proposed project. This requirement is further explained in CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2 (g), which states that an EIR must address “the ways in which the proposed project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly in the surrounding environment.”

The Program alternatives do not foster economic or population growth. Rather, they allow for communities within the Program Area to grow according to local general plans without local residents, workers, and visitors suffering from a variety of illnesses or discomfort from mosquito-borne diseases. Of concern are areas where human habitations are in close proximity to natural habitats providing ample opportunity for breeding populations of mosquitoes or where home or business maintenance practices encourage mosquitoes to breed. The District would continue its IMMP, and no change in economic activity would occur as a result of the District’s Program implementation. Therefore, the Program would not directly or indirectly stimulate economic or population growth and would not induce additional jobs or population in the Program Area.

14.4 Energy Requirements and Conservation Measures

Energy resources necessary for this Program would include gasoline to power the vehicles, aircraft, and equipment proposed for use in the Program activities. No additional electrical power would be required. All equipment used in Program implementation would be kept up to date with maintenance requirements and would be used as efficiently as possible (i. e., limit idling time of all vehicles and equipment; service and maintain all equipment according to manufacturer’s instructions to remain in good working order; maintain vehicle tire pressure to manufacturer specifications; and inspect and reinflate tires at regular intervals, as stated in BMP A14 in Table 2-6).

The District would be encouraged to implement the following measures to maximize energy efficiency and reduce energy consumption during Program implementation. With regard to employee commuting, the District is encouraged to (1) provide storage and parking facilities for bicycles; (2) subsidize costs for workers to take public transportation or participate in ride sharing programs where available; and (3) offer preferential parking for electric, hybrid, or alternative low-carbon fuel vehicles.

With regard to vehicles associated with Program surveillance, control, and treatment activities, the District is encouraged to (1) use lower-carbon fuels such as biodiesel blends where feasible; (2) encourage ride sharing when transporting work crews from the base operations to the job site; and (3) use engine retrofits such as diesel particulate matter filters with diesel oxidation catalysts where feasible.

With regard to portable offroad sources, the District is encouraged to utilize electrically or manually powered hydraulic spray equipment rather than gas-powered equipment. Many of the spray pumps in use at present are electric.

These energy conservation measures would have the benefit of reducing GHG emissions the Program generates. All impacts to climate change from GHG emissions are less than significant (LS) compared to existing conditions and require no mitigation. As an option, the District may choose to reduce small impacts even further with the following measure: Where practicable and available, the Program will use alternatively fueled equipment, such as compressed natural gas (CNG), liquefied natural gas (LNG), liquefied petroleum/propane gas (LPG), or biodiesel. (under Impacts GHG-1, GHG-3, GHG-5, GHG-7, GHG-9, and GHG-11) The District and its contractors may implement the BMPs identified above as applicable to minimize gasoline engine exhaust emissions.

This Page Intentionally Left Blank