APPENDIX N

the districts to conduct an annual inspection of each dairy facility. The requirements/regulations of the mosquito abatement districts have already been incorporated into standard conditions of approval or are addressed in Mitigation Measures #4.3.6-1 and #4.3.6-2. Inspections are considered routine for mosquito abatement districts.

Response to Comment 22: Refer to Comment 21 above. As stated in the Implementation/Monitoring discussion for Mitigation Measure #4.3.6-2, the measure would be incorporated into the conditions of approval for individual facilities. Monitoring of conditions of approval is the responsibility of the RMA; nuisance and/or abatement is handled by the responsible abatement district.

A review of violations received by RMA for the past 2 years revealed that no complaints regarding mosquito problems have been received. The basis for all complaints received dealt with the expansion of facilities without a use permit or non-compliance with conditions of approval regarding district standards. In the latter case, this typically related to the lack of access for abatement/maintenance, or construction of wastewater lagoons which did not meet district standards. All violations involving compliance with conditions of approval have been resolved.

Response to Comment 23: Refer to Response to Comment 6 above.

Response to Comment 24: Refer to Response to Comments 14, 15, 16, 17, 18 and 19 above.

Response to Comment 25: Refer to Response to Comment 6. Baseline information on the state of water quality in those portions of the county where animal confinement projects under the plan are likely is not available. Regular groundwater monitoring is currently only required for public water systems. Some of the cities in the county (e.g., Visalia, Tulare) have conducted studies to evaluate groundwater in the immediate area of their sewage treatment plants. In the case of the Visalia study, groundwater testing did reveal high concentrations of nitrate below some, but not all of the older dairies in the area (mainly below the corrals and/or sumps). The extent of the contamination was localized and would not provide an adequate overview of the status of the groundwater in the county. With the adoption of the ACFP, information will be collected to provide an appropriate baseline and to provide early detection of potential contamination before its spreads to potable groundwater.

A review of RMA's code enforcement records indicated that violations of RWQCD requirements typically involved standing water. Based on information from the CVRWQCB, only two or three monitoring wells have been required in Tulare County when determined necessary based on individual Reports of Waste Discharge.

Response to Comment 26: The commentor's recommendation regarding the alternatives is noted for the record.