



THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
Department of Agricultural Resources
**State Reclamation and
Mosquito Control Board**
251 Causeway Street, Suite 500
Boston, MA 02114-2151
<http://www.mass.gov/agr/mosquito/index.ht>



MITT ROMNEY
Governor

KERRY HEALEY
Lt. Governor

Mark S. Buffone, Chairman
Department of Agricultural Resources
Mike Gildesgame
Department of Conservation & Recreation
Glenn Haas
Department of Environmental Protection

ROBERT GOLLEDGE, JR.
EOEA Secretary

DOUGLAS P. GILLESPIE
MDAR Commissioner

Donna Mitchell
Projects Administrator
Tel: (617) 626-1715
Fax: (617) 626-1850

STATE RECLAMATION AND MOSQUITO CONTROL BOARD MINUTES/SUMMARY

WHO: State Reclamation and Mosquito Control Board (SRMCB)
DATE: December 6, 2006
WHERE: Department of Environmental Protection (DEP), One Winter Street,
Boston, MA

PRESENT: Representing
State Reclamation and Mosquito Control Board

Mark Buffone, SRMCB, Chairman
Mike Gildesgame, SRMCB, Member
Glenn Haas, SRMCB, Member

Mosquito Control Project Commissioners

Peter Mirandi, Northeast Mass Mosquito Control and Wetlands District
Arthur Tobin, Bristol County Mosquito Control Project
Richard Pollack, MAG and Norfolk County Mosquito Control Project

Mosquito Control Directors/Superintendents or Assistants

John Smith, Norfolk County Mosquito Control Project
David Henley, East Middlesex Mosquito Control Project
Tim Deschamps, Central Mass Mosquito Control Project
Walter Montgomery, Northeast Mass Mosquito Control and Wetlands District
Robert "Bob" Thorndike, Plymouth County Mosquito Control Project
Priscilla Matton, Bristol County Mosquito Control Project
Wayne Andrews, Bristol County Mosquito Control Project
Bruce Landers, Suffolk County Mosquito Control Project
Ellen Bidlack, Plymouth County Mosquito Control Project
Esteban Cuebas-Incle, Northeast Mass Mosquito Control and Wetlands District

Others

Kimberly King, mother of Adreanna Wing
Debbie Joyce, mother of Sean Joyce
Kathy Moriarty, Holbrook Board of Health, Aunt of Sean Joyce
Heidi Ricci, Mass Audubon
Kyla Bennett, PEER
Leise Jones, Clean Water Action
Pine DuBois, Jones River Watershed Association
Mettie Whipple, Eel River Watershed Association
Stephanie Schmidt, Manomet Center for Conservation Sciences
Jill Cowie, Watershed Action Alliance of SE Massachusetts
Catherine Brown, MassDPH
Cindy Stinson, MassDPH
Steven Antunes-Kenyon, MassDAR
Jennifer Quinn, MassDPH
Donna Mitchell, MassDAR/SRMCB
Bela Matyas, MassDPH
Ron Maribett, NOFA
Gary Gonyea, MassDEP

Calling the Meeting to order and Introductions

Chairman Mark Buffone of the State Reclamation and Mosquito Control Board officially opened the meeting at 1:08 PM on Wednesday, December 6, 2006 at the Department of Environmental Protection Offices at One Winter Street, Boston. He remarked that he serves on the SRMCB as the representative for the Department of Agricultural Resources. He noted that Glenn Haas, representing the Department of Environmental Protection and Mike Gildesgame representing the Department of Conservation and Recreation were also present.

With the three members of the SRMCB introduced, Chairman Buffone announced a quorum for today's meeting.

Chairman Buffone proceeded to clarify the purpose of this meeting stating that the meeting had been set up specifically to provide the Board an opportunity to hear and listen to anyone who desires to speak or read a statement concerning mosquito control in Massachusetts and in particular make comments, observations, suggestions concerning the aerial spray operation this past summer. He further stated that the Board understands and recognizes from some communications it received from the public that there was an expectation to have a dialogue in addition to obtain responses from the Board on matters concerning mosquito control.

However, after receiving a number of requests to speak and the fact the Board desires to be as responsive to the extent it can, the Board determined that this meeting provides an excellent opportunity to hear anyone and everyone concerning this important and at time controversial topic that being mosquito control especially interventions such as aerial spraying to reduce the risk of mosquito borne diseases.

With this format, although there will be no response to anything expressed, read, or stated, the format would encourage as open and frank atmosphere concerning the topic of mosquito control in Massachusetts and the 2006 aerial spraying operation. In this way, no one should fear that their remarks will be contested, confronted, or debated allowing for the widest possible participation from the public.

Chairman Buffone remarked that everything put on the table before the Board this afternoon will be thoughtfully and seriously considered. Also, the Board believes that the result of this open and transparent format, it will be better able to respond if appropriate and when warranted as it becomes better acquainted with the public concerns and perspective.

Introduction

Chairman Buffone ask the other members of the Board the liberty of presenting some summary information about the Board and a brief overview of the aerial spray this past summer. The Board feels it is important to give the public a clear understanding of who we are and what took place this summer.

He provided an overview stating that the State Reclamation and Mosquito Control Board oversees mosquito control in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. This includes both member's cities and towns that participate in a regional mosquito control district or 190 or 54.1 % and other cities and towns not members of mosquito control districts. It operates and carries out its legal authority and mandate per state law specifically Chapter 252 of the MGL. It is comprised of three members. Each member is designated by its respective state agency Commissioner from DAR, DCR, and DEP. The Chairman designated by Department of Agricultural Resources Commissioner. The Board is housed in the Department of Agricultural Resources. The Board appoints Mosquito Control Commissioners to oversee mosquito control districts at the local level.

The Board only approves, supports, and carries out mosquito control programs that are performed within the principals of Integrated Pest Management (IPM) or Integrated Mosquito Management (IMM) using widely accepted standards of control and products that afford far more benefits than risk to people or the environment.

Also, the Board and its mosquito commissions operate within guidelines of a publicly review document called a Generic Environmental Impact Report for Mosquito Control approved in 1998 (some of which specifically relates to vector control such as EEEV that predates another publicly reviewed document produced by the DPH called the State Surveillance and Response Plan). The DPH Surveillance and Response Plan

addresses how we deal with mosquito borne disease threats and was drafted as a result of the West Nile Virus threat in 2000. The Plan has been revised on annual basis. He remarked that both of these documents are publicly accessible on the web.

The Chairman proceeded to provide an overview on what transpired this summer. He commented that for the first time in 16 years or since 1990, aerial applications were conducted to reduce the risk of EEEV in response to a declaration of public health emergency by the Governor.

He stated that the Board was pleased about the fact the aerial spray operation went well. The operation was an amazing and complex event with environmental conditions reaching "perfect storm" like proportion. It was no easy task to meet the objectives of preventing human illness and death with a rapid response. The Board is extremely satisfied to know that this operation went smoothly as multiple state agencies such as the Board, DPH, Gov's office, EPA, EOEAW worked together to make a meaningful public health impact.

Continuing, the Chairman mentioned that the state received in many areas unprecedented amounts of rain fueling mosquito breeding and emergence above normal amounts. In fact, mosquito control districts were taking record numbers of calls from the public for mosquito control service (literally thousands). Also, the appearance of EEEV came earlier than usual with many mosquitoes both avian and mammal types testing positive for the virus. Obviously, these conditions caused great concern. Both the entomological and epidemiological evidence could not be ignored. The overwhelming virus load, the weather, the topography of the area where many areas are inaccessible to ground spraying, supported and led to the decision to conduct aerial spray operations to suppress the risk of disease to the public. Also, and very important to the entire event the Governor declared the situation a public health emergency.

Under these circumstances, there are a number of diverse state agencies involved but in particular the Department of Public Health and the SRMCB.

Then, Chairman Buffone clarify the roles of DPH and SRMCB highlighting that DPH plays an important role through the Arbovirus Surveillance program that collects mosquito data and test for virus. This data is necessary in characterizing the severity or risk of infection and is used in delineating areas that should received treatments.

The SRMCB plays a major role operationally. The Board has the responsibility of overall planning, supervision, guidance, coordination and implementation, of any public health emergency operation. The Board worked very closely with the contractor for both the aerial and pesticides services to accomplish the task of this operation. This operation was complex, large, and required a monumental amount of work.

There were 2 rounds of spraying with a minimum of 2 and maximum of 3 aircraft deployed during the operations and these aircraft used a class of insecticides known as pyrethroids. The product name was Anvil 10+10 ULV, which contains the active ingredient Sumithrin, and Piperonyl butoxide.

One took place on the evening of August 8 and 9th and approx. 140, 000 acres were treated. The other occurred on the evenings of August 22-24th, and the area of treatment grew in size as EEEV activity quickly expanded beyond the original area or hot zones in areas like Lakeville and Middleboro. During this round, some 410,000 acres were covered.

Weather conditions during both spray events ranged from optimal to acceptable with temperatures above 58 degrees. Mosquito abundances in the treated areas were dramatically reduced on both occasions. Percent reduction for all mosquito species combined ranged from 59.8% to 85.5% in trap collections after the first spray and from 57% to 97% in trap collections after the second spray.

Environmental monitoring conducted by State Agencies such as the DEP **did not** detect any adverse effects to water supply reservoirs or benthic invertebrates in the treatment zones. The active ingredient in Anvil 10+10 ULV, Sumithrin, was not detected in any of the water quality samples collected. Piperonyl butoxide (PBO) was detected in a few samples at very low concentrations after both spray events, but at levels that were several orders of magnitude below health-based drinking water concentrations.

Chairman noted that ecological and economic risk was addressed by adding buffer zone to certain areas that were excluded from treatment such as Fish Hatcheries - with an 800-ft buffer; Certified Organic Farms - with a 400-ft buffer; and "critical areas" - such as priority habitats for the most sensitive species and those areas that are essential to their survival, as identified by the DF&W/NHESP and Areas that are part of the MASS GIS "surface water protection areas data layer" with specific areas hand picked by the MDEP that were important to exclude Cranberries were tested also with no detectable levels of residues.

Overall, the costs of the entire operation was a little more than \$1,000,000.

Chairman Buffone highlighted that the air spray operation conducted this summer was clearly far more advanced technologically than the one performed in 1990 in a number of ways. He emphasized that the aircraft used this summer were smaller, quieter, safer (from an FAA perspective (engine climb performance) than DC-3's used in 1990. Also, he mentioned that the aircraft today are equipped with sophisticated GPS Guidance and Flight recording systems providing for more precise aerial adulticiding. The choice of pesticides are newer generation products that are quite effective at very low rates of application. Finally, the operation was done primarily during the evening or nighttime hours, which coincided with peak mosquito flight activity, especially infected mosquitoes and also minimize impacts to non-targets such as honeybees.

In conclusion, the Chairman stated the Board was very pleased with the outcome. He said, "Start to finish it went well". Given very high mosquito densities, and EEEV infection rates in both enzootic and epizootic species, the two rounds of aerial spray operations dramatically reduced mosquito populations.

Further, he outlined that the historical data from the Department of Public Health (DPH) statistics suggests a direct correlation between the number of human cases and the number of EEEV (+) pools of mosquitoes. From the unprecedented number of EEEV (+) pools of mosquitoes one would expect a minimum of 13 human cases. To date, 5 cases occurred! Therefore it is this Board's perspective that the aerial spray operations provided a positive public health impact and prevented additional human cases of EEEV in Massachusetts in 2006.

The Chairman on behalf of the Board thanked all of those involved who did an outstanding job including but not limited to Massachusetts Arbovirus Program at the State Labs personnel under the leadership of Dr Al DeMaria, mosquito control project personnel, and the experts on the Mosquito Advisory Group under the direction of Dr Richard Pollack at Harvard School of Public Health. The Board acknowledges the positive feedback from the public about the website setup by DAR and DPH providing notification and other information to the public in a consumer friendly set up. Also, the public provided feedback on is able to have answered their questions by a live person versus a recording.

Finally, in his closing statement, the Chairman stated that the Board recognized and appreciated the challenge of these operations but highlighted that the aerial adulticiding has demonstrated itself to be an important public health tool.

Even with the success of this aerial treatment, the Board plans to work with DPH and others over the winter to examine the aerial spray to continue to be prepared in the event another public health emergency is declared.

In this same vein, he admitted that the Board recognizes that there are always things that can be improved upon and the Board wants to certainly take advantage of the public thoughts and comments in these matters.

After these overviews, Chairman Buffone explained again that the purpose of this meeting was to solicit comments and observations from those attending the meeting and asked them to sign the sign up sheet if they so desired to directly address the Board. Due to the number of individuals who wished to speak, presenters were requested to limit their comments to 10 minutes in length. However, the Chair did state that individuals should take their time and if more time were needed accommodations would be made. The Chairman stated that everything put on the table before the Board this afternoon will be thoughtfully and seriously considered.

Chairman Buffone then opened up the meeting to comments from the public. Presentations were in order of their signature on the Meeting attendance sign-in sheet.

Presenters in order of their appearance

Kimberly King - Mother of Adreanna Wing

- Mother of Adreanna Wing, a 5 year old girl who died of EEEv on September 4, 2005
- Initial onset of EEEv on August 25, 2005 - developed seizures the next day
- Cost of Care over \$180,000 plus family expenses for travel, lodging, and lost pay as well as additional expenses for funeral in the amount of \$8,500
- Urged State Agencies to work together versus ignoring and fighting with one another
- Must allow Mosquito Control Districts to perform actions quickly and without hindrance from environmental groups, actions must be in best interest of public health
- Daughter died from the bite of an infected mosquito.
- Do not allow Mosquito Control actions to be influenced by political agendas versus public health
- Circulated a "Save the Children from EEE" petition, which has over 2,000 signatures, for state agencies to enhance EEEv surveillance and public notification process
- Urged better education programs for school kids to be implemented. Has personally supplied core curriculum to 197 schools and copies of CDC education program to Bristol County MCD
- Urged DPH to look at and address any confusion regarding the Surveillance and Response Plan in Towns. Some towns had not opened up their copies of the plan prior to the spraying.
- Urged that decisions be based on data and facts not on fear and guesses that Mosquito Control may harm people and the environment
- State needs to clean up man-made mosquito breeding sites, e.g. tire farms

Debbie Joyce - Mother of Sean Joyce

- Mother of Sean Joyce, a 13 year-old boy who died of EEEv in 2004
- Human life must be a priority
- What good is protecting environment if Public "lives in fear" of enjoying life
- Mosquitoes are not just a nuisance - they are a threat to public health
- Should not just spray on an Emergency basis, must be proactive to save human lives

Arthur Tobin - Commissioner Bristol County Mosquito Control

- Requested to Deferred comments at this time

Heidi Ricci - Massachusetts Audubon Society

- Stated that Mass Audubon is first and foremost concerned with public health and safety and pledged to work with state and local officials to do everything possible to prevent cases of EEEv and WNV
- Pointed out the need to update 1998 Mosquito Control GEIR especially Inland Water Management BMPs under development by DEP
- Handed out copies of Secretary of EOE Certificate regarding required updates to GEIR
- Certificate noted need for ongoing work

- Noted that control of EEEV is more difficult than WNV which is “easier” to control via larviciding
- Stated DEP’s new Storm Water Guidelines should contain MC provisions. Some SW structures are providing new breeding areas for mosquitoes, especially areas that promote cattail growth since mosquitoes from these habitats are harder to control with larvicides. Need to look at Low Impact Development and other means to reduce breeding habitat.
- Handed out copies of 2003 letter regarding Mosquito Control practices. MCD responses did not address major issue of consistent practices among regions
- Stated we need unified approach to MC throughout state
- Stated 2006 Aerial Spraying “caught folks by surprise” since protocols developed called for spraying late in season when certain triggers were met. Concerns with suppressing predator populations
- Audubon was not aware of changes to S&R Plan protocols developed in 2001 and was also unaware of S&R Plan updates or work groups since that time
- Requested that SRMCB/DPH make the products of the 2005-06 Work groups public for review
- Requested SRMCB/DPH do a better job of distributing information to the public on preventative measures, and better notification of the public
- Better public warning, advance notice of on going threat e.g. farmers, livestock, no risk of disease after spraying, etc.
- Monitoring protocols for non-target species were inadequate and would like to work with SRMCB to update
- Left list of questions that Mass Audubon would like to see addressed
- Provided copy of article on non-effectiveness of truck based spraying

Kyla Bennet - Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility (PEER)

- Mother of an 11 year old girl who suffers from recurring bone tumors due to chemical exposure
- Concerned about Public Health - concerned that the “cure”, pesticides used in Aerial Spray may lead to other Public Health effects in the long term
- Requested earlier and better notification of aerial spray operation, heard a rumor that the town would be sprayed, local BOH did not know, no notification even to residents who were sprayed
- Misinformation on DAR web site stating that schools, day care centers, recreational areas would not be sprayed - but these areas were sprayed. Information was withdrawn immediately before spraying
- Many groups, scouts, etc. caught outside unaware. Need to provide information to all farmers, not just organic farmers
- More public information on limits of aerial spray - e.g. false sense of security after spray operations - residents believed they no longer needed to use PPM
- Two cases of EEE reported after 2nd spray - how effective was the aerial spraying?
- Requested to see high efficacy data
- Conducted “bed sheet” test during spray - of 100 plus insects only found three dead mosquitoes rest were non-target species including predators of mosquitoes
- Claimed spray made situation worse since infected birds - and other mosquito predators - left the treated area and move EEE to other areas. Does AS spread EEE to other areas.
- Inquired if both Public Health Emergencies were rescinded.
- Requested information on triggers for PHE to be posted on web site.

Liese Jones - Clean Water Action Alliance

- Requested SRMCB conduct a review of MC Programs and implement uniform Best Practices across the State so MCD are operating under the same set of principles so local officials will know what to expect from their local Districts
- Organization is concerned about exposure to chemicals. Requested risk analysis of risk of EEE to risk of exposure
- Requested State focus on controlling mosquitoes at breeding sites as oppose to nuisance spraying and improve Public Education on Personal Protective Measures
- Opposed to Nuisance Control when there is a slim/remote chance of an outbreak of mosquito-borne illness
- Urged DPH and other state agencies to embrace mission of preventing threats to Public Health by promoting best practices for personal and environmental protection and at same time protect people from mosquito-borne diseases
- Stated pesticides are linked to other health problems, diseases and disorders (e.g. asthma) even at low levels, low dose over many years is a problem
- Irresponsible of DPH to advocate use of pesticides without risk/benefit analysis to prove that use of pesticides are justified
- Many chemicals are not tested for long term exposure
- Requested state focus on prevention, public education, and elimination of sources so we don't have to rely on truck or aerial spraying
- Will submit written statement and copies of scientific studies

Pine Dubois - Jones River Watershed Association

- Took action to stop Aerial spraying since they felt serious adverse impacts can result but do not feel that bugs are more important than people
- Requested pre and post monitoring data - especially where the sampling sites were located
- Questioned if AS was best use of state's financial and environmental resources
- Picked up dead crabs after first spray, felt that the dead mud crabs in the estuary were an impact that the state was not monitoring for. DMF staff was not available to assist, SRMCB should have identified/lined up another agency to respond to reports
- Observed many species of bugs, birds, etc. left area after spraying, picked up dead spiders and dragon flies
- Personally experienced an allergic reaction
- Requested that DPH/SRMCB avoid aerial spraying at any cost
- Suggested State fund purchase of Mosquito Magnets and distribute
- Requested better public notification before "bombing" them with pesticides
- Pool Isolates were in Kingston - why was her area sprayed? No mosquitoes in her yard.
- Personally lost one bee hive - other folks in area also lost bee hives - because bees went out at first light
- Planes started early one night (7PM versus 8PM) without notifying public - people outside at Mall, etc. were sprayed. People did not know whom to call.
- Felt more manpower should be addressed to deal with problem before it becomes
- Should buy a lot of Mosquito Magnets and distribute to residents around problem areas
- Wants to be involved with process, and not bombed with pesticides
- Will go to court again if necessary to stop future sprays

- Did alewives in Jones River make it out since they didn't have anything to eat for two weeks?

Stephanie Schmidt - Manomet Center For Conservation Sciences

- Advocated more monitoring to provide sound scientific basis of ecological and public health responses to chemical stressors
- State claims of little danger to humans and wildlife and little impact are not justified
- Cited article from a California study where synergist effect of PBO from MC aerial spray operations to chemicals already present in bottom sediments from other agricultural and homeowner uses of pesticides, caused toxicity to aquatic organisms
- May not be able to predict toxic effects to humans or wildlife due to variability that already exists in environment
- Peer reviewed studies indicate other public health impacts including impacts from a single exposure to a chemical.
- Manomet Center urges a multi-agency, multi organizational approach to designing and implementing a monitoring program would assist with monitoring efforts

Jill Cowie - Watershed Action Alliance of Southeastern Mass

- Provided copy of statement to SRMCB from GreenCap
- Requested DPH/SRMCB have maximum involvement of local stakeholders
- Enhance monitoring especially non-target impacts of spraying
- Claimed there was a lack of information distributed by state on health impacts, care of farm animals, amount of time needed for pesticide breakdown in swimming pools, back yards, farm animals, need to keep kids inside
- Claimed aerial spraying created false sense of security & relief, people abandoned PPM
- Questioned if Aerial spray could avoid/exclude rivers, moving water, and other water bodies besides public water supplies
- More dissemination of information of protocols and studies by DPH posted on web site
- Standardize local MCD information, believe they are all operating under different standards
- Questioned if SRMCB could standardize web site information for the various Districts - especially larvicide information, hard to find information on sites.

Richard Pollack - MAG Chair, Harvard School of Public Health

- All present at today's meeting support goals of protecting people and the environment, differ on risk threshold before we take action and on the intervention means
- Decision makers must consider immediate and long-term health and environmental threats, resources available to intervene, concerns of municipal officials and their citizens, and legal obligations/restrictions
- Nuisance versus public health - high abundances of non-infected mosquitoes can negatively impact quality of life. No "fine line" between "nuisance" or "public health" control. Public Health community recognizes proactive efforts to suppress mosquito populations early in season are warranted to preempt more serious threat later in season
- Public Health and mosquito control officials do weigh potential impact of actions on environment. Groups are encouraged and have many opportunities to participate in process and present objective evidence.

- MCPs are regulated by federal, state, and local agencies - they do not have carte blanche to disturb the environment - much care, training, and regulatory scrutiny accompany each decision and action.
- Massachusetts citizens greatly benefited from the carefully orchestrated actions by an impressive cadre of state officials and experts - a dozen or more human cases of EEEv were averted
- Aerial adulticidal treatments during 2006 fell short of intended goals due to mysteriously erected 11th hour barriers erected by some state officials that prevented treatment of certain critical areas
- Requested those with competing concerns work together toward common goals and apply objective criteria.

Arthur Tobin - Commissioner Bristol County Mosquito Control

- Agree with Dr. Pollack's summary
- Mosquito Control professionals in this room strive to learn new techniques to control mosquitoes and protect the environment and humans
- Need to learn from the past so we don't repeat mistakes

Bela Matyas - MassDPH

- DPH mission is to prevent diseases; while EEE is rare, the disease is very serious and often results in death; a life lost from a potentially preventable cause is a tragedy.
- Our education, notification, surveillance, and response efforts can always be improved, and DPH invites feed back to make things better
- This year, surveillance and coordination among the critical agencies were excellent, and aerial spraying went forward because indicators pointed towards an increased human risk of disease
- Aerial spraying was conducted before the first human or horse cases were reported
- The events and information following the aerial sprayings re-confirmed for us that the decisions to spray were correct and that the aerial spraying was very effective at achieving its goals; we believe that cases of EEE (and deaths from EEE) were prevented by these actions
- DPH always stated risk of disease and the need for public to take personal protective measures in all interviews and press releases - before and after spraying
- Much work went into selecting the best pesticide, to minimize Public Health & environmental impacts
- DPH risk analysis pointed towards increases in human cases without intervention, less impact from pesticide
- If DPH determines that the risk of human cases of EEE in an area is high, we will recommend control interventions and will rely on mosquito control professionals to determine how best to carry out those interventions; the immediate and documented risks of EEE greatly outweigh the potential/theoretical risks of the intervention; with respect to pesticide risks, the decision is not whether to spray but what to spray with

Ron Maribett - Organic Farmer, representing NOFA

- Distributed handout from Northeast Organic Farming Association regarding their opposition to the Aerial Spraying due to their concerns about adverse impacts from both the pesticide and synergist - PBO.
- Read list of side effects from sumithrin and PBO as a possible carcinogen

- Claimed Organic farmers did not receive sufficient notice of spraying. They were contacted pre-spray regarding farm boundaries but did not receive advance notice of spraying
- Questioned degree of aerial spray precision and no-spray areas. No organic farmers were contacted regarding testing for over spray
- Stated Rainfall pattern may not be an anomaly, climatic changes may be the norm in the future
- Stated arguments for and against aerial spraying have pitted family versus family in the pursuit of health and safety. Need to be concerned about health and safety of all citizens
- Organic Farmers depend on Transparency to ensure customers of the quality and safeness of their product. Farmers cannot satisfy customer demand for transparency without better notification and exclusions from spray areas.
- As organic farming becomes more prevalent, and more areas are excluded from spraying, we will have to look to other methods to control mosquitoes
- Organic farmers will participate as needed in developing other methods to deal with mosquitoes since we deal with pests everyday.

A Question?

Although the format of the meeting was established as testimony, a question was raised as the meeting was coming to an end by Alice C. Elwell - Enterprise newspaper correspondent who questioned when the decision to spray was made and why it was not made earlier in the season? She could not get information right away to alert her readers and mentioned Bela Matyas in her comment. The Chair allowed a brief response by Bela of MassDPH that the decision was made at 6pm on August 4th, and that all agencies made every effort to notify public as quickly as possible.

MEETING CLOSING

Chairman Buffone stated that from the comments and statements read this afternoon it is clear that all those present even with the differing viewpoints, all desire the goal of protecting the public health and the environment. He emphasized that the family members of EEEV victims are to be commended for their courage to speak as to the pain and suffering caused by EEEV a rare but serious and devastating disease. The Board will be mindful of the human impact perspective.

On the hand, comments pertaining to pesticides and their effects are to be carefully considered by the Board as well.

The Board would closely review the comments about more aggressive public education and more advance notification. The comments and statements pertaining to state agency cooperation and collaboration was appreciated and points out the importance of improved communication and early planning by all diverse state agencies involved with emergency events such as EEEV. The Board will consider these

comments too. All in all, the Chairman stated that the Board would continue to seek common ground in all these matters.

Finally, Chairman Buffone closed by saying that the Board would like to extend its gratitude and appreciation to all who attended this meeting and especially those addressed the Board directly with comments, questions, and statements. He strongly mentioned that the Board will consider all thoughtfully and seriously all the comments, observations, and questions raised. Also, he reemphasized again that everything put on the table before the Board this afternoon will be thoughtfully and seriously considered as a result of this open and transparent format.

The Board believes it will be better able to respond if appropriate and when warranted as it becomes better acquainted with the public concerns and perspective it heard today. He reminded the public that the Board will continue to work with all parties concern especially workgroups led by DPH over the winter.

ADJOURNMENT

Chairman Buffone entertained a motion to adjourn meeting. So moved by Glenn Haas and Mike Gildesgame. Seconded by Glenn Haas. Vote carried unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 3:05 PM

Respectfully submitted:

Gary Gonyea and Mark Buffone, Chairman