

Recommendations of the Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century Task Force

Appendix C: Task Force and Subcommittee Meeting Minutes

This appendix includes full Task Force meeting agendas and minutes, as well as Subcommittee meeting minutes. Please note that several presentations were given to the Task Force during meetings. Copies of presentations to the task force can be found at the following webpage: <https://www.mass.gov/service-details/mosquito-control-for-the-twenty-first-century-task-force-meetings>

Task Force Meetings

Friday, March 25, 2022	Tuesday, July 27, 2021
Monday, March 21, 2022	Wednesday, June 2, 2021
Thursday, March 3, 2022	Monday, April 5, 2021
Monday, February 7, 2022	Wednesday, March 3, 2021
Thursday, Jan 13, 2022	Thursday, February 4, 2021
Tuesday, December 14, 2021	Wednesday, January 27, 2021
Monday, November 15, 2021	Wednesday, December 2, 2020
Monday, November 8, 2021	Monday, November 9, 2020
Thursday, October 21, 2021	Tuesday, October 27, 2020
Wednesday, October 13, 2021	Wednesday, October 7, 2020
Tuesday, September 28, 2021	Wednesday, September 2, 2020
Thursday, September 2, 2021	Friday, August 14, 2020
Tuesday, August 10, 2021	

Subcommittee Meetings (2021-2022)

Policy Structure Subcommittee Meetings

Sept 30, Oct 14, Oct 28, Nov 9, Nov 18, Dec 9, Dec 23, Jan 6, Jan 21, Feb 4, Feb 17, Feb 25, Mar 1, Mar 29 (for vote on minutes)

Best Practices Subcommittee Meetings

Oct 4, Oct 13, Oct 25, Nov 8, Nov 22, Dec 6, Dec 20, Jan 5, Jan 19, Jan 31, Feb 8, Feb 14, Feb 28, Mar 29 (for vote on minutes)

Local Engagement Subcommittee Meetings

Oct 7, Oct 18, Nov 4, Nov 18, Dec 2, Dec 16, Jan 10, Jan 18, Jan 27, Feb 2, Feb 10, Feb 24, Mar 29 (for vote on minutes)

Pesticide Selection Subcommittee Meetings

Oct 5, Oct 19, Nov 2, Nov 16, Nov 30, Dec 13, Jan 11, Jan 25, Feb 2, Feb 8, Feb 22, Mar 29 (for vote on minutes)

**Mosquito Control for the 21st Century Task Force
Meeting Minutes and Agendas**



The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs
100 Cambridge Street, Suite 900
Boston, MA 02114

Charles D. Baker
GOVERNOR

Karyn E. Polito
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

Kathleen A. Theoharides
SECRETARY

Tel: (617) 626-1000
Fax: (617) 626-1081
<http://www.mass.gov/eea>

Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century Task Force

Friday, August 14, 2020
1:00PM

Meeting to be held via remote participation (details below)

AGENDA

1. Call to order and introductions
2. Review of legislation – mission and responsibilities of the task force
3. Status of appointments
4. EEE update

Topic: Mosquito Control Task Force Zoom Meeting
Time: Aug 14, 2020 01:00 PM Eastern Time (US and Canada)

Join Zoom Meeting:

<https://zoom.us/j/3627818382?pwd=TXIXR0hsNHJ6RC96QmcwaW03bkIvZz09>

Meeting ID: 362 781 8382

Passcode: 0c4RHy

One tap mobile

+13017158592,,3627818382#,,,,,0#,,318580# US (Germantown)

+13126266799,,3627818382#,,,,,0#,,318580# US (Chicago)

Dial by your location

+1 301 715 8592 US (Germantown)

+1 312 626 6799 US (Chicago)

+1 646 558 8656 US (New York)

+1 253 215 8782 US (Tacoma)

+1 346 248 7799 US (Houston)

+1 669 900 9128 US (San Jose)

Meeting ID: 362 781 8382

Passcode: 318580

Find your local number: <https://zoom.us/u/ar1VybOn>

Mosquito Control Task Force Meeting

August 14, 2020 at 1:00 p.m. via Zoom

-Dan Sieger began at 1:03 p.m. by asking people on the call to introduce themselves- among those who did were: Kevin Cranston: Serving as Vice-Chair (DPH Commissioner Bharel's designee), MDAR Commissioner John Lebeaux: Introduced himself/duties. Alicia Bouchard. Also Caroline Higley: Director of Environmental Policy Coordination at EEA, David Lawson, Monica Driggers, Jennifer Pederson, David Brown, Julia Blatt, Russell Hopping, Brian Farless, Heidi Ricci from Mass Audubon, Alden Bourne from New England Public Radio, Everose Schuler Richard Day Director of Central Mass Mosquito Control, Senator Anne Gobi, Brad Mitchell, Tanya Colpitts, Jessica Grigg, Brian Rossman, Jo Comerford Senate Chair of Public Health, Barbara Chrenko, Priscilla Matton, Ellie Goldberg, Kelly Barber, Alexandra Zollo, Louise Bergeron, Martin Suuberg, Pine Dubois, Cliff Youse, Jennifer Forman Orth, Catherine Brown, and Susan Kane.

-Dan Sieger then introduced himself as Undersecretary for the Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs. Mr. Sieger stated the rest of the Task Force has not yet been appointed and thus there is no quorum, so this is not an official public meeting. Instead it's a meeting to review what the Task Force is and the legislation that created it. Mr. Sieger then handed over discussion to officials from MDAR.

-Commissioner Lebeaux introduced Jessica Burgess.

-Jessica Burgess introduced herself as counsel for MDAR and General Counsel for the State Reclamation and Mosquito Control Board or SRB. Ms. Burgess then presented an overview of the new legislation that was passed on July 20, 2020 by Governor Baker entitled "An Act to Mitigate Arbovirus in the Commonwealth." A copy of the legislation can be found at <https://malegislature.gov/Laws/SessionLaws/Acts/2020/Chapter120>.

-Dan Sieger thanked Jessica and followed up by stating that there are several moving pieces from the legislation. He stated that there is an extensive charge for this group and that he appreciates people serving. There will be a more extensive discussion on specifics at the next meeting. Mr. Sieger stated that they are working to get everyone formally appointed by next week. He then turned to MDAR to discuss the next agenda item.

-Commissioner Lebeaux thanked Mr. Sieger and stated that there was an aerial spray this past Monday evening under ideal weather conditions and that we are standing by for the surveillance and tracking information. The SRB is planning to meet shortly to designate its two members to this body.

-Dan Sieger then asked Vice-Chair Kevin Cranston for some additional background on EEE.

-Kevin Cranston mentioned that DPH does laboratory testing to characterize risk of EEE, and turned things over to Dr. Catherine Brown from DPH for more details on the Commonwealth's response to EEE.

-Dr. Brown stated that even though EEE is very rare, it is very serious. The incubation period in humans is 3-10 days after a bite. Onset of symptoms can be quite sudden and seizures, coma and death can come rapidly. There is a 30-50% mortality rate and a 50% rate in MA. Most people who survive have permanent neurological issues. One species of mosquito (*Culiseta melanura*) which primarily bites birds, is to blame for the EEE amplification cycle. At a certain point when enough birds have EEE, a second type of mosquito (*Coquillettidia perturbans*) will then bite the birds and because it also feeds on mammals that mosquito is at risk of spreading EEE to humans.. Habitat that produces EEE activity is red maple/white cedar swamps, which is common in SE MA. In general there is a pattern in which outbreaks of EEE exist over a 2-3 year period. That doesn't mean cases don't exist at other times, but they are a lot less numerous. In 2019 MA had 12 cases and 6 deaths, the worst year since 1956. Bristol/Plymouth County has been the hotspot in MA for EEE. Much of the information here can be found in the DPH arbovirus response plan. The primary contribution that DPH makes to arbovirus surveillance and response is working with Mosquito Control Districts to monitor EEE activity, coordinating with the State Public Health Laboratory tests for trapped mosquitos for EEE, and then conducting a risk analysis to communicate the areas currently at risk for human disease. Trapping and testing for EEE is a very labor intensive process. Traps are left out, mosquitoes inside are collected and killed, and species are separated out to test the different types. They are grouped into groups of up to 50 where they are tested for West Nile Virus and EEE. In 2018 we had virtually no EEE activity but then in 2019 activity spiked. The purpose of a risk analysis is to allow a phased response; there are 5 different risk categories for EEE. Low risk is Green, Critical risk is red. The foundation of all prevention for mosquito borne disease in MA must be personal prevention. Everyone should use insect repellent while outdoors with EPA registered ingredients. In addition to repellents, reducing exposed skin helps as does avoiding outdoor activity between dusk and dawn in areas of increased risk. Stagnant water is a breeding site for WNV mosquitoes. We have had one human case in a critical risk community in July. We are assuming that we are in the second year of the EEE cycle.

-Dan Sieger then said that this concludes the day's agenda. Comments and questions should be held until we have a quorum next time at a public meeting. He appreciated everyone taking the time to join the Task Force and will formalizing appointments next week so we can have a meeting shortly thereafter.



The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs
100 Cambridge Street, Suite 900
Boston, MA 02114

Charles D. Baker
GOVERNOR

Karyn E. Polito
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

Kathleen A. Theoharides
SECRETARY

Tel: (617) 626-1000
Fax: (617) 626-1081
<http://www.mass.gov/eea>

Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century Task Force

Wednesday, September 2, 2020
3:30PM

Meeting to be held via remote participation (details below)

AGENDA

1. Call to order and introductions
2. Review of legislation – mission and responsibilities of the task force
3. Open meeting law
4. Summary of mosquito control structure
5. Task force workplan
6. Procurement law

Topic: Mosquito Control Task Force Meeting

Time: Sep 2, 2020 03:30 PM Eastern Time (US and Canada)

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://zoom.us/j/3627818382>

Meeting ID: 362 781 8382

One tap mobile

+13017158592,,3627818382# US (Germantown)

+13126266799,,3627818382# US (Chicago)

Dial by your location

+1 301 715 8592 US (Germantown)

+1 312 626 6799 US (Chicago)

+1 646 558 8656 US (New York)

+1 253 215 8782 US (Tacoma)

+1 346 248 7799 US (Houston)

+1 669 900 9128 US (San Jose)

Meeting ID: 362 781 8382

Find your local number: <https://zoom.us/u/ar1VybOn>

Minutes for Mosquito Control Taskforce Meeting

September 2, 2020 at 3:30 p.m. via Zoom at <https://zoom.us/j/3627818382>

Dan Sieger called the meeting to order at 1:33 p.m. He requested that participants put their names and affiliation in the chat box. He introduced Kevin Cranston of the Massachusetts Department of Public Health (“DPH”), who serves as co-chair, and John Lebeaux from the Massachusetts Department of Agricultural Resources (“MDAR”) and reviewed the agenda (see attached). Mr. Sieger then introduced Kathleen Theoharides, Secretary of the Massachusetts Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs (“EEA”).

Secretary Theoharides thanked Mr. Sieger and other participants and welcomed all the appointees. She referred to last year’s historic number of Eastern Equine Encephalitis (“EEE”) cases and deaths and stated that our teams are taking every step to combat both EEE and West Nile Virus. She is looking forward to help from this task force in reviewing mosquito control in the Commonwealth to manage mosquitoes for the health of the people of Massachusetts. She thanked the task force members for their time and said she looks forward to seeing the work coming out of this task force.

Dan Sieger introduced Commissioner John Lebeaux of MDAR who then introduced Jessica Burgess from MDAR Legal to speak about the charge of the task force and the Open Meeting Law.

Mr. Sieger then turned to Commissioner Lebeaux for a summary of Mosquito Control in the Commonwealth. Commissioner Lebeaux introduced himself as Commissioner of MDAR and Chairman of the State Reclamation and Mosquito Control Board (SRMCB). Commissioner Lebeaux informed the task force that the State Reclamation and Mosquito Control Board (“SRMCB”) oversees mosquito control in Massachusetts under the authority provided in Chapter 252 of the Massachusetts General Laws. The 3-member Board sits within MDAR and represents the Commissioners of the state departments of Agricultural Resources, Environmental Protection (DEP) and Conservation & Recreation (DCR).

Commissioner Lebeaux further explained that the SRMCB has the following authority under M.G.L. c. 252: establish the process by which municipalities can petition to form or join an MCD; approve funding methods; certify budgets for the Massachusetts Department of Revenue (“DOR”) to make necessary cherry sheet deductions; appoint and remove commissioners of Mosquito Control Districts or Projects (“MCDs”); establish administrative and technical policy guidelines and best management practices to ensure MCDs operate according to federal, state, and local laws and perform the necessary functions under the statute; and, establish conditions under which mosquito control work may be performed.

Commissioner Lebeaux informed the task force that there are 11 MCDs throughout the state. Each regional district has its own boards and commissioners that oversee the day to day work of its district. 9 of the 11 MCDs were created through special enabling legislation, as amended, while the other 2 were established by the SRMCB under M.G.L. c. 252 which set forth the

funding mechanism: Cherry Sheet Assessments through local aid deductions based upon land valuation calculations done by DOR.

Commissioner Lebeaux also explained that a city or town that is not a member can vote to join the MCD in which it is already located through a lawfully binding mechanism such as a vote of the City Council or Annual or Special Town Meeting Vote. The municipality's certified vote is then presented to the SRMCB. The SRMCB needs to vote and officially approve the municipality's action for membership or withdrawal to/from an MCD. These MCDs are generally funded through voluntary contributions made directly to the MCDs trust account.

Additional information is available at <https://www.mass.gov/state-reclamation-and-mosquito-control-board-srmcb> and a copy of the presentation is available on the task force website <https://www.mass.gov/orgs/mosquito-control-for-the-twenty-first-century-task-force>.

Dan Sieger thanked Commissioner Lebeaux and asked if any taskforce members had questions for the Commissioner.

Heidi Ricci from Mass Audubon introduced herself and stated she hoped part of the analysis will be looking at the different districts so we can do a real analysis of what the best practices are so we can promote them system wide.

Brad Mitchell from MA Farm Bureau said we have a lot of salt marsh projects, and asked if there a consistent system for those? He said we do need some consistency in his opinion.

Dan Sieger thanked them and said they will talk about that more in future meetings.

Richard Robinson, of NOFA Mass said that here farmers can request roadside spraying, and then asked what is the authority for monitoring the spraying?

Commissioner Lebeaux and Jessica Burgess answered that the individual districts monitor, and MDAR's division of crop and pest services has jurisdiction.

Bob Mann asked what if mosquitoes with arbovirus are found outside of a place within a district?

Commissioner Lebeaux answered that there is only government mosquito control where this is a district or a project.

Dan Sieger next requested feedback on the workplan from members. We want to meet once per month on a recurring basis at the beginning of the month. We need to commission a study on spraying for arbovirus in 2020 and look to ensure the scope adheres to the spirit of the statute. We recommend putting out an RFR in November and then developing subcommittees for the group to meet the deadlines set forth for next October. The RFR needs to move quickly; once that is out we can start a conversation about subcommittees.

Jennifer Pederson asked what the task force will do about the other items mandated in the legislation?

Dan Sieger answered that it is important to move on the study so it can inform other task force actions and recommendations.

Heidi Ricci from Mass Audubon agreed, and hopes to get as much information as possible out of that report.

Julia Blatt from Mass Rivers stated she was wondering about the rest of the timeline; will the end of the work be crunched trying to finish this by the end of 2021?

Dan Sieger answered that he was not sure. He said in October and November we definitely need to be laying out the other plans for what we need to accomplish but for now starting with the study is best.

Derek Brindisi asked if the taskforce was charged with the opt-out process mentioned in the legislation?

Dan Sieger stated that the taskforce will need to talk about that, but we're not focused on that right now.

Heidi Ricci from Mass Audubon said that the legislation says there has to be at least one public listening session, and then raised ideas for additional task force engagement with the public, including public access of materials but also for the public to submit suggestions and ask questions of the task force. Ms. Ricci asked Mr. Sieger what his thoughts were about an email address.

Mr. Sieger said that an email address is an interesting concept and that we can come back with an updated plan at an upcoming meeting.

Mr. Sieger stated a monthly meeting will be scheduled and if we run into time issues we can pivot to additional meetings.

Commissioner Lebeaux the introduced Rob Monahan from MDAR Fiscal for an overview of procurement processes.

Mr. Monahan stated that all state agencies must follow the same steps when procuring anything. The state utilizes a portal where everything is done and best value procurements are the goal. Members of this team will be identified to hash out the requirements in the RFR. Once that document is finalized it will be posted to Commbuys and it will be advertised. The next step is to evaluate submittals and negotiate contracts to be signed. We follow up and make sure they are staying on schedule and tweak anything as we go if necessary.

Mr. Sieger thanked Mr. Monahan and stated that we will need to consider the RFR for our next meeting. There is no funding for a study so we will talk about the scope and budget of the study.

Heidi Ricci from Mass Audubon asked whether the taskforce can provide feedback on the 2019 and 2020 spray reports?

Commissioner Lebeaux said he will follow up at the next meeting.

Ms. Blatt of Mass Rivers asked to get materials sooner.

Mr. Sieger answered in the affirmative.

Dan Sieger said that once the recommendations are filed, legislators will need to consider if there is interest in drafting legislation.

Senator Comerford agreed.

Pine Dubois asked whether there will be somewhere where everything will be posted?

Mr. Sieger answered that there is a website where things will be posted.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:46 p.m.



The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs
100 Cambridge Street, Suite 900
Boston, MA 02114

Charles D. Baker
GOVERNOR

Karyn E. Polito
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

Kathleen A. Theoharides
SECRETARY

Tel: (617) 626-1000
Fax: (617) 626-1081
<http://www.mass.gov/eea>

Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century Task Force

Wednesday, October 7, 2020
3:30PM

Meeting to be held via remote participation (details below)
Note: Meeting will be recorded

AGENDA

1. Call to order and introductions
2. Routine business
 - b. Approve minutes from Sept 2, 2020 meeting
 - c. Review scheduling for next meeting
3. Review of draft Mosquito Control Task Force Study RFR
4. Discussion on public participation
5. Discussion on topics for future meetings

Topic: Mosquito Control Task Force Zoom Meeting
Time: Oct 7, 2020 03:30 PM Eastern Time (US and Canada)

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://zoom.us/j/3627818382?pwd=TTloWDRESzdaUElRYUxRb1c4TmZLZz09>

Meeting ID: 362 781 8382

Passcode: 245504

One tap mobile

+16465588656,,3627818382#,,,,,0#,,245504# US (New York)

+13017158592,,3627818382#,,,,,0#,,245504# US (Germantown)

Dial by your location

+1 646 558 8656 US (New York)

+1 301 715 8592 US (Germantown)

+1 312 626 6799 US (Chicago)

+1 253 215 8782 US (Tacoma)

+1 346 248 7799 US (Houston)

+1 669 900 9128 US (San Jose)

Meeting ID: 362 781 8382

Passcode: 245504

Find your local number: <https://zoom.us/u/ar1VybOn>

Minutes for Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century Task Force

October 7, 2020 at 3:30 p.m. via Zoom

The meeting was held remotely under the Governor's Order issued on March 12, 2020, which authorizes a public body to meet remotely and suspends the requirement of a quorum on the body being physically present at the meeting location. All votes were taken a roll call votes.

Dan Sieger called the meeting to order at 3:51 p.m. He referred to the agenda requesting approval of the minutes from the previous meeting on September 2, 2020, scheduling meeting times for 2020 and 2021 and distribution of the RFR to all the members of the Task Force.

Caroline Higley acknowledged that the meeting was being recorded.

The meeting minutes from the September 2, 2020 were provided to the Task Force prior to the meeting. Jennifer Pederson requested that on page 2, "so" be changed to "do." Heidi Ricci requested that the minutes reflect that her main point was that she wanted more mechanisms for public participation and to submit information to the Task Force.

A motion to approve the minutes was made by Jennifer Pederson and seconded by Commissioner John Lebeaux. A roll call vote was taken, and the September minutes were approved unanimously with the changes requested.

Mr. Sieger then discussed scheduling the upcoming meetings of the Task Force. Staff drafted a schedule for all the upcoming meetings through 2021. An additional October meeting has been scheduled for October 27, 2020 to finish discussing the RFR. Mr. Sieger said he hoped a final vote on the RFR could take place at the November meeting. He said public listening sessions could take place in January through June 2021. The Task Force could potentially break into subcommittees after that to discuss the structure of recommendations and how to pursue them. He mentioned that work would continue in August and September 2021 with the aim of finishing by October 2021. Mr. Sieger then moved onto the third item of business-discussion of the RFR. The Task Force is required to commission a study by an independent research or academic organization to complete a comprehensive evaluation of the Commonwealth's mosquito control process. He then asked the Task Force to give feedback on the RFR, first by discussing the scope.

Brad Mitchell said he's looking for this to discern between nuisance control and public health control as there are different risk/benefit analyses that go with each, so he'd like to see the scope address both situations.

Richard Robinson said he thinks there should be much more detail on what we would like to see in the report including the history of control measures in the state, the history of arbovirus in the state, narratives of the scientific literature, experiences with alternative models of control, and what are other places are doing to try and control this with an added emphasis on human health.

Julia Blatt said it seemed to her the scope of work was narrow and that it should be expanded to look at best practices when it comes to mosquito control so we can see the intersection with public health.

Richard Pollack said he thinks any discussion of mosquito control should be prefaced with a discussion about public health - while we'll be looking at the costs of various intervention programs we should also consider the costs of doing nothing. People need to consider the health impact on individuals as well as the fiscal issues-tourism and agriculture.

Eve Schluter stated it would be important to identify potential data gaps so we can note what is missing to complete the picture and monitor over time. The impacts of the use of certain products on our state's species is an example of this.

Jennifer Pederson said she has an interest in water supply and would like to see water included in the scope. She recommended adding DEP as one of the entities that we consult with.

Bob Mann referenced the second sentence of the scope and recommended consolidating into a single sentence using the word control.

Heidi Porter said she would like to consider engaging with all the land of the commonwealth, not just municipalities.

Heidi Ricci said she agrees with the comments Julia made about looking into best practices. She believes the information needs to be quantifiable and measurable as much as possible, identifying gaps where we don't have as much information. She believes the name "Mosquito Control for the 21st Century" was the name chosen for a reason - we can look for innovative solutions. For example, Boulder Colorado and Washington, D.C. We now have a state climate change action plan-mosquito borne disease may be increasing because of climate change. On the land management side, we must look at dams and other issues causing still water areas. Can there be more of a menu-based approach where a community's needs are assessed?

Kathleen Baskin said it seems like a lot of the bullets from 1.2 need to be brought up to the scope in 1.1 so we can make it clear to any consultant what the expectations are.

Caroline Higley said if any Task Force members wanted to put their comments in the chat it would be helpful.

Brad Mitchell said he agrees that we need to do an analysis of the projects as there is a lot of variance in how they operate and the different ecosystems.

Anita Deeley said she wants to make sure the impact of spraying on honeybees and other pollinators is looked at as well.

Richard Robinson asked if we are looking at "effectiveness of mosquito spraying" as the reduction of human disease or number of mosquitoes killed?

Commissioner Lebeaux answered that we will have to consider that question of mosquito population v. ramping down the virus.

Richard Robinson stated he wants to make sure the Task Force determines that and not a consultant.

Helen Poynton said that an analysis of already available information was missing from the RFR. She mentioned how it is important for the RFR to target interest from academia and consultants. She also requested information on the toxicity of the chemicals used in spraying.

Jennifer Pederson asked about how the consultant will be selected.

Dan Sieger asked MDAR to weigh in.

Jessica Burgess said under the legislation it is the Task Force that is responsible for selecting the consultant. The public body responsible for that assignment is the procurement team.

Jennifer Pederson asked if the Task Force can vote to designate the staff.

Jessica Burgess explained that the Task Force is the awarding entity and in procurement through other public bodies within MDAR, a decision is made by the public body. She acknowledged that we could look at our different options to discuss at the next meeting of the Task Force.

Eve Schluter said she doesn't know if she feels comfortable ranking areas in which she has no expertise.

Dan Sieger suggested perhaps some focus groups would be a good idea.

Commissioner Lebeaux stated that we may need to prioritize things to make sure we can get everything accomplished by the deadline and flagged the need to determine what's essential to be accomplished.

Russell Hopping said the wildlife we choose to study will probably be an area we can pick and choose our priorities.

Dan Sieger moved on to discuss the public listening sessions.

Jessica Burgess explained that under the Open Meeting Law, everything discussed today could be incorporated into a new draft of the RFR but that anything submitted by the Task Force after the meeting would need to wait to be incorporated into the draft RFR until discussed at the next open meeting.

J R Shaw asked if the Task Force will look at private contractors? He introduced himself as Commissioner of Plymouth County Mosquito Control.

Dan Sieger stated we are required to do at least one public listening session. He asked what Task Force members think about the appropriate level of public participation opportunities. He also asked for thoughts about the structure of the sessions.

Heidi Ricci recommended a dedicated email box where people can submit questions and comments. We could have an early input process to make sure we're asking the right questions and then another later input process as well with survey questions as well. She recommended at least two listening sessions - one earlier and one later.

Dan Sieger asked whether we should align one with the kickoff of the study and then a second one as we develop recommendations to take input from the public? He then turned to the question of a workplan for meetings for the next year - in the next meeting or two could have a conversation about preseason prevention efforts. He asked if folks have any ideas on topic areas that haven't yet come up that they would want to see in the work plan?

Richard Robinson said in his opinion public education should absolutely be a priority.

Dan Sieger asked if there were any other comments from members of the public. Seeing none, he asked for a motion to adjourn. Commissioner Lebeaux made a motion to adjourn and seconded by Jennifer Pederson. The vote to adjourn was taken by roll call vote and was unanimous.



The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs
100 Cambridge Street, Suite 900
Boston, MA 02114

Charles D. Baker
GOVERNOR

Karyn E. Polito
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

Kathleen A. Theoharides
SECRETARY

Tel: (617) 626-1000
Fax: (617) 626-1081
<http://www.mass.gov/eea>

Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century Task Force

Tuesday, October 27, 2020
1:00-2:30PM

Meeting to be held via remote participation (details below)
Note: Meeting will be recorded

AGENDA

1. Call to order and introductions
2. Routine business
 - b. Vote on minutes from Oct 7, 2020 meeting
3. Mosquito Control District Responsibilities and Best Practices – presentation by Priscilla Matton
4. Review of statewide contract process
5. Review of draft Mosquito Control Task Force Study RFR

Topic: Mosquito Control Task Force - Meeting #4
Time: Oct 27, 2020 01:00 PM Eastern Time (US and Canada)

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/83338688149?pwd=SEZUbmdWR0srcG5UVVRIWTFRSHlOZz09>

Meeting ID: 833 3868 8149

Passcode: 7TGcBn

One tap mobile

+19292056099,,83338688149#,,,,,0#,,846223# US (New York)

+13017158592,,83338688149#,,,,,0#,,846223# US (Germantown)

Dial by your location

+1 929 205 6099 US (New York)

+1 301 715 8592 US (Germantown)

+1 312 626 6799 US (Chicago)

+1 669 900 6833 US (San Jose)

+1 253 215 8782 US (Tacoma)

+1 346 248 7799 US (Houston)

Meeting ID: 833 3868 8149

Passcode: 846223

Find your local number: <https://us02web.zoom.us/u/kbnBhCjohW>

Minutes for the Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century Task Force Meeting
October 27, 1:00 p.m. via Zoom

The meeting was held remotely under the Governor's Order issued on March 12, 2020, which authorizes a public body to meet remotely and suspends the requirement of a quorum on the body being physically present at the meeting location. All votes were taken a roll call votes.

Members in Attendance: Dan Sieger, Kevin Cranston, Stephen Doody, Kathy Baskin, Julia Blatt, Eve Schluter, Heidi Porter, Derek Brindisi, Commissioner John Lebeaux, Tanya Colpitts, Anita Deeley, Russell Hopping, Kimberly LeBeau, Bob Mann, Priscilla Matton, Jennifer Pederson, Rich Pollack, Helen Poynton, Heidi Ricci, Steven Rich, Richard Robinson, and Sam Telford.

Dan Sieger called the meeting to order at 1:03 p.m. He announced the agenda for the meeting:

- 1) Routine Business/Approval of minutes,
- 2) Presentation on mosquito control districts,
- 3) Procurement processes
- 4) RFR/Feedback from the taskforce,
- 5) Creating a subcommittee to review the RFR.

Caroline Higley acknowledged that the meeting was being recorded.

Dan Sieger asked for comments on the minutes. The meeting minutes from the October 7, 2020 meeting were provided to the Task Force prior to the meeting. A motion to approve the minutes was made by Commissioner Lebeaux and seconded by Jennifer Pederson after one typo was flagged. A roll call vote was taken, and the October 7 minutes were approved unanimously with the change requested.

Commissioner Lebeaux then introduced Priscilla Matton to give a presentation on the State Reclamation Board and the Mosquito Control Districts throughout the state. Priscilla Matton gave a PowerPoint presentation via screen-sharing about the 11 mosquito control districts in the Commonwealth. She described the structure of the districts and the funding by individual members towns. She described how the staffs were all Commonwealth-certified for applying pesticides and many held advanced secondary degrees. She listed the services mosquito control offers to member communities in the mosquito control districts as part of an integrated pest management services system. She described the measures the districts take to monitor and hopefully eliminate Arbovirus/EEE and West Nile Virus threats especially. She said an existing Generic Environmental Impact Report may provide some answers to questions people may be looking for in the RFR. She then detailed the current standards and measures the districts use for pesticide application as well as how they honor the wishes of those who choose to opt-out of spraying. She mentioned education measures the districts employ to reduce standing water on homeowners' property.

Dan Sieger thanked her for the presentation and opened for questions and comments others had for Priscilla Matton.

Heidi Ricci asked if there are different thresholds in different districts for dipping for larval and adult mosquitoes.

Priscilla Matton answered that there are different thresholds in different districts. She said that truck spraying is very difficult for EEE control but better for West Nile Virus Control and mentioned that aerial spraying is recommended for EEE control measures if the EEE threat is deemed serious enough.

Stephen Doody asked if Priscilla could speak as to the options towns have besides choosing not to participate in the district?

Priscilla said no, she could not.

Dan Sieger then asked Robert Monahan to review the procurement process and how it applies to the RFR for the study. Mr. Monahan mentioned that all the executive branches are required to use a state-wide service that pre-approves environmental research consultant vendors. These vendors are pre-approved by OSD so there are qualified vendors ready to go in certain areas. He outlined what would happen if they received multiple offers or no offers at all from these pre-approved vendors. He reiterated that no one should reach out to potential vendors before the posting on Commbuys.

Caroline Higley shared the RFR on the screen and discussed the changes in the RFR since the last meeting based on the comments, questions, and other feedback that had been received.

Mr. Sieger asked for comments from members.

Russ Hopping asked if it would be possible for different sections to be submitted at different times.

Robert Monahan answered in the affirmative and mentioned that they could set quarterly progress reports or even break down the project into sections.

Anita Deeley suggested that honeybees should be moved to agriculture and away from nature in the RFR.

Caroline Higley then clarified some questions that were asked about the wording of the RFR.

A suggestion was made to focus on the impact on human health and the reduction of arbovirus diseases as defining effectiveness of control measures.

Jennifer Pederson raised a concern that not enough academic institutions were included on Commbuys for environmental services besides UMass-Donahue.

Helen Poynton pointed out academics would be potentially good at putting together interdisciplinary teams that would then not have to subcontract out aspects of the study.

Caroline Higley then talked about where the RFR will go from here - the next meeting in two weeks will include a vote on the final version of the RFR.

Dan Sieger said the intent is to distribute a copy before the next meeting and to hold a vote at that meeting.

Caroline Higley mentioned how they do not have a set number as a budget in the RFR as there is not yet a budget for fiscal year 2021 in the Commonwealth, but she imagines around couple hundred thousand dollars.

Jessica Burgess then spoke about the review options for the taskforce including the option of creating a subcommittee to be responsible for reviewing, evaluating and rewarding. The taskforce would need to vote on creating the subcommittee and vote on defining its responsibilities. The subcommittee would also be required to follow open meeting law requirements.

Dan Sieger suggested that members let staff know by the next meeting if they would like to be included on a possible procurement review subcommittee. He asked if anyone not on the committee had any comments or questions. Hearing none, he asked for a motion to adjourn which was provided by Jennifer Pederson and seconded by Commissioner Lebeaux. The meeting ended at 2:30 p.m.



The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs
100 Cambridge Street, Suite 900
Boston, MA 02114

Charles D. Baker
GOVERNOR

Karyn E. Polito
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

Kathleen A. Theoharides
SECRETARY

Tel: (617) 626-1000
Fax: (617) 626-1081
<http://www.mass.gov/eea>

Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century Task Force

Monday, November 9, 2020
11:00AM

Meeting to be held via remote participation (details below)
Note: Meeting will be recorded

AGENDA

1. Call to order and introductions
2. Routine business
 - b. Vote on minutes from Oct 27, 2020 meeting
3. Vote on Mosquito Control Task Force Study RFR
4. Subcommittee for evaluation of responses to RFR
 - b. Discuss
 - c. Vote, if necessary

Topic: Mosquito Control Task Force - Meeting #5
Time: Nov 9, 2020 11:00 AM Eastern Time (US and Canada)

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/82920296887?pwd=ZHhhZ0pWUkhLaXBmV1Z2QThEazVoZz09>

Meeting ID: 829 2029 6887

Passcode: ydi4Y2

One tap mobile

+19292056099,,82920296887#,,,,,0#,,772960# US (New York)

+13017158592,,82920296887#,,,,,0#,,772960# US (Germantown)

Dial by your location

+1 929 205 6099 US (New York)

+1 301 715 8592 US (Germantown)

+1 312 626 6799 US (Chicago)

+1 669 900 6833 US (San Jose)

+1 253 215 8782 US (Tacoma)

+1 346 248 7799 US (Houston)

Meeting ID: 829 2029 6887

Passcode: 772960

Find your local number: <https://us02web.zoom.us/u/kzJ09E5zf>

Minutes for the Mosquito Control Taskforce for the Twenty-First Century Meeting

November 9, 2020, 11:00 a.m. via Zoom

The meeting was held remotely under the Governor's Order issued on March 12, 2020, which authorizes a public body to meet remotely and suspends the requirement of a quorum on the body being physically present at the meeting location. All votes were taken as roll call votes.

Members in Attendance: Dan Sieger, Kevin Cranston, Stephen Doody, Kathy Baskin, Eve Schluter, Heidi Porter, Commissioner John Lebeaux, Julia Blatt, Tonya Colpitts, Anita Deeley, Russell Hopping, Kimberly LeBeau, Bob Mann, Priscilla Matton, Brad Mitchell, Jennifer Pederson, Richard Pollack, Heidi Ricci, Steven Rich, and Richard Robinson.

Dan Sieger called the meeting to order at 11:03 a.m. and announced the meeting was being recorded. He asked for comments on the minutes from the last meeting on October 27th. Hearing none, he asked for a motion to approve the minutes. Commissioner Lebeaux moved to approve the minutes and Jennifer Pederson seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken and the October 27th minutes were approved unanimously with those absent from the last meeting abstaining.

Dan Sieger then opened the discussion about finalizing the RFR. All bids will be due by December 11th. He then introduced Caroline Higley to give a summary of the changes to the RFR made since the last meeting.

Caroline Higley reported that the format of the RFR had been changed to match the state-wide contract PRF-61 template. Staff changed the language to identify what the bidder should consider quantifiable impacts, and what they should look at when summarizing the history of arbovirus in the area. Staff also summarized the opt-out options for mosquito control in the Commonwealth and in other states and updated the timeline.

Dan Sieger then opened discussion about any last-minute changes to the RFR with the aim of voting on the RFR afterward.

Heidi Ricci recommend including evaluation of why some communities may choose not to join a mosquito control district and what other options communities have. She recommended analysis of a third option of mosquito control consisting of tiered services. Caroline Higley responded that staff would try to make it clearer that they want a range of options for mosquito control to be researched and not only two scenarios.

Richard Robinson commented that the focus should be on the impact on human health, not on how many mosquitoes are killed.

Richard Pollack said he agreed the human health aspect is critical, but also thinks people value mosquito control for quality of life issues in addition to strictly human health so he thinks a broader look at mosquito control and its benefits is necessary.

Richard Robinson said he had nothing against adding quality of life, but he wanted to reiterate that good mosquito control for protecting human health is not necessarily how many mosquitoes

are killed. It was decided they would look at the language of the original legislation passed charging this taskforce to determine the ideal language for the charge of the RFR.

Dan Sieger then asked for a vote on the RFR. A motion to approve the RFR was made by Commissioner Lebeaux and seconded by Jenifer Pederson. The vote was unanimously approved.

Dan Sieger then opened discussion about RFR evaluation and whether the Task Force should create a subcommittee to review submittals.

Priscilla Matton commented that everyone should read and review everything, so she did not believe a subcommittee would be helpful.

Heidi Ricci and Eve Schluter agreed everyone on the taskforce should read and vote on everything but wondered if a subcommittee would be useful to determine evaluation criteria and how things will be weighted.

Jessica Burgess clarified that a subcommittee would traditionally pre-screen bids for the taskforce to vote.

Dan Sieger asked Rob Monahan to give a summary of the evaluation process for bids. Dan Sieger thought they could use the early December meeting to start thinking about a rubric.

Eve Schluter suggested they needed a rubric of what will be evaluated ahead of an early December meeting so they can discuss it at the meeting.

Dan Sieger asked if anyone had strong objection to doing the review as an entire committee as opposed to a sub-committee. No one objected. He said they would try to send a draft before the December meeting. Responses will be submitted in December, and hopefully the Task Force will be able to vote in January. He announced they now have a place for members of the public to make comments to the taskforce online which can be read and discussed during public meetings in the future. The next meeting is scheduled for December 2nd.

Staff from Senator Comerford's office and Heidi Ricci brought up the importance of sending guidance to communities who are considering opting-out of mosquito spraying.

Dan Sieger asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting which was provided by Commissioner Lebeaux and seconded by Richard Pollock. The meeting ended at 12:00 p.m.



The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs
100 Cambridge Street, Suite 900
Boston, MA 02114

Charles D. Baker
GOVERNOR

Karyn E. Polito
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

Kathleen A. Theoharides
SECRETARY

Tel: (617) 626-1000
Fax: (617) 626-1081
<http://www.mass.gov/eea>

Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century Task Force

Wednesday, December 2, 2020
1:00PM

Meeting to be held via remote participation (details below)
Note: Meeting will be recorded

AGENDA

1. Call to order and introductions
2. Routine business
 - b. Vote on minutes from Nov 9, 2020 meeting
3. Mosquito Control Task Force Study RFR
 - b. Update on RFR
 - c. Discussion on evaluation criteria
 - d. Discussion on approval process

Topic: Mosquito Control Task Force - Meeting #6

Time: Dec 2, 2020 01:00 PM Eastern Time (US and Canada)

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84568584382?pwd=V0R0REY2NUMyWldGenM4cmVjdFBzZz09>

Meeting ID: 845 6858 4382

Passcode: ydi4Y2

One tap mobile

+19292056099,,84568584382#,,,,,0#,,574987# US (New York)

+13017158592,,84568584382#,,,,,0#,,574987# US (Germantown)

Dial by your location

+1 929 205 6099 US (New York)

+1 301 715 8592 US (Germantown)

+1 312 626 6799 US (Chicago)

+1 669 900 6833 US (San Jose)

+1 253 215 8782 US (Tacoma)

+1 346 248 7799 US (Houston)

Meeting ID: 845 6858 4382

Passcode: 574987

Find your local number: <https://us02web.zoom.us/u/kfwhdzTY2>

Minutes for the Mosquito Control Taskforce for the Twenty-First Century Meeting

December 2, 2020, 1:00 p.m. via Zoom

The meeting was held remotely under the Governor's Order issued on March 12, 2020, which authorizes a public body to meet remotely and suspends the requirement of a quorum on the body being physically present at the meeting location. All votes were taken as roll call votes.

Members in Attendance: Dan Sieger, Stephen Doody, Kathy Baskin, Eve Schluter, Commissioner John Lebeaux, Julia Blatt, Tonya Colpitts, Anita Deeley, Russell Hopping, Kim LeBeau, Bob Mann, Priscilla Matton, Brad Mitchell, Jennifer Pederson, Rich Pollack, Heidi Porter, Helen Poynton, Heidi Ricci, Stephen Rich, Richard Robinson, and Sam Telford.

Dan Sieger called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m. and announced the meeting was being recorded. He stated that the RFR has been posted and that the purpose of the meeting is to discuss evaluation criteria. He mentioned the Globe article regarding PFAS and stated that the state agencies are working with EPA to obtain a sample directly from the manufacturer in IL for additional testing. Once that additional information has been obtained the Task Force can invite the DEP team to answer technical questions at a future meeting. He then asked for questions on the subject.

Julia Blatt asked for a timeline for a decision if the state does not want to use this product.

Alisha Bouchard responded that there is flexibility under the contract and no set deadline.

Dan Sieger stated that this is a priority.

Heidi Ricci expressed thanks for the information and stated that it is also important to look at ground spraying because this finding points to concerns about chemical use and what we do not know about the impact on human health and the environment.

Brian Rosman from Senator Comerford's office raised the subject of the local opt-out provision included in the legislation and asked whether progress had been made.

Dan Sieger mentioned bringing something back to the group at a future meeting.

Kim LeBeau asked how the manufacturer is chosen for the large-scale aerial spraying.

Taryn LaScola-Miner stated that state agencies reviewed Anvil last year with toxicology information being provided to the group. The agencies looked at Anvil and 3 other products submitted to the SRB and the SRB voted to choose Anvil.

Dan Sieger emphasized the importance of this discussion and that it will be placed on the agenda when we have additional information.

Dan Sieger then turned to discussion of the RFR. The RFR needed to be reposted which pushes the proposal deadline back by two weeks. Vendors have been notified and the delay does not impact the schedule. The Task Force will spend today's meeting discussing evaluation criteria and the evaluation of bids will take place at a public meeting in January. The documents for review will be compiled and forwarded as soon as possible after the deadline of December 31st

and detailed guidance will be shared with the group. The evaluation will take place at the meeting on January 7th.

Heidi Ricci asked for a summary of the timeline and when the Task Force would be expected to act.

Caroline Higley confirmed that bids would be compiled and sent out as quickly as possible after December 31st.

Richard Robinson asked whether decisions would be made at the meeting on the 7th.

Dan Sieger responded that the aim will be to rank the bids which will determine the winning candidate but there is flexibility if the group decides it needs additional time for discussion.

Richard Robinson mentioned that it would be helpful to hear other Task Force member thoughts.

Jessica Burgess replied that because the Task Force is a public body the only opportunity for sharing views under the open meeting law is to discuss in the public forum.

Dan Sieger mentioned that one approach might be to take people's feedback at the beginning of the meeting before diving into the ranking.

Jessica Burgess answered a question from Pine DuBois about public participation by clarifying that once the procurement is complete the public will have access to the documents, subject to the public records law, but will not be able to participate in the process because they are not part of the procurement team.

Dan Sieger stated that staff will discuss ways to continue to make the process as transparent and accessible as possible.

Dan Sieger then turned to the evaluation criteria.

Caroline Higley then began the discussion of the evaluation criteria which she posted in the chat function. The proposal is to weigh each evaluation criteria evenly and staff was hoping to obtain feedback about that approach.

Eve Schluter inquired about the reasons for the proposed approach.

Caroline Higley responded that the aim was to minimize errors given the complexity of the RFR and the large number of reviewers.

Julia Blatt asked if more specifics could be included under the Technical Expertise bullet.

Caroline Higley responded that significantly more detail will be added under each criteria and members discussed their thoughts on potential technical expertise subcategories.

Task Force members expressed concern about selecting the consulting team with the proper mix of expertise and that it might be difficult to find a bidder with all the areas of expertise needed.

Kathy Baskin mentioned that a contractor can assemble the right team for the project and that the group would be able to look at the entire team.

The Task Force then discussed the second bullet, demonstrated experience and past performance. Staff clarified that they would verify that all required information is submitted, including the subcategories in the RFR, and that it is common to receive letters of support that highlight past experience.

Caroline Higley next touched on Bullet 3 regarding the contractor team and the group discussed the Task Force members being on the same page about the scoresheet.

Jessica Burgess clarified that the evaluation criteria will not include anything that is not included in the RFR and that bidders are required to disclose any potential conflicts of interest.

Staff also described the mechanics of weighting and Dan Sieger asked whether the Task Force wished to weigh some bullets more than others. Task Force members focused on where the meat of the scope was included and discussed the relative importance of the bullets.

Caroline Higley clarified that the scope will ultimately be the report and that these bullets are indications of whether the entity will be able to accomplish the product the Task Force wishes to obtain.

Task Force members then discussed the scorecard and how to evaluate using the same methodology and expressed some concern about Task Force members reaching different scores based on different interpretation of the bullets. Caroline Higley went into some additional detail about the evaluation criteria and the RFR through discussion it was clarified that while we will do our best to put items in categories that make sense, ultimately members have different experiences and will approach things differently. The goal will be to organize criteria that make sense and then the group can weigh in which will make the review more thorough and complete.

Dan Sieger commented on the value of each of the bullets and asked again about the idea of giving even weight to the bullets. After additional discussion the Task Force reached consensus that the simplest approach would be to give each bullet the same weight.

The Task Force discussed the process for approval and staff recommended reviewing all the proposals in advance but not completing the form until after the discussion period at the next meeting since the form will be a public record and can't be changed once completed.

Task Force members discussed how the report will fit into the charge of the group and Dan Sieger clarified that the RFR will lead to a study to inform the work of the Task Force which will in turn lead to the Task Force report to the legislature. This study will be the first step and getting it right will help with our charge. He also mentioned that staff will look into the best way to submit the rankings at the next meeting. He stated that he appreciates the diligent work and that the Task Force may consider bi-weekly meetings in the coming months. He reiterated that people could reach out to him with PFAS questions.

Heidi Ricci requested the final RFR as posted and Caroline Higley responded that she would forward the document.

Dan Sieger asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting which was provided by Richard Pollock and seconded by Commissioner Lebeaux. The meeting ended at 3:04 p.m.



The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs
100 Cambridge Street, Suite 900
Boston, MA 02114

Charles D. Baker
GOVERNOR

Karyn E. Polito
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

Kathleen A. Theoharides
SECRETARY

Tel: (617) 626-1000
Fax: (617) 626-1081
<http://www.mass.gov/eea>

Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century Task Force

Wednesday, January 27, 2021
1:30PM

Meeting to be held via remote participation (details below)
Note: Meeting will be recorded

AGENDA

1. Call to order and introductions
2. Routine business
 - b. Vote on minutes from Nov 9, 2020 meeting
 - c. Vote on minutes from Dec 2, 2020 meeting
3. Mosquito Control Task Force Study RFR
 - b. Update on RFR
 - c. Process looking ahead
4. Update on spraying opt-out process
5. Planning for a public listening session
6. Plan for next meeting on 2/4
 - b. EPA announcement on PFAS/Pesticides

Topic: Mosquito Control Task Force - Meeting #7 (rescheduled)
Time: Jan 27, 2021 01:30 PM Eastern Time (US and Canada)

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84964940384?pwd=VjdtOFVtSlp1UjZKNS9lVXhvQmZlZ09>

Meeting ID: 849 6494 0384

Passcode: 4uhBDs

One tap mobile

+13126266799,,84964940384#,,,,*536178# US (Chicago)

+19292056099,,84964940384#,,,,*536178# US (New York)

Dial by your location

+1 312 626 6799 US (Chicago)

+1 929 205 6099 US (New York)

+1 301 715 8592 US (Washington D.C)

+1 346 248 7799 US (Houston)

+1 669 900 6833 US (San Jose)

+1 253 215 8782 US (Tacoma)

Meeting ID: 849 6494 0384

Passcode: 536178

Find your local number: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84964940384?pwd=VjdtOFVtSlp1UjZKNS9lVXhvQmZlZ09>

Minutes for the Mosquito Control Taskforce for the Twenty-First Century Meeting

January 27, 2021, 1:30 p.m. via Zoom

The meeting was held remotely under the Governor's Order issued on March 12, 2020, which authorizes a public body to meet remotely and suspends the requirement of a quorum on the body being physically present at the meeting location. All votes were taken as roll call votes.

Members in Attendance: Dan Sieger, Kevin Cranston, Kathy Baskin, Eve Schluter, Heidi Porter, Commissioner John Lebeaux, Julia Blatt, Derek Brindisi, Tonya Colpitts, Anita Deeley, Russell Hopping, Kim LeBeau, Bob Mann, Priscilla Matton, Rich Pollack, Helen Poynton, Heidi Ricci, Stephen Rich, Richard Robinson and Sam Telford.

Dan Sieger called the meeting to order at 1:35 and announced the meeting was being recorded. He requested that attendees introduce themselves by entering their name and organization into the chat box and reviewed the agenda for the meeting. He asked for comments on the minutes from the meetings on November 9th and December 2nd. Hearing none, he asked for a motion to approve the November 9th minutes. Richard Robinson moved to approve the minutes and John Lebeaux seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken, and the November 9th minutes were approved unanimously with those absent from the last meeting abstaining. He then asked for a motion to approve the December 2nd minutes. Richard Robinson moved to approve the minutes and John Lebeaux seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken, and the December 2nd minutes were approved unanimously with those absent from the last meeting abstaining.

Dan Sieger then turned to discussion of the RFR. While the original early January meeting was planned to be used to vote on RFR bid submissions, unfortunately no bids were submitted. The state's Operational Services Division requires submission of a waiver request in order to post the RFR to an audience outside of the statewide contract section. OSD has confirmed that we secured the waiver to post publicly which we hope to do as soon as possible.

Caroline Higley discussed outreach to the relevant entities on the list to receive feedback, which is required of the waiver process. The feedback suggested that the issue was not the RFR itself but rather the fact that mosquito policy is a new topic area to bidders and a concern about whether they were the best entities to complete the project. As a result, we do not believe there is any need to reopen up the RFR for discussion.

Dan Sieger and Caroline Higley mentioned a couple of non-substantive changes that need to be made to the RFR including updating the dates, changing the date of submittal to March 1st, and changing the progress report requirement to a progress update requirement. We also clarify that this is categorized as a large procurement with a potential cap and low range to give a sense of the scope of the budget.

Rich Robinson asked about the deadline for submission and process going forward.

Caroline Higley discussed the process moving forward. She clarified that staff will be sharing the bid packet on March 1st before the March 3rd meeting at which bids will be evaluated.

We will notify Task Force members when the RFR is posted. Under procurement law, task force members are not allowed to engage with potential bidders. The only communication allowed between task force members and potential bidders is to share a link to the bid online. In order to track outreach, EEA/MDAR staff will maintain a master outreach list; if task force members wish to contact certain entities, we request that you email EEA/MDAR staff with your request to avoid duplicative outreach. We aim to use the March 3rd meeting for bid evaluation. We are required to do all bid evaluation in a public forum. As we were planning in early January, we will share bid packages as soon as they are available for task force members to review in advance.

Heidi Ricci asked for clarification about the prohibition on communications with outside bidders.

Caroline Higley and Jessica Burgess answered that it is important to avoid discussing the bid in order to keep the procurement fair and open and not advantage any particular entity. There is a process to submit questions through COMMBUYS.

Julia Blatt asked whether a Google doc summarizing contacts could be shared with the Task Force members.

Caroline Higley answered that because of Open Meeting Law constraints sharing would not be possible.

Dan Sieger mentioned that this additional step does delay our process and the Task Force may need to consider our timeline at a future meeting.

Dan Sieger then turned to the next item on the agenda, a discussion of the municipal opt-out provision in the legislation. EEA, MDAR and DPH are close to completing development of a process to permit municipalities to opt-out of spraying conducted by the SRB. The agencies are discussing some of the details and potential concerns in an effort to finalize the work product as soon as possible. We are carefully considering the type of guidance to be provided to municipalities that wish to opt-out, including requirements to submit alternative mosquito management plans, to be approved by EEA and we are hoping to craft a template for municipalities to use in the development of these alternative mosquito management plans. We are also discussing how to assess impacts to the regional mosquito control. A communication strategy will be developed to ensure municipalities are aware of the process and the requirements.

John Lebeaux discussed the elements that would likely be included in a template such as an integrated management plan, trapping, surveillance and testing, water management, source reduction, education and outreach and control of mosquitos at the early stages through larviciding. We are considering elements related to efficacy, adverse effects, overall public health considerations and the impact of not spraying.

Julia Blatt mentioned that allowing either the Board of Selectmen or Town Meeting might be the best approach.

Derek Brindisi asked whether there would be a public comment period for the process and Dan Sieger replied that is a helpful suggestion.

Heidi Ricci commented that she has heard from some communities that they are interested in surveillance, public education and source reduction but do not want the pesticide application. The point of this was to give communities options they feel most appropriate.

Rich Pollack asked whether we are viewing the opt out as all or nothing and recommended being clear about what we are discussing.

Jessica Burgess clarified that this discussion is based on a specific, narrow legislative mandate and is not in relation to receiving services. This allows municipalities to opt out of spraying once DPH has deemed there to be an elevated risk and SRB is conducting additional spraying. The mechanism for opting out of that spraying is to file the alternative plan. This is separate and distinct from the work of the projects.

Richard Robinson commented that model plans/programs would be helpful, especially for small towns.

Dan Sieger asked for additional comments.

Brian Rosman from Senator Comerford's office stated that he appreciated the update and reiterated the importance of public comment to receive feedback and ideas.

Alisha Bouchard flagged the issue of timing going into the mosquito season and Dan Sieger reiterated that we would be mindful of the timing constraints.

John Lebeaux flagged the need to consider COVID implications in the Town Meeting context.

Jessica Burgess mentioned that this part of the legislation sunsets in 2022 so this process would be in place for the short term.

Dan Sieger then turned to discussion of the listening session for the public required by the legislation and asked for feedback from Task Force members.

Rich Pollack mentioned that the most insightful sessions are when we just listen and allow people to pose questions, air concerns and offer suggestions with time limits.

Heidi Ricci agreed and recommended keeping the first session open-ended after a presentation in the beginning to provide context. The second session should be more structured when we have draft recommendations.

Eve Schluter mentioned that it is sometimes easier for people to react to something but agrees the second session should solicit comments.

Dan Sieger mentioned that it may be helpful to pose questions for people to react to.

Stephen Rich mentioned the possibility of a skilled facilitator.

Dan Sieger stated that additional thoughts will be provided at an upcoming meeting but envisions that the session would be posted, and members could attend although it would not an official Task Force meeting.

Dan Sieger then turned to the subject of PFAS. As discussed previously, PEER found PFAS in a sample of Anvil, which was confirmed by independent testing by the state. EPA initiated a process to identify the source and confirmed fluorinated high-density polyethylene (HDPE) containers that are used to store and transport a mosquito control pesticide product contain PFAS compounds that are leaching into the pesticide product. EPA announced that the affected pesticide manufacturer has voluntarily stopped shipment of any products in fluorinated containers and is conducting its own testing to confirm EPA results and product stability in un-fluorinated containers and issued a subpoena under the Toxics Substance Control Act to obtain information about the fluorination process used by the company that fluorinates the containers used by the pesticide manufacturer. We have invited EPA to attend the next meeting and present on their findings and the current status of their process.

Dan Sieger then mentioned the second item for the next meeting, a presentation by Chief Apiary Inspector at MDAR, Kim Skyrn in response to task force member Brad Mitchell's request to have a presentation on honeybee health.

Russell Hopping requested that native species also be included in the honeybee presentation.

Dan Sieger then opened the discussion to comments from the public.

Pine DuBois thanked the Task Force for their work and asked about tests on other products in Plymouth.

Taryn LaScola-Miner mentioned that there are plans to take additional samples going forward.

Dan Sieger stated that we will provide an update in the near future.

Dan Sieger asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting which was provided by Richard Pollack and seconded by Julia Blatt. The meeting ended at 2:50 p.m.



The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs
100 Cambridge Street, Suite 900
Boston, MA 02114

Charles D. Baker
GOVERNOR

Karyn E. Polito
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

Kathleen A. Theoharides
SECRETARY

Tel: (617) 626-1000
Fax: (617) 626-1081
<http://www.mass.gov/eea>

Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century Task Force

Thursday, February 4, 2021
3:45PM

Meeting to be held via remote participation (details below)
Note: Meeting will be recorded

AGENDA

1. Call to order and introductions
2. Routine business
 - a. Vote on minutes from Feb 27, 2021 meeting
3. Mosquito Control Task Force Study RFR – update
4. Presentation on Honey Bee Health in the Commonwealth
5. Presentation by EPA on PFAS/Pesticides

Topic: Mosquito Control Task Force - Meeting #8
Time: Feb 4, 2021 03:45 PM Eastern Time (US and Canada)

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/83307711575?pwd=bmtlaCs3dXI0MldWcEE4OTNUMk81Zz09>

Meeting ID: 833 0771 1575

Passcode: ydi4Y2

One tap mobile

+13126266799,,83307711575#,,,,,0#,,100515# US (Chicago)

+19292056099,,83307711575#,,,,,0#,,100515# US (New York)

Dial by your location

+1 312 626 6799 US (Chicago)

+1 929 205 6099 US (New York)

+1 301 715 8592 US (Germantown)

+1 346 248 7799 US (Houston)

+1 669 900 6833 US (San Jose)

+1 253 215 8782 US (Tacoma)

Meeting ID: 833 0771 1575

Passcode: 100515

Find your local number: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/kc6mpNNc5l>

Minutes for the Mosquito Control Task Force for the Twenty-First Century Meeting

February 4, 2021, 3:45 p.m. via Zoom

The meeting was held remotely under the Governor's Order issued on March 12, 2020, which authorizes a public body to meet remotely and suspends the requirement of a quorum on the body being physically present at the meeting location. All votes were taken as roll call votes.

Members in Attendance: Dan Sieger, Kevin Cranston, Commissioner John Lebeaux, Stephen Doody, Kathy Baskin, Eve Schluter, Derek Brindisi, Julia Blatt, Anita Deeley, Russell Hopping, Kim LeBeau, Bob Mann, Priscilla Matton, Jennifer Pederson, Rich Pollack, Helen Poynton, Heidi Ricci, Stephen Rich, Richard Robinson and Sam Telford.

Dan Sieger called the meeting to order at 3:47 p.m. and announced the meeting was being recorded. He requested that attendees introduce themselves by entering their name and organization into the chat box and reviewed the agenda for the meeting. He asked for comments on the minutes from the meeting on January 27th. Hearing none, he asked for a motion to approve the January 27th minutes. John Lebeaux moved to approve the minutes and Priscilla Matton seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken, and the January 27th minutes were approved unanimously with those absent from the last meeting abstaining.

Dan Sieger then turned to Caroline Higley for an update on the RFR. EEA posted the RFR publicly on January 28th and responses are due back on March 1st. The Mosquito Control Task Force website now has a link to the RFR to make distribution easier. With respect to outreach, EEA and MDAR have reached out to many organizations and individuals and entities through social media accounts, Centers for Excellence in Vector Borne Disease, regional Mosquito Control Associations, individuals at academic institutions, and independent consultants and companies. Caroline Higley reminded members to email her with outreach requests. EEA and MDAR will continue to track the outreach and will reach out on behalf of Task Force members. She also reminded members not to discuss or engage with potential bidders on the subject of the RFR and to refer questions to EEA staff.

Task Force members asked whether the list of entities contacted could be shared and whether the posting could be provided on listservs. Caroline Higley and Dan Sieger promised to share whatever information is appropriate and confirmed that listservs had been contacted.

Caroline Higley mentioned that we will reach out again on March 1st with the bid package and guidance for the meeting on March 3rd, which will be used to evaluate and select a bidder. Dan Sieger mentioned that we can be flexible about what happens at that meeting depending on the number of bids we receive.

Dan Sieger then introduced Kim Skyrn, Chief Apiary Inspector at MDAR, to present on Honeybee Health in MA.

Following the presentation Heidi Ricci mentioned that it is great to see the effort being put toward monitoring honeybee health but also wondered about other native bees and pollinators.

She asked about the sublethal impacts that might make the bees more vulnerable to other diseases.

Kim Skyrn answered that this concerns us as well and is another reason we are diligent about revisiting hives and doing pre-spray investigations. He welcomed any input going forward.

Anita Deeley asked whether this was the result of one spray event and whether we would expect additional impact if there were multiple sprays.

Kim Skyrn answered that this was the result of one spray but in 2019 we did see multiple sprays.

Dan Sieger then introduced Ed Messina, Acting Director of EPA's Office of Pesticide Programs within the Office of Chemical Safety & Pollution Prevention for a presentation on PFAS and Pesticides.

Ed Messina mentioned that he appreciates the collaboration with the state and described the PFAS issue EPA is currently focused on. His office became involved when Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility (PEER) contacted Massachusetts state officials re: PFAS in Anvil. EPA Region 1 contacted his office which followed up by providing lab assistance researching pesticide products. His office has also reached out to the company involved which confirmed that there should be no PFAS in the pesticidal product. After running multiple tests it appears that heated fluorinated containers may be the source of the PFAS. (See [link](#) to EPA Press Release from December 2020).

Ed Messina also reached out to Clarke which took action and is exploring the option of different containers. EPA has also reached out to other agencies and associations to examine other processes and supply chains to make sure PFAS is not included in other containers. Ed Messina referred to the EPA website for additional PFAS information and the EPA PFAS Action Plan.

Dan Sieger thanked Ed Messina for the presentation and the ongoing collaboration and then called on Kyla Bennett whose work for PEER raised this issue initially.

Kyla Bennett asked whether Clarke's roughly 60 products use the same containers. Also, EPA lists a number of PFAS that are approved inerts in pesticides. How can we be sure that there are not PFAS added as inert ingredients in other pesticides?

Ed Messina answered no, Clarke does not use the same containers for all their products but do use them for some others. He believes that none of the inerts are currently being used and that the website has been updated.

Jennifer Pederson asked whether EPA has looked at whether other drinking water chemicals are shipped in fluorinated containers.

Ed Messina answered that that is an area EPA is planning to explore. He mentioned that oily matrix products are the ones that typically use fluorinated containers. They are exploring all products under EPA control.

Dan Sieger asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting which was provided by Rich Pollack and seconded by Jennifer Pederson. The meeting ended at 5:00 p.m.



The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs
100 Cambridge Street, Suite 900
Boston, MA 02114

Charles D. Baker
GOVERNOR

Karyn E. Polito
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

Kathleen A. Theoharides
SECRETARY

Tel: (617) 626-1000
Fax: (617) 626-1081
<http://www.mass.gov/eea>

Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century Task Force

Wednesday, March 3, 2021
1:00PM

Meeting to be held via remote participation (details below)

AGENDA

1. Call to order and introductions
2. Routine business
 - a. Vote on minutes from Feb 4, 2021 meeting
3. Spraying opt-out process update
4. Mosquito Control Task Force Study RFR
 - a. Discuss bids
 - b. Vote on bids

Topic: Mosquito Control Task Force - Meeting #9

Time: Mar 3, 2021 01:00 PM Eastern Time (US and Canada)

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/87497063903?pwd=T3lCcHF0RGJuaXM2QmZKU1hKU1YyQT09>

Meeting ID: 874 9706 3903

Passcode: ydi4Y2

One tap mobile

+13126266799,,87497063903#,,,,,0#,,348430# US (Chicago)

+19292056099,,87497063903#,,,,,0#,,348430# US (New York)

Dial by your location

+1 312 626 6799 US (Chicago)

+1 929 205 6099 US (New York)

+1 301 715 8592 US (Germantown)

+1 346 248 7799 US (Houston)

+1 669 900 6833 US (San Jose)

+1 253 215 8782 US (Tacoma)

Meeting ID: 874 9706 3903

Passcode: 348430

Find your local number: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/87497063903?pwd=T3lCcHF0RGJuaXM2QmZKU1hKU1YyQT09>

Minutes for the Mosquito Control Task Force for the Twenty-First Century Meeting

March 3, 2021, 1:00 p.m. via Zoom

The meeting was held remotely under the Governor's Order issued on March 12, 2020, which authorizes a public body to meet remotely and suspends the requirement of a quorum on the body being physically present at the meeting location. All votes were taken as roll call votes.

Members in Attendance: Dan Sieger, Kevin Cranston, Commissioner John Lebeaux, Stephen Doody, Kathy Baskin, Tonya Colpitts, Eve Schluter, Derek Brindisi, Julia Blatt, Anita Deeley, Russell Hopping, Kim LeBeau, Bob Mann, Priscilla Matton, Jennifer Pederson, Rich Pollack, Helen Poynton, Heidi Ricci, Stephen Rich, Richard Robinson and Sam Telford.

Dan Sieger called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m. He requested that attendees introduce themselves by entering their name and organization into the chat box and reviewed the agenda for the meeting. He asked for comments on the minutes from the meeting on February 4, 2021 noting the correct spelling of Clarke would be added. Hearing none, he asked for a motion to approve the January 27th minutes. John Lebeaux moved to approve the minutes and Jennifer Pederson seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken, and the February 4th minutes were approved unanimously.

Dan Sieger then turned to John Lebeaux for a summary of the Mosquito Control opt-out process and draft application. John Lebeaux provided a detailed overview of the application and noted an alternative management plan must be approved before opt-out requests would be recognized. John Lebeaux also noted the opt out runs through the end of this calendar year and that applications are due by May 15th. Dan Sieger explained the goal was for municipalities to show they have dedicated time and resources to mosquito control without creating an overly burdensome process.

Jennifer Pederson asked whether such plans must be approved before municipalities vote on whether to opt out. She was told the vote to opt out should happen first and then they can develop the plan. A plan must be approved by EEA before the opt out would be honored by the SRB.

Derek Brindisi asked whether the application implied that plan approval required only a demonstration of outreach and education and whether other plan components would be considered "extra." John Lebeaux explained that public outreach and education were required and that other activities were options about which they wanted to make municipalities aware. Dan Sieger agreed, reiterating that outreach and education were the bare minimum and that other pieces would be evaluated.

Heidi Ricci expressed gratitude for home rule flexibility and asked how mosquito control districts would get budgets approved. John Lebeaux said the budget is either accepted or rejected in full, without authority for line-item veto. Heidi Ricci also asked about provisions for storm basin and water catcher maintenance. John Lebeaux and Dan Sieger noted the inclusion of culvert language but stated that catch basin cleanout may need to be included elsewhere in the application.

The task force members then engaged in a discussion of the voting process at town meeting and what would indicate municipal intent to opt out of spraying.

Priscilla Matton asked how surveillance would be conducted. Jennifer Forman Orth stated non-member municipalities can use outside contractors for surveillance.

Jennifer Pederson asked whether a municipality would need to conduct a revote if EEA denied its plan. Dan Sieger said it would not, and that EEA would work collaboratively with the municipality to obtain more information.

Eve Schluter asked whether municipalities would need to submit a plan every year or if the opt out was a one-time choice. Dan Sieger said the legislation calls for the development of an opt-out but the legislation is only in effect for two years. John Lebeaux agreed, further explaining the plan was designed to expire at the end of this year so municipalities could assess whether they want to participate again in the future or otherwise amend their decision. Dan Sieger also said EEA would review and approve the plans and would work closely with DPH and MDAR throughout the process, although specific metrics had not yet been finalized.

The meeting then moved to the review and selection of a contractor pursuant to the mosquito control process study RFR. Dan Sieger reported that one complete bid submission was received. One other entity attempted to bid but did not complete the process prior to the deadline.

Caroline Higley discussed the bid review process. She reviewed the history of the RFR, with its goal to complete a comprehensive study on mosquito control processes in Massachusetts. Bids were due by the evening of Monday, March 1st. Only task force members would be permitted to participate in today's bid evaluation discussion because review was limited to the procurement team. Once discussion of the bid was complete, task force members would be instructed to begin their scoring. Once complete, score sheets were to be sent in one email to caroline.higley2@mass.gov and Robert.Monahan@mass.gov. A roll call reading of the scores would then be initiated. Task force members would read aloud their bottom-line score awarded to the bidder. Finally, a roll call vote to award the contract would be initiated.

Helen Poynton asked what would happen if the bid were not approved. Caroline Higley explained the RFR would need to be reissued, potentially with a changed scope.

Dan Sieger then proceeded through each section of the score sheet criteria, permitting task force members to raise questions about each section.

As to Section One, Helen Poynton expressed concerns about the lack of an ecotoxicologist in the proposal. She noted the submitted résumés showed experience for human risk assessment but not for ecological risk assessment, and that the fields are different.

Richard Pollack first asked about the criteria contained in Section (b)(3) and thought the bid did not provide enough information about the maximum amount to be expended on key versus supporting personnel. He asked whether that information would be available in the final contract. Rob Monahan confirmed this information could be fleshed out in the contract's scope of work. Richard Pollack reiterated it was impossible to know the level of effort to be expended, and that

this information was needed to evaluate the bid. He also noted that with respect to the first section's criteria, he found the key personnel to be limited in mosquito biology and management, in contrast to the consultants identified.

Richard Robinson noted he did not see off-target expertise in the bid.

Julia Blatt felt the bid paid considerable deference to a retired individual who created the current program and questioned whether the bidder therefore could be objective in evaluating the program.

Stephen Rich felt the proposal was well constructed and urged fellow task force members not to let the great be the enemy of the good.

Several task force members expressed concern about the number of hours that would be dedicated to the work by consultants and subcontractors as opposed to key personnel, with a preference expressed for more detailed work descriptions and the formal inclusion of "informal" associates assisting with the proposal. Jennifer Pederson asked whether task force members sought more information on this issue than what had been provided in Table 5, which both she felt provided adequate detail.

Several task force members also expressed concern about the lack of ecosystem risk analysis and the bidder's lack of knowledge about, or failure to include information related to, bee issues.

As to Section Two, Richard Robinson noted he could not locate Lauren Brown's perchlorate study listed under the "experience" section. He emphasized he was not making any negative implications with this observation, and stated his belief that the group of individuals noted was impressive.

Kathleen Baskin explained that consultants frequently do not put their names on a project in bids such as these.

As to Section Three, Helen Poynton asked whether the task force could ask the bidder to bring in an ecotoxicologist and whether that would result in a budgetary change. Robert Monahan explained the request could be made as long as it was originally required in the RFR. If so, then they were permitted to make the request to the bidder.

Anita Deeley did not want to vote yes if there were no pollinator expert and asked if the task force could ask the bidder to rectify that omission before voting on whether to advance the bid. Dan Sieger explained the task force would first vote and then proceed to contract negotiation. He also cautioned the task force to remember there was only one bid and if they voted no, they would need to restart the entire procurement process.

As to Section Four, Helen Poynton thought the project approach regarding interviews with agencies and stakeholders was a little weak as compared to the RFR's emphasis on these issues.

Richard Robinson thought one of the individuals named in the bid had witness interview experience.

Eve Schluter thought the section on non-pollinators was not as fleshed out as other sections had been.

As to Section Five, Dan Sieger believed there was nothing in the bid to indicate the bidder could not keep up with the demanding schedule set forth for the program review.

Richard Pollack thought the timeframe provided might be optimistic.

As to Section Six, no comments.

As to Section Seven, Richard Robinson thought the bid overall was really high quality.

Helen Poynton stated she liked the meeting schedule, which made her feel as though the bidder would be receptive to task force feedback.

Heidi Ricci was concerned about the section (h) option description.

With discussion of each criteria section concluded, Dan Sieger instructed task force members to compile their score sheets and email them along as indicated. Caroline Higley confirmed only full points should be awarded. The task force took a ten (10) minute break to vote. Results were as follows:

Task Force Member	Score	Vote
Dan Sieger	34	Y
Kevin Cranston	36	Y
John Lebeaux	26	Y
Stephen Doody	33	Y
Kathleen Baskin	38	Y
Eve Schluter	32	Y
Heidi Porter	31	Y
Derek Brindisi	-----	-----
Julia Blatt	34	Y
Tanya Colpitts	38	Y
Anita Deeley	22	N
Russell Hopping	28	Y
Kim LeBeau	29	Y
Robert Mann	36	Y
Priscilla Matton	29	Y
Brad Mitchell	-----	-----
Jennifer Pederson	33	Y
Rich Pollock	17	N
Helen Poynton	20	N
Heidi Ricci	31	Y
Stephen Rich	29	Y
Richard Robinson	36	Y
Sam Telford	27	Y
TOTAL	18 Y, 3N	

Dan Sieger asked for a motion to approve the bid. John Lebeaux moved to award, which was seconded by Jennifer Pederson.

Dan Sieger concluded by asking whether there were any items for next meeting. Heidi Ricci asked about edits to be made to the opt-out plan. Kevin Cranston requested that Katie Brown be invited. Dan Sieger then asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. Jennifer Pederson moved to adjourn, which was seconded by John Lebeaux. The meeting ended at 2:56 p.m.



The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs
100 Cambridge Street, Suite 900
Boston, MA 02114

Charles D. Baker
GOVERNOR

Karyn E. Polito
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

Kathleen A. Theoharides
SECRETARY

Tel: (617) 626-1000
Fax: (617) 626-1081
<http://www.mass.gov/eea>

Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century Task Force

Monday, April 5, 2021
11:00AM

Meeting to be held via remote participation (details below)

AGENDA

1. Call to order and introductions
2. Routine business
 - a. Vote on minutes from March 3, 2021 meeting
3. Updates
 - a. 2021 Arbovirus Season
 - b. PFAS/Pesticides
 - c. Spraying opt-out process
 - d. MCTF Study
4. Kickoff on Study - discussion on topics of interest
5. Public listening session planning

Note: This meeting will be hosted in a webinar format

Topic: Mosquito Control Task Force – Meeting #10

Time: April 5, 2021 11:00 AM Eastern Time (US and Canada)

Join from a PC, Mac, iPad, iPhone or Android device:

Please click this URL to join.

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/88545372761?pwd=QmpLWjFadm5XcFJrT2xiL1ZybitpZz09>

Passcode: 6AcBB6

Or One tap mobile:

+13126266799,,88545372761#,,,*604730# US (Chicago)

+19292056099,,88545372761#,,,*604730# US (New York)

Or join by phone:

Dial (for higher quality, dial a number based on your current location):

US: +1 312 626 6799 or +1 929 205 6099 or +1 301 715 8592 or +1 346 248 7799

or +1 669 900 6833 or +1 253 215 8782

Webinar ID: 885 4537 2761

Passcode: 604730

International numbers available: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/88545372761?pwd=QmpLWjFadm5XcFJrT2xiL1ZybitpZz09>

Minutes for the Mosquito Control Task Force for the Twenty-First Century Meeting

April 5, 2021, 11:00 a.m. via Zoom

The meeting was held remotely under the Governor's Order issued on March 12, 2020, which authorizes a public body to meet remotely and suspends the requirement of a quorum on the body being physically present at the meeting location. All votes were taken as roll call votes.

Members in Attendance: Dan Sieger, Kevin Cranston, Commissioner John Lebeaux, Stephen Doody, Kathy Baskin, Eve Schluter, Anita Deeley, Russell Hopping, Kim LeBeau, Bob Mann, Priscilla Matton, Jennifer Pederson, Rich Pollack, Helen Poynton, Heidi Ricci, Stephen Rich, Richard Robinson, Brad Mitchell, and Sam Telford.

Dan Sieger called the meeting to order at 11:30 a.m. The meeting began 30 minutes after the scheduled start time due to technology issues. Dan Sieger and Caroline Higley explained the Zoom Webinar instructions for engagement by the public.

Dan Sieger began by outlining the meeting agenda. He then asked for questions and comments related to the minutes from the last meeting. Helen Poynton requested a change to reflect that resumes showed risk for human risk assessment and not ecological risk assessment. No objections were made to this amendment. A motion was made and seconded for their approval, and they were approved.

Dan Sieger then introduced Dr. Katie Brown (DPH) to present expectations for the upcoming EEE season. Dr. Brown provided a brief update on the 2020 season. There were both West Nile viruses and EEE cases last year. The case numbers were greatly reduced from 2019 but were nonetheless consistent with an "outbreak" year. A single aerial spray was conducted mostly in Plymouth county last year. Generally, there will be outbreak cycles that last 2-3 years. She then explained the historical indicators of risk based on the long history of EEE in the Commonwealth. These include above-average rainfall in the prior fall and current spring; mild winters with insulating snow cover; EEE activity in the previous year; any EEE virus isolations from mosquitos prior to July 1st; isolation of EEE virus from a mammal-biting species of mosquito; infection of humans prior to late August; and, higher than average summer temperatures, which accelerate mosquito life cycle and thereby shorten the time interval between the mosquito becoming infected with the virus and then becoming capable of transmission.

Currently, we are below average on rainfall, which is not consistent with indicators of increased risk. In terms of temperature, we are average to above average through December and January 2021, but overall temperatures have been in the average range. We had a relatively mild winter in southeastern Massachusetts and did have EEE last year. The remaining indicators will need to be measured by the surveillance system going forward.

Dr. Brown also cautioned that no single indicator perfectly predicts risk, and she discussed long-term changes that likely affect risk. She concluded with recommendations for precautions, including: applying insect repellent when outdoors (repellent with an EPA-registered ingredient like DEET, permethrin, picaridin, oil of lemon eucalyptus); reducing exposed skin (long sleeves,

long pants and socks when outdoors); avoiding peak mosquito hours (dusk to dawn peak biting times); and, reducing mosquito breeding opportunities (dump standing water).

Dan Sieger next opened the floor to questions from task force members.

Richard Robinson noted the periodic peaks are getting higher. He questioned whether this was due to an increase in surveillance or other trends? Dr. Brown said this circumstance was not due entirely to surveillance artifact.

Heidi Ricci asked if there was an increase in perturbans population or an overall trend, and was curious if there's been any work looking at that in relation to perturbans, habitat, or cattails. She explained she was thinking of the detention basins full of cattails and other degraded wetlands, roadside ditches, etc., and asked if anyone had studied this? Dr. Brown said she did not know if she could answer if anyone has studied it, but said she has seen an increase in the proportion of the total mosquito population that is attributable to perturbans. She also said there may be other task force members who can talk about whether there have been any studies or not. The task force then discussed perturbans statistics. Priscilla Matton noted that 48% comes from one site in their county.

Dan Sieger next discussed the PFAS update and whether a container leaked it and what conditions are affecting that leaching. Pesticide testing results are pending.

He then explained that on 3/19/21, EEA announced the spraying opt-out process. EEA worked with divisional services to use its local list serv to make sure all municipalities were reached. An overview of the new web page with all relevant application and materials was also distributed.

Caroline Higley mentioned that EEA has been responding to inquiries as they've come in about this process. Dan Sieger asked Heidi Ricci to pass along email inquiry she had received to them to troubleshoot.

Dan Sieger next explained that Eastern Research Group ("ERG") had attended the last meeting and took a lot of feedback into account. ERG was able to amend its proposal to include an ecotoxicologist and pollinator expert. The contract was signed last week and the study was officially underway. Prior to ERG initiating all the work, Dan Sieger wanted to confirm there were no conflicts of interest based on the list of consultants ERG expects to use for the study. If members have or suspect such conflicts, he asked them to let Caroline Higley know and to reach out to State Ethics Commission.

Dan Sieger then opened the floor for discussion about areas to be investigated by ERG, beginning with the mosquito control structure.

Brad Mitchell asked about having a small work group to guide ERG and thought a more centralized office was needed to oversee mosquito control with regional offices as necessary.

Heidi Ricci next talked about the control structure and overall responsiveness to community interests and needs. She saw mosquitos as part of larger ecosystems upon which we all depend. She hoped more information on relative expenditures and on how much of the existing system is

spent on things like routine spraying versus public education and surveillance, and other things, would be made available.

Russell Hopping agreed that a central oversight and clearing house would be very helpful.

Heidi Ricci noted the current opt-out process has been very difficult for some parties. Dan Sieger noted the opt-out process is coming up in a couple of items and thanked Heidi for her comment.

Dan Sieger and Caroline Higley then asked about public engagement issues and asked about experiences, perspectives, and opinions on how public participation works now, e.g., are there better ways to proceed, and should there be more public participation.

Brad Mitchell said there is a range of expertise and consistency on the boards but not a lot of interaction between projects and towns.

Rich Pollock talked about efforts to reach out to the municipalities and noted a good give and take. He said there were people who show up to the publicized meetings. He agreed there were certainly opportunities to weigh in and ask questions but said perhaps this could be done in a better fashion and would listen to ideas. Dan Sieger suggested having a best practices kind of thing to determine whether public engagement was occurring as best it could.

Priscilla Matton noted some towns were very receptive and others less so, with reach-out efforts made to the less communicative towns for assistance.

Heidi Ricci thought more emphasis should be made on resources for public education about risk reduction.

Brad Mitchell discussed the two types of opting out relative to spraying for clarity and expressed concerns about how individuals will opt their property out of being sprayed by trucks.

Priscilla Matton outlined the additional information they would like to receive regarding property location in order to better serve members of the public and their properties.

Jessica Burgess explained the legal options for opt out. She noted a couple of different ways and explained the differences for public and private property owners. She distinguished between opt out and exclusion, which mean either a statutory or regulatory opportunity to do one or the other. Under 333 CMR 13.00, there is an opportunity for a private property owner to exclude the property from wide-area pesticide application. She noted the process was streamlined a couple of years back, and owners can do paper or electronic applications at any point during the year, with a short waiting period for legal operation. Traditionally, MDAR maintains a database of individuals requesting an exclusion, and if there is going to be a wide-area application, the property owner would come to MDAR and get information about it. Another situation is if the owner made a request for information through the automated system or in paper format, and are located within the mosquito control district. In that scenario, notice is automatically sent to the district where the property requesting the exclusion is located. Under M.G.L. c. 252, § 2A, private property owners have an opt out, which also gets submitted to the department through the same system. The property owner could request just a Section 2A opt out from SRB spraying or a Section 13.00 exclusion from the mosquito control district or other wide-area application, or

both. The third opt out is for municipalities and that is what the task force has generally been discussing here. This is the only chance for municipalities to opt out of SRB activity, and this option does not extend to private property spraying opt out. The municipal opt-out is the one that just went out and has been the subject of discussion.

Heidi Ricci raised numerous concerns about organic and smaller farms who have no way of protecting production operations from aerial spraying.

Anita Deeley spoke to her experience of opt out as a beekeeper on smaller properties that are closer to the road. She noted a problem with communication from the local board of health notifying residents about spraying; sometimes she receives 24 hours' notice, but sometimes only a few hours' notice, and that it can be difficult to move or cover her hives and protect the bees.

Richard Robinson reiterated the points as to organic farms and suggested the creation of an FAQ to outline the various rights and aspects of spraying.

Anita Deeley wondered if a different opt-out process could be implemented because doing it every year is burdensome.

Brad Mitchell discussed the public health benefit of spraying, and noted that if you are non-certified organic, it is less of an issue for marketing and advertising. He also emphasized the need to balance opting out against the public health risks of not spraying.

Dan Sieger noted an issue of controlling mosquitos on state and federal private land. He then opened the discussion to any other comments.

Helen Poynton noted that mosquitos develop resistance to sprays being used and the context of her research into same.

Jennifer Pederson discussed wanting consultants to look at notification to water systems and whether boundaries are correct.

Stephen Doody discussed staging for properties controlled by DCR.

Dan Sieger noted aiming to keep to original meeting time despite the delay. He thanked everyone for their contributions and the work to be done.

Richard Robinson thought it would be helpful if consultants could ask if health were protected successfully with only personal protection, with no widespread spraying. He did not know if such a study had ever been done but reiterated that the beginning and end of safety is personal behavior.

Brad Mitchell noted military studies have been conducted around efficacy and that they have a ton of information on PPE and repellants.

Stephen Doody noted he voted "aye" on last month's minutes.

Dan Sieger said the next meeting would be used for a public listening session. The purpose will be to accept comments and concerns on mosquito issues and control structure. He will provide an overall review and have an open-ended session for comments with speaking time at the end for

members of the public. He encouraged task force members to be present if they can make it. He said the task force will then look to future meetings relating to a draft study and other actions. The listening session will be conducted 5/3/21.

Jennifer Pederson asked about the next meeting's logistics given the Zoom bombing problems in the past. Caroline Higley said she was hopeful the webinar structure can be used going forward but requested that people identify themselves and said they would have quick reflexes as need be. Dan Sieger advised everyone just trying their best but was open to other ideas and suggestions and asked that such ideas be sent to Caroline Higley. Richard Robinson was concerned about there being adequate introduction time at the next meeting; he said he would spend at least double that time to explain what the task force is before opening the floor to questions. Dan Sieger said the introduction will be a balance of how the task force gets information out there without getting too deep in the weeds and said he would be trying to work out specific logistics during meeting preparation.

No other questions were raised. Dan Sieger then sought a motion to adjourn. Commissioner John Lebeaux so moved, and Richard Robinson seconded. A roll call vote was taken and the meeting adjourned at 1:07 p.m.



The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs
100 Cambridge Street, Suite 900
Boston, MA 02114

Charles D. Baker
GOVERNOR

Karyn E. Polito
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

Kathleen A. Theoharides
SECRETARY

Tel: (617) 626-1000
Fax: (617) 626-1081
<http://www.mass.gov/eea>

Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century Task Force

Monday, May 3, 2021
11:00AM

Meeting to be held via remote participation (details below)

AGENDA

1. Presentation on mosquito control in the Commonwealth
2. Public comments
 - a. Public speaking time will be limited to 3 minutes
 - b. Written comments will be accepted through 5pm on May 5, 2021. Please submit comments at the following link: [Submit a Comment](#)

This meeting will be conducted via remote participation. Please find webinar registration information below:

When: May 3, 2021 11:00 AM Eastern Time (US and Canada)

Topic: Public Listening Session - Mosquito Control Task Force

Please register in advance for this webinar:

https://us02web.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_P0akAc8-SzetU4lqs1HI-Q

After registering, you will receive a confirmation email containing information about joining the webinar.



The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs
100 Cambridge Street, Suite 900
Boston, MA 02114

Charles D. Baker
GOVERNOR

Karyn E. Polito
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

Kathleen A. Theoharides
SECRETARY

Tel: (617) 626-1000
Fax: (617) 626-1081
<http://www.mass.gov/eea>

Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century Task Force

Wednesday, June 2, 2021
1:00PM

Meeting to be held via remote participation (details below)

AGENDA

1. Call to order and introductions
2. Routine business
 - a. Vote on minutes from April 5, 2021 meeting
3. Updates
 - a. PFAS/Pesticides
 - b. Opt-out process
4. MCTF Study –Progress Report presentation by ERG
5. Public listening session recap

Note: This meeting will be hosted in a webinar format

Topic: Mosquito Control Task Force – Meeting #12

Time: June 2, 2021 1:00 PM Eastern Time (US and Canada)

Join from a PC, Mac, iPad, iPhone or Android device:

Please click this URL to join.

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84884258884?pwd=aFJpTGFiRjQ5cUVDMWp1NkVwd1I3QT09>

Passcode: ajR4RR

Or One tap mobile:

+19292056099,,84884258884#,,, *832509# US (New York)

+13017158592,,84884258884#,,, *832509# US (Washington DC)

Or join by phone:

Dial(for higher quality, dial a number based on your current location):

US: +1 929 205 6099 or +1 301 715 8592 or +1 312 626 6799 or +1 669 900 6833 or +1 253 215 8782 or +1 346 248 7799

Webinar ID: 848 8425 8884

Passcode: 832509

International numbers available: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84884258884?pwd=aFJpTGFiRjQ5cUVDMWp1NkVwd1I3QT09>

Minutes for the Mosquito Control Task Force for the Twenty-First Century Meeting

June 2, 2021, 1:00 p.m. via Zoom

The meeting was held remotely under the Governor's Order issued on March 12, 2020, which authorizes a public body to meet remotely and suspends the requirement of a quorum on the body being physically present at the meeting location. All votes were taken as roll call votes.

Members in Attendance: Beth Card, Kevin Cranston, Commissioner John Lebeaux, Kathy Baskin, Tonya Colpitts, Julia Blatt, Anita Deeley, Russell Hopping, Kim LeBeau, Bob Mann, Priscilla Matton, Brad Mitchell, Jennifer Pederson, Rich Pollack, Helen Poynton, Heidi Ricci and Richard Robinson.

Beth Card called the meeting to order at 1:03 p.m. She introduced herself and provided an overview of her background and the agenda for today's meeting. A motion was made and seconded for approval of the minutes from the last meeting. Beth Card conducted a roll call vote. The minutes were approved with Julia Blatt abstaining.

The meeting agenda proceeded as follows, with Beth Card providing commentary unless otherwise noted.

I. PFAS/Pesticides.

March 5th – Announcement that PFAS is coming from fluorinated containers for Anvil. Anvil shipped in metal does not contain detectable levels of PFAS. MA initiated its own testing. Analysis is continuing; some is complete but getting more data on a regular basis. Eleven non-Anvil products also tested, including multiple container sizes of same product. Upon confirmation of PFAS, on April 26th, mosquito control districts were asked to immediately stop using affected products. Included postponement of larviciding efforts in Bristol/Plymouth County areas until confirmed that relevant containers had no detectable levels. VectoBac product was applied in a few locations this season. Understand from analysis done that PFAS levels in that product do not present health concerns in communities where applied. This aligned with takeaway we understood from Anvil testing as well.

Heidi Ricci noted this is why we need to be cautious about pesticides in general. Don't know synergistic effects of pesticides in general. So many flaws in federal regulation. Really need to be cautious, particularly with chemicals that won't break down.

Jennifer Pederson curious about mosquito control happening in wetland areas with wells and what the legacy effects might be. Is MA planning to look at that, too, and see if there is any correlation there? Beth Card explained her understanding that we are careful in terms of sampling in water supply areas and think there is interest and effort to look at where there has been application in the past. Lot of moving parts to all of this. Those areas would be of first and foremost concern. Asked for Kathy Baskin's input, who said there were no focused plans on groundwater wells. Have looked at surface waters both inside and outside historical spray areas. Looking at data to see if there are any trends. Jennifer Pederson asked that well water testing be top priority. Caroline Higley added that DEP is doing "worst case scenario" modeling of test

results here. Assuming a pesticide directly enters a drinking water source, PFAS levels are essentially non-detectable. That scenario modeling is still ongoing but consistent with results of Anvil testing this past fall.

Richard Robinson asked if anyone at state level was privy to inert ingredient components, even if they're not going to be made public. Brad Mitchell said that during his time at MDAR, he could not get that information except through DEP. Certain ingredients that trigger thresholds get reported on safety data sheet; not saying we shouldn't have access to all of it, but typically reportable through some other mechanism.

II. Opt-out Program Update.

Beth Card noted that opt-out applications were due May 28th. EEA received 35 complete applications, mostly from central and western MA communities. Now that EEA has submissions, review has begun with support from EEA agencies and DPH. Trying to move with relative speed on this so municipalities have some ability/certainty in terms of their process and to be able to implement alternative mosquito management plans as quickly as possible ahead of the season. Applications will be considered individually and focus will be on historical arbovirus risk, regional risk of excluding the municipality from spraying, and ability of municipality to successfully implement alternative plan.

Heidi Ricci stated she's heard from numerous communities asking about how they can get support for surveillance testing without routine spraying of larvicides or adulticides. DPH has great public education resources and she's pointed many to those for public education but surveillance resources remain lacking. Caroline Higley thinks this issue falls within Task Force's function and if people want to discuss that. Kevin Cranston agreed and felt it was part of Task Force's goal of providing such recommendations. Heidi Ricci reiterated concerns about process not being opt-in. Jennifer Pederson suggested an overview be provided at the upcoming MMA conference.

III. ERG Progress Report.

Lauren Brown provided update on ERG's progress to date. She is a senior toxicologist at ERG and serves as project director. Gave overview of research team, which includes tech advisory panel. For activities completed to date, ERG did onboard additional experts in response to Task Force feedback; listened in on proposal review. Heard need for additional ecotoxicology and pollinator expertise. ERG has been attending weekly check-in calls with EEA to stay on schedule and answer questions about report. Have also attended all Task Force calls since contract award and having multiple scope/advisory calls to make sure they stay on task. Have extracted all data from more than 100 annual mosquito control district and SRB reports from 2016 to present, and select data from 2009 to present. Will continue to analyze and synthesize data moving forward.

She next explained updates in the nine different subject matter areas being examined by ERG:

1. Working on history of WNV and EEE in MA. Reached out to DPH for data on human and animal cases; obtained it and have begun summarizing in tables and maps. Have also had calls with them to understand nuances and limitations of data, e.g. changes in data

collection methods. Have run into obstacle with data precision. Given privacy concerns, data only available at county level for human cases. For animals, it is available at municipality level.

2. Looking at mosquito policy structure, its effectiveness, and the challenges it generates on public and private lands. Have reviewed more than 40 documents related to best practices and interviewed more than 20 respondents.
3. Looking at mosquito control opt-outs and exclusions. Have reviewed current opt-out policies and individual exclusion requests, looking specifically at MA and other states where relevant (New England, NY, NJ, and MI).
4. Looking at pesticides and their composition, toxicity, resistance, PFAS, and frequency of use. Have collected information on products applied since 2009 and the amount of each applied since 2016. Looking at bioaccumulation tendencies and reviewing literature on synergistic effects with ecotoxicology expert. Noted unknown inert ingredients as a data gap, as it impacts complete understanding on synergistic effects.
5. Reviewing and providing information about six different types of non-chemical mosquito controls listed in the RFP. Plan to summarize effectiveness for each of these, applicability for use in MA, and considerations for protected areas and buffer zones per Wetlands Protection Act.
6. Looking into minimizing non-target impacts of mosquito pesticide use. Will outline potential changes to pesticide use to protect non-target receptors. Specifically focusing on vulnerable individuals, drinking water supplies, pollinators, and aquatic life. Have conducted interviews with relevant experts and still need to finalize literature review on best practices.
7. Looking at public water system laws and regulations for pesticide use protections. Have conducted several interviews with drinking water and pesticide experts. Question for Task Force: is anyone aware of any monitoring done in conjunction with non-aerial pesticide application?
8. Looking at impact of mosquitos, mosquito-borne diseases, and mosquito controls. This includes looking at costs of human infections and how these would change by various levels of control. Also looking at how commerce is impacted by mosquito-borne disease and control.
9. Looking at impact of climate change on mosquito populations and mosquito-borne diseases. Question for Task Force: are there key people in state government with whom they should speak on these issues?

ERG's next steps will be synthesizing the research to date, finalizing topic area reports, developing executive summary for review by tech advisory panel and EEA, responding to comments from review, and then submitting it to the Task Force.

Jennifer Pederson thanked ERG for the hard work. Asked for what was needed from water suppliers. Lauren Brown explained ERG hasn't found evidence of monitoring after non-aerial spraying and wondering if instances of that were occurring.

Heidi Ricci also thanked and said very helpful. Hoped presentation would be available later for reference. Three questions. 1) On efficacy, and how assessing that, recognize challenges with the level of specificity of some data; don't know if possible but really interested in understanding more about where trapping is done in relation to habitats of mosquitos and populations of people, and how it relates to where cases are? Particularly want to assess how much chemical use is in response to places where it's not possible to do reduction actions v. just roadside spraying for nuisance. 2) On market, glad to see sensitive individuals included there; hope it includes infants and people with chemical sensitivities. Hope they will look at literature reviews of Boulder, CO folks and comments from the public listening session. Worried about EJ populations and people who are not English speaking, and not knowing what should be reported. Asked if ERG is doing anything on other species, like amphibians? Lauren Brown said they are looking at aquatic life and focusing on the species as outlined on the slide. 3) On best practices, know different districts operate slightly differently; some lots of spraying, some almost never do it. Would want to look at those trends. Also, didn't see trash removal as form of source reduction; Lauren Brown said she could follow up with folks on what's included in each sub-category.

Kim LeBeau asked about Section 4 (pesticides composition, toxicity, resistance, PFAS, frequency of use), and was wondering what others are doing to check chemicals before delivery to consumer, as well as long-term storage of chemicals and whether packaging degrades and therefore provides possibility for PFAS or other components to enter into the pesticides.

Russell Hopping thanked for presentation and referenced Section 6 and pesticides impacts; concerned bees and pollinators being lumped together with agricultural environment; lots of other pollinators, too.

Richard Pollack urged focus on human health impacts.

Dotty (public) asked about how spraying success is being measured; why can't state use all-natural spraying? Caroline Higley said that report would address in some capacity. Lauren Brown indicated that they are looking at all pesticides being used by state, understanding their active ingredients; definite spectrum as it relates to human health and environmental toxicity of compounds.

Heidi Ricci had additional question about transparency and public input. Various documents prepared from time to time; ways to improve opportunities for public input into ongoing updates? And also asked for clarification regarding role of Mosquito Advisory Group. Website says non-governmental but when/how do they meet, what is their role, and could overall system be reorganized in other, larger ways? Lauren Brown hoped the organizational chart being created will help answer some of those questions.

Jane (public) asked if statistics could be obtained from certain public organizations. Caroline Higley said can ask ERG to add to their list of organizations to check. She also urged people to use public comment process via the form available online.

Another member of the public made recommendation for study using BTI and EU environmental policy groups because they have better resources for pesticides and insecticides; use some of those resources, if possible.

IV. Recap of Public Listening Session.

Beth Card discussed May 3rd listening session. Goal was for Task Force members to listen to public perspectives on mosquito control and recommendations. 258 attendees, including Task Force members and Commonwealth employees. Received oral comments from 38 individuals. Caroline Higley distributed summary of oral comments. There have also been about 130 written comments received. General themes of oral comments included discussion of opt-out program, data and information related to mosquito control, opposition to pesticide use and spraying, concern about ingredients, and PFAS. Other commenters voiced support for various components of mosquito control, including some mentions of spraying and other components. Finally, there were comments on mosquito control structure. ERG attended the session and will also receive a copy of the oral and written comment summaries to inform their work. Do also plan to post summary online for public to view.

Richard Robinson said that for future meetings, would be helpful if table of contents could be included with comment summary.

Heidi Ricci noted comments from people not wanting to be subject to chemical trespass. People growing with organic means, managing properties for native pollinators and species, and they're being subjected to chemical exposures they don't want when there are very few people impacted (contrasted with COVID and not requiring vaccines for much greater numbers of impacted people).

Helen Poynton asked whether the Task Force is expected to read all of the comments in their entirety because many were very long. Beth Card explained EEA's intention was to pass along what it saw and received, and that EEA wanted to make sure Task Force all had it. Caroline Higley added ERG would benefit from having access to some of those documents.

Caroline Higley acknowledged public comment seeking more listening sessions and two other comments asking if listening session comments will be shared. She explained EEA's plan to post summary of listening session. Heidi Ricci explained her thought that written comments could be shared with anyone, based on language included when comments are submitted. Beth Card agreed but said could talk with team offline about how we'll pass them along. Caroline Higley agreed and said they're public record. Jennifer Pederson noted public comments posted in other contexts. Another member of the public asked about presence of Louisiana entomologist at the listening session. Caroline Higley explained it was open to the public and so anyone was able to sign up to speak at it.

V. Upcoming.

Beth Card noted no next meeting currently scheduled but also described additional work to come, including review of ERG report. Team proposes having Task Force meeting in second week of July with goal being to establish clear path forward on how it will make its next recommendations after ERG study is received on August 15th. Anticipating that subcommittees will be created to work on various topics, which may then do some of the recommendation writing for the various categories.

Heidi Ricci suggested scheduling for week after July 5th because many people will be taking vacation. Caroline Higley agreed, and noted they may schedule one monthly meeting ahead with understanding that more than one monthly meeting may be needed.

Jennifer Pederson thought it was easier to cancel meeting than schedule it, so would rather have them set up and locked in for now.

Beth Card noted Caroline Higley will work on getting meetings scheduled, with July meeting focused on process, subcommittee formation, and next steps once ERG report is received. Caroline Higley open to suggestions on how subcommittees should be formed and how best to structure this. Brad Mitchell agreed strongly on having subcommittees to make discussions more specific.

Julia Blatt asked whether each committee would be staffed by an agency staffer. Caroline Higley said all subcommittees subject to open meeting law and need to be publicized with agendas noted, so details will need to be worked out.

Eve Schluter agreed on need for subcommittees.

Beth Card noted would work on shoring up July meeting plan.

Beth Card then stated she would hear motion to close meeting but asked if there were any public questions to answer first. One question related to email address for asking questions. Caroline Higley said people encouraged to submit questions through mosquito control Task Force online submission or send an email to her. Another public question asked for at least two more public listening sessions, especially after ERG report received and before final recommendations are made.

Beth Card then thanked Task Force members, Caroline Higley, and agency staff for all their hard work. She then asked for a motion to adjourn. Julia Blatt so moved, with Richard Robinson seconding. Meeting adjourned at 2:32 p.m.



The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs
100 Cambridge Street, Suite 900
Boston, MA 02114

Charles D. Baker
GOVERNOR

Karyn E. Polito
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

Kathleen A. Theoharides
SECRETARY

Tel: (617) 626-1000
Fax: (617) 626-1081
<http://www.mass.gov/eea>

Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century Task Force

Tuesday, July 27, 2021
12:00PM

Meeting to be held via remote participation (details below)

AGENDA

1. Call to order and introductions
2. Routine business
 - a. Vote on minutes from June 2, 2021 meeting
3. Updates - Opt-out process
4. Path Forward for MCTF

Note: This meeting will be hosted in a webinar format

Topic: Mosquito Control Task Force - Meeting #13

When: Jul 27, 2021 12:00 PM Eastern Time (US and Canada)

Please register in advance for this webinar using the link below. After registering, you will receive a confirmation email containing information about joining the webinar.

https://us02web.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_T6-nWo7GQ9-8W1Nd3RkOQw

Minutes for the Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century Task Force Meeting

July 27, 2021, 12:00 p.m. via Zoom.

Beth Card called the meeting to order at 12:04 p.m. She reminded participants that the meeting was being hosted as a Zoom webinar and that the agenda would include an update on the mosquito spraying opt-out program and on a proposal for the task force's steps moving forward.

The board then voted to approve the minutes from the last meeting taking a roll call vote as required. Voting in favor were: Kevin Cranston, John Lebeaux, Steve Doody, Eve Schulter, Heidi Porter, Anita Deeley, Russell Hopping, Priscilla Matton, Jennifer Pederson, Rich Pollock, Heidi Ricci, Steven Rich, and Richard Robinson. Sam Telford abstained, citing his absence from a previous meeting. No vote was recorded for: Kathy Baskin, Derek Brindisi, Julia Blatt, Tonya Colpitts, Kim LeBeau, Bob Mann, Brad Mitchell, or Helen Poynton.

Caroline Higley then provided an update on the spraying opt-out program.

- As of 6/1, EEA received 35 applications to opt out. Upon receipt of the submissions, EEA reviewed them all in consultation with DPH, MDAR, DFG, and DEP. Applications were assessed to determine the regional impact of exclusion from spraying, including the risk to public health, and overall strength of the submitted plan.
- It is important to evaluate regional impact to assess the potential risk; mosquitoes, birds, and relevant insects can't be confined to a particular municipality. Especially relevant because one opt-out request can affect several surrounding municipalities that don't wish to opt out. EEA took into account many historical factors dating back to 2003, including habitat, sampling, and cases in humans and animals, as well as plan quality.
- Range of regional risk included minimal, low, moderate, high, and very high. Minimal regional risk municipalities were without local (within the municipal boundary or within an adjacent municipal boundary) or regional evidence of a mosquito sample testing positive for EEE virus, or a human or animal case of EEE, regardless of suitable habitat and plan strength and ability to implement. Low regional risk municipalities were the same as minimal, but local only. Moderate risk municipalities had local evidence of a mosquito sample testing positive for EEE virus, or were with strong evidence of a locally infected human or animal case of EEE, that had local suitable mosquito habitat, and submitted a plan that did not effectively control mosquito populations, particularly on a regional basis.
- Of the 35 applications under consideration, 24 of the applications were rated as low/minimal risk and approved. 11 were rated as moderate risk and denied. None of applications were rated as high or very high risk.
- Overall would very much like to note that there were substantial opportunities for improvement in all submissions this year. As a reminder, opt out only applies to SRMCB-initiated spraying this calendar year. DPH has not determined that a high risk of arbovirus exists for this year or issued a public health advisement for spraying yet. Guidance will be forthcoming for the 2022 opt-out process. EEA expects to learn from this year's process and will account for feedback to make amendments for process next

year. This includes not only increasing resources to help municipalities develop plans, but also expanding the scope of the review process next year. Also, reminder that opt-out program intended to be temporary and is bridging the gap for this year and next year, until the task force can develop long term policy recommendations for mosquito policy in future seasons.

- We are looking forward to completion of the study due next month and the task force's recommendation process that will be initiated shortly thereafter, to pave the path forward after the opt out program sunsets next year.

Heidi Ricci asked to hear from legislators in the meeting.

Brian Rosman (Senator Comerford's office) then spoke and noted it appeared the criteria for opt out solely related to risk level and was not related to the content of application. He said a number of towns had a lot of concerns during the process of applying, had asked EEA several times what criteria would be used for applications and review and what things EEA wanted in applications, and got no response. After applications were denied, Senator Comerford wrote to EEA to ask for an opportunity for the municipalities to cure and was denied summarily by EEA. He asked to begin a discussion on that issue. If EEA's goal was to have better applications, and many were deficient, then letting the municipalities improve them and submit stronger applications that meet EEA's criteria would be a positive step forward in line with what we're looking for in the statutory requirements.

Caroline Higley saying that overall, given the plan quality this year, EEA didn't believe municipalities would have enough time to make plan improvements before needing to implement them, which would have been right now. Beth Card added that EEA hears the comment and is certainly looking to provide additional guidance as we go into next season. She agreed that trying to do that this year would have been a scramble and they wouldn't have had time to do so before this spraying season, but she was taking the comment to heart to determine how to better prepare to help communities next year.

Brian Rosman said that since we don't know when spraying will start for this year, it's hard to say how much time EEA will need or how soon a decision would be made by the state. He also said it was hard for him to understand EEA saying there's not enough time when we're dealing with many unknowns. Caroline Higley acknowledged that in past years, the spraying started as early as mid-July and that it can go through early September. She reiterated that there would not be enough time for amendments to be made and review to happen in order to implement revised plans, in order to mitigate impact to regional risk. Brian Rosman asked if municipalities could have a deadline by the second week of August, would that be enough time, given we've seen no mosquito issue yet? Kevin Cranston then noted that EEE could happen at any time. Typically, we would start seeing first findings in July, which are often an indicator of a bad season, and it can emerge very rapidly. Just not having detected a positive mosquito as of today's data doesn't mean we might not see a positive finding imminently. He also said we might see a sequence of findings resulting in raising a community's risk level, even before the end of July. Brian Rosman reiterated his request for towns to use those two weeks to process applications with the hope there would be no need to spray before then, and then towns would be protected through August

and September? He also said it was concerning that EEA raised timing as an issue when the statute was passed months ago, it took considerable time for EEA to implement its process and judge applications, and now time has run out. From the towns' point of view, it is difficult to understand. Caroline Higley explained that EEA announced its process in mid-March, which gave towns two months to fill out an application that detailed all criteria to inform decision-making. Cities and towns were aware of all components that would be considered. In addition, EEA added an extension on top of that, which pushed EEA further into mosquito control season, and after which EEA evaluated applications. Municipalities had plenty of time to submit components they felt were necessary. Brian Rosman agreed, but said municipalities did not have criteria used to evaluate the applications. As days go by without any crisis, he felt EEA should allow towns to try and implement plans. Beth Card said EEA did appreciate that comment, and wasn't sure EEA had an answer today about next steps, but reiterated the focus continues to be providing as much information and assistance to towns as we can looking to next year, and that EEA hears the concerns being raised and was not dismissing them in any way.

Heidi Ricci then expressed her own concerns about transparency and substance. She explained the opt-out process scratches the surface of concerns more broadly across the entire mosquito control program. When task force learned decisions on opt-out had issued, she reached out to Caroline Higley for more information about evaluation criteria and the list of communities approved/denied. She said Caroline Higley pushed off a response and indicated that she'd give a summary at the next meeting. The next day, she got her hands on the document EEA issued. She didn't understand why that document was not immediately shared with the entire task force. She also thought the task force should have access to applications themselves so it can look at them, because they need to compare the standards being imposed on municipalities with what the districts are doing. She reiterated that there were really serious questions to be answered here, and that the state should be assisting communities in supporting them with what they need for public health and not imposing on them requirement that they don't want. She said the municipalities were working very hard under very difficult circumstances to try to meet state requirements without understanding what the criteria are. The task force does not have the criteria in writing, there's no information on how applications were actually ranked, who was involved in making those decisions, etc. The same sentiment applies with process on spraying, in which agencies meet behind closed doors to decide they're going to initiate spraying, after which it is announced. The entire system needs to be more objective and transparent. The task force needs real data about efficacy. She then sent an article relating to the denial of a local municipality plan to other members of the task force and public in the meeting chat.

Beth Card thanked Heidi for her comments and article. She noted that she appreciated the comments on transparency. This was the first time through this process and agencies are ultimately responsible for making these decisions. She certainly respects the task force wanting to provide input in that process, and how the task force thinks this should be shaped will be focal point of discussions.

Jennifer Pederson posed a follow-up question to Heidi; are you suggesting the task force should be evaluating applications? Heidi responded that the task force needs to understand the review

process, how applications were ranked and what criteria was used, so it can compare against what the districts do in how they evaluate their own efficacy. Jennifer Pederson noted we're all up against tight time frames and trying to figure out the best path forward, and as Caroline Higley said, this is intended to be a stop gap ahead of finding permanent solutions to what the control program will be going forward. She said she could certainly understand Heidi's concerns, but did not think they needed that level of review as task force members. She also said she heard Brian Rosman's concerns and felt improvements could be made but didn't think the task force can get into these weeds on this year's program. Heidi Ricci reiterated that her concerns were not so much for this year's program but related to larger concerns about control. She said she has been hearing for decades from towns wanting education from the state about community surveillance and would like to better understand what towns thought they could do on their own and compare to what the districts are doing so the task force can identify gaps that could be recommended for reformed programs going forward. She didn't expect everybody to review all those materials but did think the task force should have access to them if it wanted to look at them. Beth Card thanked them for this conversation.

Caroline Higley then flagged a public comment questioning how EEA defined "region," about the science analyzing how far mosquitoes carry arbovirus after hatching, and about opt out questions more generally. She said the regional risk was defined/evaluated by EEA according to the statute and that she was happy to follow up on more specific questions after the call.

Russell Hopping followed up on Heidi Ricci's question and asked if there was a legal reason the task force couldn't see applications at this point. Beth Card said she had not consulted with counsel on whether there's a legal reason and was happy to do it outside of the conversation here. She did think that they will use information from this year about how proposals were evaluated and how agencies worked together in conversations going forward.

Beth Card then turned to the proposal for the task force's upcoming actions. Caroline Higley walked through a PowerPoint presentation outlining ideas and areas to focus on going forward:

1. Creating four subcommittees on policy structure, local engagement, pesticide selection, and best practices.
2. Meeting twice per month. Full task force still meeting once per month for full discussions.
3. All meetings would be open to the public and she proposed hosting several additional windows of targeted written public comment periods to align with the recommendations process, plus a listening session and process to incorporate comments into final recommendations.
4. Each subcommittee has at least five* members, plus chair. All task force members could attend all subcommittee meetings but only official subcommittee members could vote.
5. EEA would send survey to assess interest in each subcommittee and distribute the results and proposal ahead of the August meeting, where the whole task force can vote on whole proposal.
6. Intent is to keep subcommittees small to facilitate progress. EEA is working to secure administrative support for subcommittees. That could include scheduling and sending

notice of meetings, drafting recommendations on behalf of the subcommittee, and finalizing recommendations on behalf of the subcommittee, supporting the subcommittee in developing materials for the full task force, and aggregating public comments and ensuring opportunities for public engagement to support task force.

7. Subcommittees organized by recommendation, as required by statute. Four subcommittees' subject matter areas outlined in greater detail.

Jen Pederson thanked Caroline Higley for the work that went into this and agreed with structure proposed.

Heidi Ricci saw a real effort here to divide task force areas into topical buckets to have focused effort around them. She noted that there would be interaction between these different things, so coming together as a whole to share updates and discuss intersections is important. She also thought that, in particular, it was interesting how the proposal was reordered from the legislation, which first talks about consultant report and determining efficacy and cost effectiveness, and then goes into recommendations. In terms of structure here, Heidi Ricci thought the subcommittee working on future mosquito control policy and organizational structure is unable to accomplish enough until it had at least gotten a first pass through all the other recommendations. It is hard to make recommendations to restructure until we have a handle on the other issues. Caroline Higley said the study was due 8/15 and the task force will have two weeks to review before ERG presents it and then the task force can dive into the concepts in the subcommittees. She emphasized the tight timeline and wanting to move forward as much as possible as quickly as possible. Beth Card noted she heard Heidi Ricci's concern about getting a better grip on the issues before proceeding, and thought the process Caroline Higley outlined allows for that to happen. Heidi Ricci reiterated that as the action items have been reorganized, the task force should still closely track the language in the legislation but she saw a couple places where there was different wording used and they should stick with their charge. Caroline Higley said she was fairly positive she copied and pasted the language but if there had been accidental deviation, she gave her apologies and agreed with Heidi Ricci's sentiment.

Richard Pollack said this proposal was a great first start. He was leery about some of the language in describing some of the tasks here and thought it might be good to have an opportunity to tweak this a bit. He wondered if the task force would have a chance to do that or if the subcommittees will do it. Beth Card said this is the proposal for the task force to consider and her instinct was that EEA didn't want the subcommittees to do it on their own; rather, EEA would want the whole group on the same page for what each subcommittee's focus will be. Her expectation was to get feedback from the task force on the overall plan and at the follow up meeting on 8/10, the task force can vote to create all the subcommittees to make sure they're in place before needing to make progress looking ahead. Richard Pollack sought clarification on whether, if he has minor comments, it was better to address now or should he send those comments around later and distribute them to others? Caroline Higley said any comments would best be raised once subcommittees were created so they can take into account recommendations with which they're tasked, but if anyone thinks reorganization of recommendations into

subcommittees should happen, it would be better to do it now. Richard Pollack said he would hold off, and said the scope was fine but the flavor of the language was a little cause of concern.

Richard Robinson noted that it struck him that without analyzing more carefully, he wasn't sure that each group would have an equivalent amount of work to do. He highlighted the pesticide selection, which seemed straightforward compared to some others, and suggested that this group be smaller or its scope be expanded. He further noted the risk that each subcommittee self-selects, rather than the makeup representing a wider range of approaches. There is also a risk that the subcommittees will make recommendations too in depth or too broad in approach, which may not meet the approval of the larger committee and ultimately the legislature. It would be great if there were a wide range of potential approaches, in order to avoid losing time and interest and in order to develop a set of recommendations that will meet final approval. Caroline Higley said she did consider the issue of different workloads, noted it was challenging to balance exactly between all these things, and said this was why people can attend multiple subcommittee meetings even if they don't sit on them. As for scope, this is something each subcommittee can define as it starts its work, and it's also why it would be good to have the full task force meeting each month so it can discuss ideas before each subcommittee develops recommendations.

Beth Card then asked Caroline Higley to run through next steps. Heidi Ricci had one final point of clarification; she reiterated starting from the language in the legislation. She agreed with Richard Pollack that there were certain aspects to some of these phrases that needed further work. She also requested that this presentation be up on the website soon and circulated.

Caroline Higley agreed to both and, hearing no widespread objections to the proposal, said she would share it along with the survey to assess interest in various subcommittees and to discuss procedures on how the next meeting will work. At the 8/10 meeting, the full task force should expect to vote on subcommittees and the assignments to each subcommittee. It would be great for as many task force members as possible to attend. Shortly thereafter, the study is due 8/15 and will immediately be distributed to task force members for review. The task force will have an associated presentation at the 9/2 task force meeting. ERG will present on the full study at that time. EEA will also formally put a wall between comments received prior to 9/2 and after to aggregate all public comments associated with the study itself. Public comment will also be available to the task force to assess when making its recommendations.

Jennifer Pederson asked for clarification about the public comment period; would the study be released and then would there be 30 days for the public to reply? Caroline Higley explained the portal will be open for comments to be made. Jennifer Pederson also asked about posting the recorded meetings. Caroline Higley said they have not been recording meetings for a while now but could consider that going forward, especially in anticipation of ERG's study presentation.

Seeing no other comments, Beth Card sought a motion to adjourn. Jennifer Pederson made the motion which was seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 1:03 p.m.

**Correction: Four members, plus chair*



The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs
100 Cambridge Street, Suite 900
Boston, MA 02114

Charles D. Baker
GOVERNOR

Karyn E. Polito
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

Kathleen A. Theoharides
SECRETARY

Tel: (617) 626-1000
Fax: (617) 626-1081
<http://www.mass.gov/eea>

Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century Task Force

Tuesday, August 10, 2021
12:00PM

Meeting to be held via remote participation (details below)

AGENDA

1. Call to order and introductions
2. Routine business
 - a. Vote on minutes from July 27, 2021 meeting
3. Subcommittee proposal – discussion and vote to create

Note: This meeting will be hosted in a webinar format

When: Aug 10, 2021 12:00 PM Eastern Time (US and Canada)

Topic: Mosquito Control Task Force - Meeting #14

Please register in advance for this webinar using the link below. After registering, you will receive a confirmation email containing information about joining the webinar.

https://us02web.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN__PXW9EM_ScO2Ft-fqq346Q

Minutes for the Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century Task Force Meeting

August 10, 2021, 12:00p.m. via Zoom.

Beth Card called meeting to order at 12:04 p.m. Routine items:

1. Like previous meetings, this meeting is being hosted as a Zoom webinar. All task force members and state staff are panelists and can participate freely. Everyone else is participating as attendees and can post questions through the Q&A function.
2. Will first vote on minutes, then present miscellaneous updates, and then discuss, initiate, and vote on proposed subcommittee assignments. The task force may not need the full time blocked off today (two hours).
3. DCR's designee, Steve Doody, will be moving on from his task force position and will be replaced by Nicole Keleher, the forest health director at DCR. Nicole Keleher introduced herself and provided her background.

Jennifer Pederson noted her name was spelled wrong in last roll call but moved to approve the minutes. Commissioner Lebeaux seconded the motion.

Minute approval vote: Kevin Cranston (aye), John Lebeaux (aye), Nicole Keleher (abstain), Kathy Baskin (aye), no vote heard from Eve Schluter or Heidi Porter, Derek Brindisi (abstain), no vote heard from Julia Blatt or Tonya Colpitts, Anita Deeley (aye), Russell Hopping (aye), Kim LeBeau (abstain), Bob Mann (abstain), Priscilla Matton (aye), Brad Mitchell (abstain), Jennifer Pederson (aye), Richard Pollack (aye), Helen Poynton (abstain), Heidi Ricci (aye), Stephen Rich (aye), no vote heard from Richard Robinson, Sam Telford (aye).

Updates:

1. Status update on EEE from Vice Chair Kevin Cranston.
 - a. Mosquito abundance being observed is based on submitted specimens (mosquito, human, and mammal) to the state public health lab as well as data from DPH long term traps. We are collecting DPH traps directly, which gives us some comparability across seasons.
 - b. Collected over 4,000 pools for testing at state public health lab. Pools are a group of similar or identical species that have been sorted by a given trap, generally about 50 mosquitoes per pool. The whole pool gets tested for virus presence.
 - i. Have yet to see a single Eastern Equine Encephalitis ("EEE") positive pool.
 - ii. Have seen 30 West Nile Virus ("WNV") positive pools.
 - iii. Tested 6 mammal submissions, generally from horses, and yet to see a single EEE or WNV positive specimen.
 - iv. Over 85 human specimens and yet to see a single EEE or WNV human positive.
 - c. We are at the point in the season when human positive tests tend to emerge, which can occur through August and September. The mosquito abundance is trending up significantly for all EEE vectors.

- i. Very dry/hot spring and wet/cool summer, but heavy precipitation events have driven mosquito abundance for a number of important species.
- ii. In particular, we look at *Culiseta melanura* (bird biting mosquito). Starting in early July, we've seen a steep/steady trend up in abundance of these mosquitoes.
 - 1. This has hit a 5-year mean, even higher than 10-year mean in terms of overall abundance. Can't predict future but looks like it continues to be on increase. Has exceeded 2020 mean.
- iii. Another species is *Coquillettidia perturbans* (bridge vector that bites mosquitoes and mammals). This is often one species associated with mammals/humans getting EEE.
 - 1. This mosquito has also hit the 2020 mean and has been increasing quite dramatically in the last two weeks, probably associated with some of the rain events. *Aedes vexans* and *Ochlerotatus* also seeing dramatic increases.
- iv. Good news is we're not seeing EEE in mammals or humans, but the bad news is that if there were significant infections in birds, conditions are in place for bridging events.
- d. Heidi Ricci asked if the population number data can be shared and said this was a very helpful update. Kevin Cranston said they can be made available to task force members and will send to Caroline Higley.
- e. Heidi Ricci also asked if they're targeting responses to WNV? Kevin Cranston noted that DPH is seeing WNV pools in 8 counties. Recommendations stay the same; largely associated with human habitation and often in urban environments.
- f. No other questions.

Beth Card moved to the establishment of subcommittees. As a reminder, the goal is to create subcommittees that will work in smaller groups to focus on subsets of required recommendations given the wide range of scope that we have before us. Beth expressed appreciation for the task force again for its willingness to volunteer and commit time. Members were very generous with offerings to participate. The proposal to create 4 subcommittees was organized around statutorily-required recommendations. Each will meet twice per month until recommendations are finalized. The full task force at the same time will continue to meet once per month and during these meetings, a portion of time will be devoted to subcommittee updates and discussions of challenging topics. Each subcommittee should probably have at least 4 members plus 1 chair. Subcommittees will be a bit of extra work for chair, who is responsible for leading the subcommittee with lots of support from its members, including helping to establish the direction and strategy of the subcommittee and providing full updates to the task force. Members are responsible for attending all meetings to the extent they can and then vote on decisions for those subcommittees.

The plan today is to share the proposal now and give task force members 10 minutes to sit and read quietly before coming back to talk about things. EEA was more or less able to give everyone their strong preferences across the board, including where people expressed strong

preference for chairpersonship and membership. EEA tried to keep individual membership to 3 subcommittees or fewer, as it's a big time commitment. EEA also tried to ensure an odd number of members on each subcommittee to avoid tie votes. If anyone wants to see the survey responses, she's happy to share. Caroline Higley added a legal reminder that the voting in each subcommittee will be by simple majority, and quorum will be determined by number of folks who are actually on subcommittee.

Heidi Ricci raised question on process; if any subcommittee do not come to consensus on any key point, can they submit alternative thoughts even if an odd number? Maybe cross bridge when we get there? Beth Card said the task force as a whole will be making final decision, so subcommittee will put things forth to task force, who will ultimately vote and decide. Can use monthly updates, too, to bring up challenging conversations about issues and let the full task force weigh in. Goal is to ensure that everyone is heard so people can make fully informed decisions in the end. Brad Mitchell requested confirmation if subcommittees are mainly advisory? Beth said yes; votes will put a finer point on where subcommittees land on certain issues, but final product back to Legislature will be from the full task force. There could be an option to put minority positions forward so task force is aware.

Caroline then screenshared the assignments. Took break at 12:27 p.m. so task force members could review. Beth Card called people back at 12:37 p.m. Caroline added that she can track change edit the document as discussion goes so people can follow changes. Reminder that everyone has the ability to attend any of the meetings and participate; but the proposal on screen contains the voting members of each subcommittee. Heidi Porter had expressed interest in mosquito control policy but was not chosen; if multiple people were chosen, was a little confused about how rankings were done. With multiple folks on each one, a willingness to pull people in from pool of "willing" folks would be appreciated. Caroline said it was not intentional to exclude and can make the change now. Tried to first take into account the strong preferences. Beth Card said can take care of adjustments and then go back and figure out about odd/even numbers of committee members.

Heidi Ricci said she appreciated effort going into this. Fine with her assignments. So much integration between different subcommittees; as she looked at policy subcommittee, wanted to make sure we're not narrowing their charge too much. Wants to ensure that if group comes up with ideas to discuss beyond just the specific recommendations assigned to each subcommittee, that we can include some of those. Beth Card said that was helpful; happy to think about it and hear from others. Noted that we have set parameters around what we think charge of subcommittee ought to be in line with legislation, and of course there will be areas where we may expand or one subcommittee's conversation may bleed into another's. Tried to set a framework to keep conversations from becoming unwieldy, but to extent each subcommittee wishes to branch out into broader area, worth highlighting at task force updates.

Brad Mitchell said on best practices, can remove him because large group and pretty well balanced; think it could get in way of being effective. Noted that didn't wish to wordsmith descriptions. Agree with Heidi Ricci and don't think there's an issue with going a bit beyond if

there is consensus from subcommittee members. Stephen Rich interpreted bullet points to be guides rather than boundaries, so consistent with how he made decision on how he could serve.

Beth Card didn't see any other hands raised. Asked how members felt about having even numbers of subcommittee members now that adjustments were made? Brad Mitchell thinks these are advisory, so fine for even number. Would look to have minority opinions reflected in what's brought back to task force; won't always agree and that's okay. Important that all of task force reflect minority opinions as well when they report. Bob Mann agreed with Brad Mitchell's point. Heidi Ricci thirded this opinion.

Caroline Higley added that if there are people who really want to be on a particular subcommittee, or if folks think they're overrepresented, please use this as an opportunity to weigh in.

Heidi Ricci asked if there were any task force members who did not respond to survey. Caroline Higley thought everyone did respond. Didn't get all state government designees to respond but she had follow-up conversations with those folks to confirm their perspectives. Heidi Porter indicated concern about even numbered subcommittees for voting. Brad Mitchell pointed out Robert's Rules allow even number when advisory only and not making policy decisions. Beth Card asked Heidi Porter if she felt more comfortable given that the full task force will be making the final decision. Heidi Porter said she was fine with it but wanted to put her thoughts on the table. Heidi Ricci asked a question about general scope of work – is the overarching goal for recommendations public and environmental health or is it also nuisance control, or is that to be discussed among subcommittees and provide comment back to overall task force? Caroline Higley said it involves both and may be up to subcommittees the mechanisms which drive subsets of components of recommendations.

Beth Card then moved to individual subcommittee discussion. Reminder of roll call for every subcommittee. Discussed the subcommittees as follows:

1. Mosquito Control Policy Structure. No discussion or comments. Brad Mitchell made motion to approve, seconded by Rich Pollack. Roll call: Cranston (aye), Lebeaux (aye), Keleher (aye), Baskin (aye), Schluter (didn't hear), Porter (aye), Brindisi (didn't hear), Blatt (none), Colpitts (none), Deeley (aye), Hopping (aye), LeBeau (aye), Mann (aye), Matton (aye), Mitchell (aye), Pederson (aye), Pollack (aye), Poynton (aye), Ricci (aye), Rich (aye), Robinson (didn't hear), Telford (aye). Motion carries.
2. Local Engagement. No discussion or comments from task force members. Caroline Higley noted member of public question; Henry asked if number of members is fixed? Caroline Higley said the count of persons per subcommittee was defined based on interest, not a predetermined number. Jennifer Pederson moved to approve, seconded by Kathy Baskin. Roll call: Cranston (aye), Lebeaux (aye), Keleher (aye), Baskin (aye), Schluter (didn't hear), Porter (aye), Brindisi (aye), Blatt and Colpitts (didn't hear), Deeley (didn't hear), Hopping (aye), LeBeau (aye), Mann (aye), Matton (aye), Mitchell (aye), Pederson (aye), Pollack (aye), Poynton (aye), Ricci (aye), Rich (aye), Robinson (didn't hear), Telford (aye). Motion carries.

3. Pesticide Selection. Helen Poynton asked if whether there would be room for proposing a tiered approach, such as these are the safest pesticides we could use and would use them in certain situations, and then if things worsened, move up to more hazardous type insecticides. Would that fall within scope of this subcommittee? Beth Card said this was a good question, and to the extent there are conversations or ideas that cross subcommittees, would certainly note there is opportunity for that and will also bring ideas together as needed in full task force meetings. Rich Pollack said that rather than concentrate just on safest, thought subcommittee might best consider an array of issues, with safety prioritization one of them, but also efficacy, cost, and other possibilities. Should leave it open for subcommittee to consider. Beth Card thought that was also a good suggestion. Jennifer Pederson said this was one thing ERG is looking at for the report and will have report before subcommittees start. Will ERG be available after report is delivered? Caroline Higley said she hoped to report back on that soon. No further discussion or comments. Jennifer Pederson moved to accept, seconded by Steven Rich. Roll call: Cranston (aye), Lebeaux (aye), Keleher (aye), Baskin (aye), Schluter (didn't hear), Porter (aye), Brindisi Blatt and Colpitts (didn't hear), Deeley (aye), Hopping (aye), LeBeau (aye), Mann (aye), Matton (aye), Mitchell (aye), Pederson (aye), Pollack (aye), Poynton (aye), Ricci (aye), Rich (aye), Robinson (didn't hear), Telford (aye).
4. Best Practices. No discussion or comments. Rich Pollack moved to accept, Brad Mitchell seconded. Roll call: Cranston (aye), Lebeaux (aye), Keleher (aye), Baskin (aye), Schluter (didn't hear), Porter (aye), Brindisi Blatt and Colpitts (didn't hear), Deeley (aye), Hopping (aye), LeBeau (aye), Mann (aye), Matton (aye), Mitchell (aye), Pederson (aye), Pollack (aye), Poynton (aye), Ricci (aye), Rich (aye), Robinson (none), Telford (aye).

Beth Card thanked everyone again for commitment to this and level of detail to which all engaged in conversation and willingness to serve on these subcommittees.

A couple of update items from Beth Card:

1. Mosquito control study is due 8/15, a Sunday, so will distribute it thereafter.
2. Reminder to all that once it is shared, it can't be discussed so we don't have any deliberations taking place outside of open meeting law requirements.
3. ERG will be doing a presentation for the task force on 9/2 and at that point there will be lots of opportunity for conversation then. It's also our plan on 9/2 to publicly share and post online the study and open it up for a public comment period. Public comments will not be used to amend report but will give the public a chance to raise issues about the report that it thinks the task force should take into account during recommendation process. We may be in touch between now and then so we can start to schedule subcommittee meetings.

Heidi Ricci confirmed that task force will receive the final report but should not distribute it, and that members can ask questions and provide comments at 9/2 meeting or during public comment period but those won't be incorporated into the report. Beth Card said expectation is that we won't seek ERG to modify their deliverable; rather, we'll take feedback, capture it in a way that task force can use it in discussions and decision making going forward. There will be a new

document that summarizes the feedback received through the public comment process. Caroline confirmed that and said they expect to summarize and aggregate these comments and all other comments received throughout this process for recommendations. Heidi Ricci asked whether, if report won't be amended, why it can't be made available to the public at the same time? Caroline Higley said it would be made available to the public at the meeting itself. Jessica Burgess said we can discuss legality of that; part of consideration is that this is how materials created by public body are routinely handled in this way, to public body first and then provided to public at public meeting, but we can discuss that further.

Jennifer Pederson noted that there will be plenty of time for public comment after the report is released. Beth Card agreed, saying 9/2 won't be the only time for comment. Brad Mitchell said he felt it made sense to share with task force first because it may get questions about it at the meeting, so long as the public has time to see it and comment on it.

Heidi Ricci reiterated her different perspective, indicating there's a compressed time frame and we have to report to our respective constituencies, and would rather have it be available publicly and isn't sure why we can't just release it at the same time. Brian from Senator Comerford's office and other members of the public echoed that sentiment. Beth Card noted these comments and said she will take this back and discuss with the team and will follow up accordingly. She also reminded the task force that even if the report is shared broadly, they cannot discuss it with each other outside of public meeting so as not to violate public meeting law. Caroline Higley also reminded that each subcommittee is its own body now and so no deliberation outside of those meetings, either.

Jennifer Pederson noted a question from the public about public records law and once this is final, it could be requested under the public records law, and so why would we make people go through that? Beth Card said we would not make people go through that process and that we plan to share it publicly. Caroline Higley echoed Jessica Burgess' and Brad Mitchell's point that as the task force commissioned this study, had thought to have task force look at it first, but absolutely hears the feedback and will take that into account and will update the task force thereafter.

Seeing no other hands, Beth Card asked if there were any additional questions or comments from members of the public. Heidi Ricci raised issue for which she did not expect a state response at this point - MA Audubon received requests to waive property opt-out exclusion for locations where there have been zero positive mosquitoes found, which prompted her to begin looking at Duet and Anvil labels. She noticed a precaution about protecting bees, which she believed applied to all bees, not just honeybees. She put the quote from the label into the chat and said she didn't understand why spraying these chemicals takes place when there is no evidence of disease. Maybe more of a question for the pesticide board or for people to think about if they're on a subcommittee looking into this. Beth Card thanked her for that comment and said that was likely a conversation with pesticide program folks and can certainly look to take that back and follow up.

Pine DuBois (member of the public) asked under what circumstances will aerial spraying occur this year if there is a turn and positive test results in EEE pools? Kevin Cranston said it's a public health recommendation that would prompt concern about risk of human disease; multifactorial consideration, including looking at trends of detection in pools and positive findings in mammals and humans. Generally, at the level of high or critical risk determination on standardized mapping, at that point the acting Commissioner would make a recommendation that it's high or critical risk in a particular region and would prompt a consideration of aerial application, and that then becomes a joint decision with SRB/MDAR around initiating those actions. He referred to the overall surveillance response plan that lays out factors and considerations, which includes weather conditions, time of year, and the anticipation of likely effectiveness of aerial application as well.

Beth Card saw no other hands from task force or Q&A from public and asked for a motion to adjourn. Brad Mitchell made motion to adjourn, Commissioner Lebeaux seconded, with all in favor saying aye. Meeting adjourned at 1:21 p.m.



The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs
100 Cambridge Street, Suite 900
Boston, MA 02114

Charles D. Baker
GOVERNOR

Karyn E. Polito
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

Kathleen A. Theoharides
SECRETARY

Tel: (617) 626-1000
Fax: (617) 626-1081
<http://www.mass.gov/eea>

Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century Task Force

Thursday, September 2, 2021
12:00PM

Meeting to be held via remote participation (details below)

AGENDA

1. Call to order and introductions
2. Routine business
 - a. Vote on minutes from August 10, 2021 meeting
3. Update on administrative support for task force
4. ERG Presentation on Mosquito Control Task Force Study
Note: Report can be found online [here](#)

Note: This meeting will be hosted in a webinar format

Topic: Mosquito Control Task Force – Meeting #15

When: Sep 2, 2021 12:00 PM Eastern Time (US and Canada)

Please register in advance for this webinar using the link below. After registering, you will receive a confirmation email containing information about joining the webinar.

https://us02web.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_BOMYe7RrSX-YdP8vMBO4PQ

9.2.21 Mosquito Control Task Force (MCTF) Meeting #15 – Minutes

Beth Card called meeting to order at 12:02 p.m.

1. Like previous meetings, this meeting is being hosted as a Zoom webinar. All task force members and state staff are panelists and can participate freely. Everyone else is participating as attendees and can post questions through the Q&A function. No questions were raised about these Zoom logistics.
2. Will first vote on minutes, then present an update on the administrative support plan, and then hear from our colleagues at ERG on the MCTF study.

John Lebeaux moved to approve the minutes of August 10, 2021. Jennifer Pederson seconded the motion.

Minute approval vote: Kevin Cranston (aye), John Lebeaux (aye), Nicole Keleher (aye), Kathy Baskin (aye), Eve Schluter (abstain), no vote heard from Heidi Porter, Derek Brindisi (aye), Julia Blatt (abstain), no vote heard from Tanya Colpitts, Anita Deeley (aye), Russell Hopping (aye), Kim LeBeau (aye), Bob Mann (aye), Priscilla Matton (aye), no vote heard from Brad Mitchell, Jennifer Pederson (aye), Richard Pollack (aye), Helen Poynton (aye), Heidi Ricci (aye), Steven Rich (aye), Richard Robinson (abstain), Sam Telford (aye). Approved.

Updates:

Beth Card provided an update about administrative support for the task force. The contract with ERG has been extended to provide support with scheduling, drafting agendas and notices, supporting the subcommittees in mapping out the process for which recommendations can be made, helping the subcommittees write draft and final recommendations, supporting subcommittee chairs in developing materials for full Task Force review, helping to aggregate public comments and any additional strategic support we might need. We are working closely with ERG to map out the process going forward with an immediate next step being to schedule the subcommittee meetings.

Julia Blatt asked whether there is a list of the subcommittees and the chairs.

Caroline answered that the list is posted on the Task Force webpage.

Beth Card then introduced Dr. Lauren Brown to provide an overview of the ERG report. She noted challenges that were reported regarding mosquito policy, which included a concern about chemical treatment on private property, the difficulty of conducting mosquito control and surveillance on public lands, endangered species and critical habitat protection, and restrictions under the Children and Families Protection Act. Potential solutions received from respondents included increased awareness of management options and strengthened relationships with landowners to facilitate communication.

For the mosquito control opt-outs and exclusions report, ERG reviewed current policies and exclusion requests in MA and other states. No other NE states have comparable opt-out policies or exclusions. There is a similar process in MI but hasn't been in effect very long. 2021 was the first year for municipal opt-out process in MA. 35 municipalities submitted on-time requests, with 24 approved and 11 deemed moderate risk and denied.

For the pesticide composition, toxicity, resistance, PFAS, and frequency of use report, ERG conducted literature reviews, searched EPA databases and registration reports, among other actions. For toxicity, a full risk assessment was not conducted for this report. Ecological toxicity was the main concern for active ingredients and Dr. Brown discussed certain active ingredients (pyrethroids and spinosads) and their risks. She noted that many specific ingredients in the pesticides are not available to MDAR. She also discussed the finding of PFAS in pesticides and noted EPA testing indicated fluorinated storage containers as a possible source in Anvil 10+10. MA immediately stopped using the only pesticide found to contain PFAS upon having a positive test result. DEP and MDAR are currently testing different containers and trying to determine how contamination is occurring. Dr. Brown then discussed pesticide resistance in mosquitoes, which is typically related to overuse or misuse of a particular pesticide. ERG could only locate literature on *Culex pipiens* and *Aedes vexans* and noted that control programs can reduce resistance by monitoring populations, rotating pesticides, using non-chemical strategies, and avoiding the use of persistent chemicals. About half of MA mosquito control districts (“MCDs”) did resistance testing in 2020.

For the integrated pest management and non-chemical controls report, ERG looked at studies on how control was implemented, its effectiveness over mosquito life cycles, applicability and limitations for MA use, and considerations for environmentally sensitive areas. All MCDs using chemical controls are following Integrated Pest Management, which integrates actions like stormwater management/source reduction and public education. Mosquito predator habitat management and other educational efforts not currently well coordinated across MA were also considered.

For the maximizing pesticide effectiveness and minimizing non-target impacts report, ERG reviewed literature and MCD reports and other agency reports, among other sources. ERG then juxtaposed the American Mosquito Control Association’s (“AMCA”) best practices against MA’s to compare and found that many best practices are being used in MA, although not consistently across all areas, and that information sharing and monitoring of efficacy are limited. Many protective measures that were identified benefit multiple non-target receptor categories. Selecting the least hazardous pesticide is important and while the process is not well established for MCDs, municipalities, and private applicators, the report does provide suggestions. The report also presents numerous ways to minimize non-target impacts, including notifying about pesticide application events, location and precision, timing, and climate/weather considerations, all in addition to following label instructions.

For the public water system laws and regulations report, ERG reviewed laws and regulations relevant to drinking water supplies, public water systems, and pesticide applications. ERG also interviewed key agency representatives and summarized the available monitoring data and outcomes. Dr. Brown noted the regulatory framework offers multiple prongs of protection with levels of restrictions imposed for use, including limitations on levels that can enter the environment. Other NE states have developed similar pesticide and groundwater regulations, health-based standards, drinking water monitoring requirements, and source water assessment programs. Improvement could be made in leveraging existing programs to encourage collaborative partnerships with local watershed organizations, establishing a system in which pesticide applicators communicate spray plans to water system managers, and researching impacts of household pesticide use, pesticide use by private entities, and truck-based spraying activities on water quality. ERG also created a public health model to analyze human infections by level of control, relying on literature review of EEE and WNV infections, by using a decision tree model to estimate outcome of each infection with outcome specific distribution to find out

what the infection would cost. The model estimates that business as usual would result in 4 EEE deaths at an average cost of \$16M and 12 cases with 0 deaths of WNV costing \$194,232. If there were no mosquito control, however, the number of cases would nearly triple. Dr. Brown did also note that as mosquito control increased, there did seem to be diminishing returns for both EEE and WNV.

ERG then looked at the impact on agriculture and pollinators and didn't find evidence that currently used chemicals are having an impact on honey bees. Since 2019 reports of mortality were released, there has been no evidence of mortality higher than what would be expected, but the synergistic effects of pesticides could cause the increase. She said there was no literature discussing this problem and so it could not be evaluated. ERG did see a preference for the use of chemicals to reduce disease-bearing mosquitoes to reduce disease risk. ERG did not see a significant impact on fish and bird populations.

For the climate change impact report, ERG reviewed relevant literature and interviewed four experts on health impacts and vector-borne disease. They identified climatic variables linked to changes in arbovirus/mosquito habitat and model outputs attributing climate change factors to changes in habitat, among others. Dr. Brown said modeling based on temperature is the most advanced and clearly attributes temperature changes to a change in mosquito population and arbovirus occurrence. Bird migration patterns and sea level rise may affect these factors but require more study. ERG did not identify any studies attributing changes in EEE to climate change. She did note there is an increased risk of WNV in NE over time as well as an increased risk of disease from *Aedes albopictus* and *aegypti* mosquitoes in NE due to climate change.

Dr. Brown then opened the floor to questions. Beth Card first asked for questions from the task force members.

Heidi Ricci posed several questions to Dr. Brown. 1) The review of pesticides seems to say there is some evidence of human health impacts of pyrethroids that EPA says it still needs study; it seems like there's not a lot of information here on at-risk or particularly sensitive communities? Dr. Brown noted a 2015 report on topic of issues Heidi Ricci raised, and that in the report, it does state there are potential issues of concern that are still controversial and there isn't a firm conclusion on them yet. 2) As for the recommendations for minimizing human health exposures; no data on the extent to which people even receive those notices or even comply? Dr. Brown said she did not recall any. 3) Is there data on the impact of hundreds of native wild bees and other pollinators like moths that are out at night or other beneficial insects? Dr. Brown said ERG pulled in data from the EPA on lethal concentrations for non-target insects. ERG also pulled in information on ETI and some of the other complex ecological environmental factors. Heidi Ricci said she was surprised because there was a heavy focus on honey bees. 4) Overview question/comment; Dr. Brown was able to confirm some districts followed some practices for record keeping based on AMCA recommendations, but there is no centralized way to evaluate efficacy of statewide practices now? And in evaluating potential impacts of control on human health, was she correct in understanding that ERG took the percentage of mosquitoes killed by a particular spray event and applied that to effectiveness at preventing disease? Do we know there's any correlation there, because people avoiding bites might have more of an effect than killing 50% of mosquitoes? Heidi Ricci said she did not understand the modeling and did not think it's really valid. Dr. Brown said there is a discussion on additional considerations that need to be evaluated on that modeling exercise, and that given the data available, that was an assumption that needed to be made to quantify that.

Julia Blatt asked for further elaboration on pyrethroids and potential toxic impacts, noting it's really hard to avoid aquatic environments in MA. Dr. Brown said the data were based on a specific set of chemicals but that a representation was made that it's good for the entire class of chemicals. She pulled up a table that showed EPA classifications system based on toxicology studies ranking compound toxicities. Pyrethroids rank as very highly toxic. She believed EPA's current policy is to ensure their application is such that exposure would be very minimal.

Priscilla Matton asked for a list of individuals that were part of the assessment team. Dr. Brown said she will work with Caroline Higley to get that information out.

Russell Hopping thanked Dr. Brown for the presentation. He expressed concern about the lack of breadth for other pollinators included in this report. His main question was whether under the opt-out, some of the feedback made it sound like it created a challenge for spraying to be effective? Did that challenge relate to operations on the ground or that it wasn't actually effective in controlling mosquitoes or their diseases? Abby Burton explained that if you have too many folks opting out, it limits the geographic area where MCD can spray because they leave certain buffer zones. No one was identified as a severe challenge but it's one more thing to work around during spraying when dealing with excluded areas.

Helen Poynton thanked Dr. Brown for the report, saying it was well written and organized. She had a few requests for more information. 1) More information on resistance testing; Helen Poynton's own groups have done resistance in non-target crustaceans in MA, so she was really concerned about their existence. 2) What were the permethrin levels detected in drinking water samples? 3) The model presented at the end of the report on different tiers of control and how that would affect cases; could Dr. Brown go through it in additional detail? Dr. Brown provided more context and discussion on the model limitations.

Richard Robinson also thought the report was excellent. He asked about budgetary costs to adult mosquito control and breakdown of nuisance v. public health control, particularly at the adult stage. He reiterated that until we really know how much mosquito spraying is done just for nuisance control, it's hard to evaluate the data. He wondered if there are some data gaps the task force can try to fill and if there is any low hanging fruit that might be valuable to pursue. Beth Card said a link will be sent around and that she can circulate information as a follow up to the question.

Jen Pederson asked about the second report and its interview process. How did ERG focus on those particular groups and will those people interviewed be disclosed? Diana Pietri said identities were to be kept confidential so they could ensure full disclosure. She said ERG went for a cross section across MCDs and those who worked with related groups like local boards of health. ERG also wanted to speak to people at the Commonwealth level and part of EEA and MDAR as well as folks knowledgeable about the science. So, ERG created categories of types of individuals they wanted to speak with and reached out accordingly.

Jen Pederson then asked about informant bias, and Diana Pietri said this was a great question and that everyone has such bias, so that's why they aimed for a representative sample to counteract the individual perspectives and biases.

Heidi Ricci reiterated her labeling concern from the past meeting. Beth Card said she will discuss it with her team and would get back in touch. Bob Mann seconded the concern and said the pesticide subcommittee could discuss that issue.

Beth Card then read questions from Q&A. She noted there were many questions, and if she couldn't reach them all, she would follow up individually afterwards.

1. Cost of illness question and relation to comorbidities. Dr. Brown directed to underlying literature on what they cited.
2. Christopher Horton asked if positive rate analysis took into account the type of trap used to collect? Dr. Brown was not positive of the answer; she said she knew that in the first report, there was data on this analysis, but wanted to refer to that report for specific details so she didn't misspeak. She was not sure if ERG did it by type of trap; might be by type of mosquito.
3. David Brown asked if all pesticides used by MA have been reviewed and registered by EPA and are used according to label directions? Dr. Brown said yes, all registered by EPA. Heidi Ricci noted that she's questioning that with her comment made earlier and that there are deep flaws with the EPA registration process.
4. David Brown asked about mosquito control application rates. Dr. Brown said they were looking at inherent toxicity of these chemicals, not the amount of exposure. Helen Poynton did a quick calculation based on data in report and said she ended up with a very general number that shows the rate is closer to pounds per acre than ounces per acre.
5. Christopher Horton asked why was ERG looking at forces beyond EPA? Don't they do an ongoing review of scientific literature related to products? Dr. Brown said they wanted to make sure that if there were any data gaps or differing data available out there, that the realm was captured and as noted, there are interests in looking at other data sources.

→ Please note endnote with requested correction

6. Question about how districts make stormwater management sites? Priscilla Matton said there are a significant number of sites and data are large, but you can ask any individual mosquito control for specific information.
7. David Brown asked about the cost difference between larviciding and adulticiding? He thought it was relevant to demonstrating that there aren't significant impacts to pollinators. Dr. Brown said they were reviewing those impacts and taking them into consideration in formulating a response.
8. Kyle Bennett noted EPA carcinogen question and whether it was reclassified? Dr. Brown said this is an errata/edit that needs to be made to the report and that ERG will make sure it's clarified.
9. David Brown said application techniques and impact on non-target organisms needs to be recognized and cited a list of publications and other resource information to review. Beth Card said they can read that and offer responses.
10. Christopher Horton asked why there was a focus on toxicity and pyrethroids in report? Isn't toxicity evaluated by EPA during registration and other risk assessment processes? Are EPA standards for product registration not satisfactory? Dr. Brown explained toxicity is a main concern as stated by EPA and they used EPA categorizations. ERG was looking at inherent toxicity of the chemicals and not risk. EPA does comprehensive risk assessments.
11. Patti Page asked, given the high level of toxicity to aquatic life, how can you protect non-target arthropods, especially with resistance in crustaceans? Dr. Brown referred to the sixth report that

outlined the best approaches to minimize the impact to non-target receptors. Patti Page followed up with concerns about impacts on lobsters and lethal effects on lobsters.

12. Jane Alessandra identified an error in report on p. 241, saying most window ACs do not have features to close out outside air. Beth Card said they can review and correct, if necessary, in the errata sheet.
13. David Brown said thank you, and Beth Card thanked him for his questions and comments.
14. Will video of this meeting be available online? Caroline Higley said the meeting was not being recorded and minutes will be posted as soon as the task force votes on them at the next meeting. She also said the presentation will be posted online.

Richard Robinson raised an additional question about being able to refer back to this Q&A and have it be distributed. Beth Card said she was not sure how it would be saved but was assured it would be. Richard also noted some errors to correct on the errata sheet and asked how to do it. Beth Card said those should be submitted by 9.17.21 directly to Caroline Higley if they're from task force members. Members of the public should submit through the public comment page.

Beth Card said that EEA would be collecting feedback and recommendations for clarifications and questions through 9.17.21. Errata sheet will be developed and shared and Q&A will be reviewed and saved. Next steps will be working to start getting some of the subcommittee meetings and full task force meetings scheduled.

Heidi Ricci asked for clarification about comment submission for the task force and public via the comment portal, or if task force members can submit them directly to Caroline Higley? Beth Card said yes, they will be submitted and then EEA will look to compile all the feedback received and that will be useful for subcommittees to have as they are deliberating as well. Caroline Higley also noted there's a difference between comments received related to perspectives/opinions and factual corrections. If task force members email her directly, it will be easier to parse apart, but the members can submit via general comment portal, too.

Beth Card then sought a motion and second to adjourn. John Lebeaux made the motion, which Jennifer Pederson seconded. Roll call ayes. Meeting adjourned at 1:58 p.m.

Requested Correction: After meeting ended, Helen Poynton indicated that the average amount of sumithrin sprayed during spraying events in MA (based on table 4.2 of the MCTF Report) is 0.0037 lbs active ingredient/ acre, and requests to amend Q&A response, to confirm that the public commentor was correct.



The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs
100 Cambridge Street, Suite 900
Boston, MA 02114

Charles D. Baker
GOVERNOR

Karyn E. Polito
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

Kathleen A. Theoharides
SECRETARY

Tel: (617) 626-1000
Fax: (617) 626-1081
<http://www.mass.gov/eea>

Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century Task Force

Thursday, October 21, 2021
12:00PM

Meeting to be held via remote participation (details below)

AGENDA

1. Call to order and introductions
2. Routine business
 - a. Vote on minutes from September 28, 2021 and October 13, 2021 meetings
3. MCTF Calendar
4. MCTF Subcommittee Updates
 - a. Best Practices
 - b. Pesticide Selection
 - c. Mosquito Control Policy Structure
 - d. Local Engagement
5. Structure of Recommendations
6. Process Updates

Note: This meeting will be hosted in a webinar format

Topic: Mosquito Control Task Force - Meeting #17

When: Oct 21, 2021 12:00 PM Eastern Time (US and Canada)

Please register in advance for this webinar using the link below. After registering, you will receive a confirmation email containing information about joining the webinar.

https://us02web.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_Qh1KO-ZGT2CzkRsly_7w3w

10.21.21 Mosquito Control Task Force (MCTF) Meeting #17 – Minutes

Beth Card called the meeting to order at 12:04 p.m. and provided an overview for meeting process. Like previous meetings, this one is a Zoom webinar with all state staff and Task Force members participating as panelists. All others are attendees can use Q&A function to pose questions that will be answered throughout meeting. Topics to be covered will not include minutes; they will be sent ahead of next meeting.

Richard Robinson noted problems with one link that had been sent for the meeting, which wasn't working, and speculated that this might be keeping some members from joining.

Attendees: Kevin Cranston, John Lebeaux, Nicole Keleher, Kathleen Baskin, Derek Brindisi, Julia Blatt, Anita Deeley, Russell Hopping, Kim LeBeau, Bob Mann, Priscilla Matton, Jennifer Pederson, Richard Pollack, Helen Poynton, Heidi Ricci, Stephen Rich, Richard Robinson.

I. Upcoming Calendar

Beth Card asked about the upcoming schedule and wanted to discuss what that will look like. Conversations with legislators have been had about a formal extension of the due date for Task Force reports. We are seeking an extension through May 2022 and we are optimistic that progress will be made. Caroline Higley provided an overview of the working calendar for upcoming months. The calendar aligns with subcommittee tasks and builds in buffers in case more time is needed for the recommendation process. Considering hosting a second public listening session after substantive progress has been made on recommendations and would like feedback from group on that proposal. Once tentatively drafted, January and February will be used for debate and finalization, solicitation of final comments and presentation to the full Task Force for final recommendations approval. Formal voting will then be initiated to send those recommendations to the Legislature. Ideally those recommendations would be advanced at the end of April but this is a challenging, complicated topic, and could possibly extend into May as a result. Caroline Higley said she can post this outline on the website for others to review.

Heidi Ricci supported idea of another public listening session, calling it essential, and said the schedule looks pretty good.

Stephen Rich noted upcoming scheduling conflict for his calendar in January. Caroline Higley said she could work with him on that.

II. Subcommittee Updates

Beth Card noted 40 minutes allocated for this section of the meeting and asked for chairs to stick to 10 minutes apiece as best as possible.

A. Best Practices (Richard Robinson)

This subcommittee (SC) has met 3 times and spent time on open meeting law questions. Decided to leave those issues to the lawyers. Substantive discussions have included identifying critical gaps that members feel should be filled before we make recommendations to larger committee or, if impractical to fill, at least identify them as missing from our knowledge base and make recommendations more tentative than they otherwise would be. Think they've identified important ones and don't think there's

consensus of relative importance of gaps, but haven't tried to do that either. Have started to dig into critical issues, including but not limited to the set of practices of MCDs, whether we should be addressing what those practices are and how they're done, and looking forward to presentation to current practices at next meeting. Also, what may be a hot topic, is relative strength of data on effect of mosquito control measures on public health; how good is data that measures do protect public health and, similarly, how good is data for effect on non-target organisms and vulnerable individuals? Just opened that conversation and looking forward to seeing how it plays out. That will be a major component of the next meeting. Important that we, as SC, identify commonalities as well as differences; think SC is operating in good will and will determine how to negotiate differences.

Jennifer Pederson had a question about point on pesticides on vulnerable populations; seems like that particular piece might be best handled under Pesticide group; anyone else agree? Richard said it was an interesting idea, and doesn't think he has an opinion on that question. The decision probably belongs in this group rather than us taking it off or keeping it on their plate. Didn't see that task in the remit for the pesticide group. Jennifer said she wasn't sure it was because didn't know if legislation called for that particular inquiry but seems that part of process evaluating the pesticide is going through federal registration process, and EPA is evaluating when they do that, but just her thought.

Heidi Ricci said this came up at Local Engagement SC meeting. Thinks more input from outside experts on this issue needed. Not so much which pesticides should be used and which are less toxic, but whole question of efficacy related to spectrum of control practices, including education, and further understanding risks. Beth Card said we could leave question of whether it's in the right SC or not for now and continue to monitor how it's being raised in SCs going forward. She made note of Heidi's comment about outside expertise being helpful.

Kevin Cranston noted DPH is happy to make expertise available to all, and would appreciate clarity about process of requesting that so appropriate individuals can be lined up at the right time. Caroline Higley said that would be covered later in this meeting.

B. Pesticide Selection (Bob Mann)

Have had two meetings. First meeting was more perfunctory and included introduction of all members. Second meeting began to get into more details about the SC's mission. Discussion of pesticide process took some time to go through, followed by a similar review by Priscilla Matton and her perspective on this universe. Having the different perspectives were helpful and illuminating. Then had an engaging Q&A period and appreciated full attendance at the meeting.

C. Mosquito Control Policy Structure (Stephen Rich)

This SC has also met twice and did a lot of the same things as previous SCs detailed. Second meeting got into the details of the matter, including existing legislation and excellent presentation by Jessica Burgess. Strong opinions on legislation but really only had that one conversation, so holding off on saying where future meetings are going. Did identify need to pin down some definitions, e.g., goals of mosquito control in MA, how we would define them, and the need to define things like "nuisance." Along those lines, next meeting's homework is to identify data gaps in the report and to find potential sources to fill those gaps. Also had some conversation about overlap of SC with others. Thinks where things are important, redundancy will happen and don't need to spend too much time worried about it.

Heidi Ricci said Jessica Burgess's presentation on structure was really helpful and enlightening and helped spark good conversation in the group. Was hoping to have access to other SC's presentations, as well. Caroline Higley confirmed that will happen.

D. Local Engagement (Heidi Ricci)

Thanked ERG and agency staff for keeping members organized and moving forward. Have had two meetings. First was primarily taken up with procedure and second dealt with more substance, focusing primarily on two of three directives (promoting public participating in management and providing local options for pesticides). She noted the desire to bring in outside experts for assistance, including from DPH, and referenced Senator Jo Comerford's interest in attending to present her perspective.

III. Recommendation Structure

Beth Card thanked everyone for their updates and then invited ERG to walk Task Force through the process for actually developing the recommendations. Abby Burton provided this update and started by reminding everyone of Task Force's charge under the legislation. When developing effective recommendations, important to consider the audience, which here is the Legislature. A good recommendation needs to be actionable by the Legislature. Will have four components: summarizing the status quo and need for change; be "SMART"; explain the rationale for the recommendation; and note what specific legislation should be changed and provide suggested language. Then provided more detail on each of these components. "SMART" refers to being Specific action to be taken with explicit detail; Meaningful rationale for recommendation and how it will make a positive difference; Authority identified for who can make the changes, remembering that the primary audience is the Legislature; Realistic recommendations that are clear and accompanied by roadmap describing how charges fit the legal framework; and, Time bound (which may not apply here, with Legislature acting on its own time frame), especially if recommended change is temporary. Jessica Burgess noted help would be available in both SCs and full Task Force to assist with identifying current legislation and policies.

IV. Recurring Questions Expected

Caroline Higley explained that there have been a few topics that have come up at SC meetings that she wanted to run through a standardized approach looking ahead.

A. First is clarification of ERG's role in SCs. ERG is available to provide reference documents from the report and non-literature sources collected as part of preparing the report but is not able to carry out additional literature review or undertake new research or analyses, and is not going to be soliciting presentations from outside experts not identified by SCs or revising or amending the report except by the errata document.

Heidi Ricci asked a question on areas of report for summary presented briefly and based on review of ERG had done on more detailed background information; to the extent there are questions on work already done, can Task Force members ask those things? Caroline Higley confirmed and said EEA can coordinate responses to that.

B. Second is articulation of approach in hosting guest speakers at meetings. SCs will be self-regulating for this process, and if SC member wants to invite the speaker to the meeting, must present

the proposal to full SC and get majority support to do so. If agreed to, the SC must collectively decide on goal of hosting the speaker and speaking time should be limited to however long the SC decides.

Kim LeBeau asked if full Task Force would be told of guest speakers in each SC so members could choose to attend as well? Caroline said that was a great idea and was interested in creating a structure in conjunction with ERG to accomplish that.

Heidi Ricci asked about incorporation of Task Force edits to report and objected to entitling the report as coming from the "Task Force" when ERG drafted it and Task Force did not have opportunity to amend it. Also objecting to shortening of Task Force title and the issue with discussion of non-target impacts, saying lack of data does not mean lack of impact.

Richard Robinson agreed that it's important to prevent errors in record as to Task Force title, saying he'd rather not be misrepresented.

Jessica Burgess noted for record that legislation says the Task Force shall commission a study and completely understands point being made by Heidi.

C. Third is request to identify data information gaps. ERG has been maintaining list of those requests and will discuss whether it makes sense to address at SC or full Task Force meetings. Looking ahead, if you're attending multiple SCs and think there are potential cross-committee issues, send Caroline an email describing the issue and she will work with ERG to organize it accordingly. If there are DPH specific questions, send Caroline an email about that by COB Friday.

Richard Robinson not sure if COB Friday is workable; SC is meeting on Monday and can be put on agenda for then. Caroline said that would be fine.

V. Next Steps

Caroline Higley said SCs will continue to meet and is looking forward to next set of updates. Will continue to keep list of miscellaneous process items to address. Always interested to hear about topics of interest for the full group. Very appreciative of the work and time being put into the SC meetings.

Heidi Ricci asked for clarification on comments she submitted on gaps in sources and wondered when that would be shared. Caroline Higley said the process for sharing this kind of information is being discussed.

Noting no public comments, Beth Card took a motion to adjourn. Richard Robinson made the motion, with Jennifer Pederson seconding. All ayes. Meeting was adjourned at 1:19 p.m.



The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs
100 Cambridge Street, Suite 900
Boston, MA 02114

Charles D. Baker
GOVERNOR

Karyn E. Polito
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

Kathleen A. Theoharides
SECRETARY

Tel: (617) 626-1000
Fax: (617) 626-1081
<http://www.mass.gov/eea>

Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century Task Force

Monday, November 8, 2021
12:30-1:00PM

Meeting to be held via remote participation (details below)

AGENDA

1. Call to order and roll call
2. Presentation by DPH on Subcommittee Questions

**Please note: this meeting is scheduled to occur within an existing meeting of the MCTF Subcommittee on Best Practices*

Note: This meeting will be hosted in a webinar format

Topic: Mosquito Control Task Force – Meeting #17.5

When: Nov 8, 2021 12:30 PM Eastern Time (US and Canada)

Please register in advance for this webinar using the link below. After registering, you will receive a confirmation email containing information about joining the webinar.

PLEASE NOTE: This link will refer you to the webpage of the MCTF Subcommittee: Best Practices. This full task force meeting will occur in the middle of the subcommittee meeting.

https://us02web.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_geR4Rnk_QI2a0jozB3WpYA

11.08.21 Mosquito Control Task Force (MCTF) DPH Presentation – Minutes

November 8, 2021, 12:30 p.m. via Zoom

Meeting Topic:

- DPH presentation and Q&A

Kevin Cranston stepped in for Beth Card who was not available for the meeting. Roll call was conducted at approximately 12:30 p.m. and a quorum was established. Task Force members in attendance included Kim LeBeau, Kathy Baskin, Russell Hopping, Bob Mann, Priscilla Matton, Jennifer Pederson, Richard Robinson, Heidi Ricci, Stephen Rich, John Lebeaux, Richard Pollack, and Anita Deeley.

Kevin Cranston introduced Dr. Brown from DPH. Dr. Brown acknowledged the hard work that the MCTF has done and noted that the DPH Toxicologist was not available today, so Dr. Brown would speak to the pieces that fall under her subject matter expertise, though DPH is happy to work with MCTF to bring in others with other areas of expertise as needed.

Dr. Brown initiated her presentation and noted that DPH performs three main categories of activities for mosquito control.

- Surveillance: DPH conducts mosquito and human/veterinary surveillance. DPH also looks at post aerial spray data: they look at syndromic surveillance data to see if there are changes in healthcare-seeking behavior after spray events and also efficacy data (for which they collaborate with MCDs and MDAR).
- Lab testing: DPH does testing for mosquitoes and veterinary/human cases.
- Risk assessment and communication: Surveillance requires communication of results and information as to how individuals can protect themselves. DPH focuses on public health actions not related to spraying but DPH does collaborate with partners when the risk is high or increasing for outreach before aerial sprays. DPH also collaborates with CDC, academic partners, and others.

- Surveillance

Dr. Brown acknowledged that there are many complex ecological systems at play. Habitat, infected birds, appropriate mosquito vectors, and human habitats contribute to arbovirus risk. Risk modifiers can increase/decrease human risk: proportion of infected bird population, size of mosquito vector populations, weather, and human behavior. These are all interconnected. Surveillance targets include mosquito vectors, human/animal cases, and weather. DPH doesn't have the capacity to investigate the proportion of birds that are infected.

- Drivers of EEE activity

Some drivers are the same as WNV, but they are not exactly the same. DPH monitors some factors in advance; they look at the prior year's activity, the rainfall from the prior fall and current spring, and juvenile mosquito populations. During the season, DPH monitors temperature, rainfall, populations of adult mosquitoes, and infection rate in mosquitoes. After the season, DPH retrospectively monitors viral genetics.

- Rare diseases

EEE and WNV are rare. Asymptomatic infections represent a significant amount of cases for WNV (for every severe case of WNV, there are around 100 asymptomatic cases), but it's unclear how many EEE asymptomatic cases there are. Dr. Brown noted for WNV, mosquito vectors are more opportunistic so there are more cases. Mosquitoes and birds that carry WNV also tend to live in urban environments, so there are more common interactions with people.

For EEE, mosquito must bite a bird to acquire the virus, which is a less common event. EEE activity is focused outside of urban habitats.

- EEE surveillance

There are long-term trap sites in SE Massachusetts (a historic hot spot for EEE), which allows for good, standardized comparisons of data over time. DPH is working with MCDs to do trapping in emerging areas. There is trapping that happens in places not under MCDs' jurisdiction but that have the potential as emerging areas. Note that "emerging areas" can be areas of historic risk – Dr. Brown showed a map of cases of EEE in horses in 1938.

Dr. Brown acknowledged that there is bias in sampling because sampling is done in areas likely to have large mosquito populations. But given DPH's long experience with the data, they have a good sense of how to evaluate positive findings. Trapping usually starts in an area known to be high risk and then spreads out once the virus is identified to see how the risk progresses during a season. There is also responsive trapping, in which case trapping starts after something appears in an area that previously didn't have traps.

- WNV surveillance

There aren't long-term trap sites available for WNV in the same way that there are for EEE given that EEE is an older disease in MA. Traps are set in known areas of risk, which tend to be urban areas with large mosquito populations. Again, the sampling is biased because DPH wants to be able to identify the virus ASAP (there is also responsive trapping). Surveillance provides information on the relative abundance of mosquito vector populations, differentiating enzootic from bridge vectors (mammal biting vs. bird biting). DPH showed some graphs from long-term trap sites demonstrating the relative abundance of mosquito populations compared to 5-10-year means.

Dr. Brown emphasized that surveillance is very labor intensive: teams must go out and set traps, leave them, come back, and collect the mosquitoes, then count and sort mosquitoes by different species groups. Not all mosquitoes are tested – testing is done for members of species that are most relevant for EEE/WNV. Mosquitoes are pooled into groups of 50 to extract as much information as possible.

- Case investigations

Once a human or veterinary case has been identified, DPH starts conducting investigations. For animals, DPH collects information on the animal's location, recent travel, and vaccination status, and informs the owners of the risk. For humans, knowing about outdoor activity, known mosquito exposure, and recent travel is important; however, information-gathering is more complicated because humans move around more and sometimes the patient isn't able to provide info or it's emotionally difficult to get info from friends/family. DPH works hard to get the best information possible to guide public health action.

- Arbovirus surveillance and response plan

It is noted that DPH uses all available data to come up with arbovirus risk. Tiered risk levels are supposed to be based on "objective" criteria but are assessed in conjunction with more subjective information like weather and experience. Tiered public health recommendations are relatively consistent with CDC's recommendations, particularly for WNV. (CDC doesn't have tiered recommendations for EEE because EEE isn't prevalent nationally). DPH communications focus on personal protection – e.g. avoiding peak activity time, wearing certain clothing, etc. DPH is aware of the other tools available, such as larviciding which seems to be effective for WNV but not necessarily EEE. Ground spraying occurs under specific high-risk circumstances for EEE and is done according to recommendations from mosquito control experts, particularly when the other risk reduction tools aren't sufficient.

- Risk communication

There are specific triggers to do press releases. DPH also updates the website daily with mosquito testing results and risk level changes.

- Laboratory testing

It is noted that DPH uses PCR testing for mosquitoes, which detects viral genetic materials. There are two different sections (targets) of genetic material used to ensure the test's specificity. For animals and humans, DPH does serology tests that detect antibodies to viruses. There are two tests, a screening test that is prone to false positives and a confirmatory test that is extremely specialized and not available in commercial laboratories. PCR is also used in certain circumstances. The State Public Health Laboratory (SPHL) has a huge amount of experience with testing for WNV and EEE. There are QA/QC protocols and the lab is overseen by CLIA (a lab certification program) and CDC. SPHL also participates in the Select Agent Registered Program.

Dr. Brown discussed how there were certain benefits of the current centralized program: there is greater standardization, coordination of testing and the release of results (which can enhance the real-time situational awareness), and there is a greater ability to assess risk across municipality borders because there is an understanding of how the data is collected and what the results might mean. When individual communities use their own protocol, it can complicate things. There is an electronic data-sharing system so that MCDs and MDAR have access to the mosquito data. DPH also wants to make sure they're conducting the "right-size" surveillance – once EEE has been found in a particular location, it might continue coming up in that location, but that doesn't necessarily mean the risk levels are higher. Over the years, DPH has developed the ability to understand what appropriate surveillance levels should be. Another benefit of the current system is that DPH can store samples for additional studies.

Dr. Brown was asked that if DPH were to rely on private vendors for testing, what might be required of those vendors? Dr. Brown indicated that DPH would want the same lab testing turnaround time that we have now (24 hours), the lab would need to meet a minimum quality standard, the lab would need to participate in select agent registration/have the ability to transfer EEE-positive specimens for additional studies (which places an additional burden on the SPHL because they have to make sure the samples are used appropriately), the lab should have knowledge of both WNV/EEE ecology and have staff trained in the ability to identify mosquitoes to the species level, and finally, the lab should have the ability to share data on a close to real-time basis. DPH has not had the experience of working with any vendor so far that meets most of these requirements.

- The efficacy of mosquito control

Dr. Brown noted how this is an extremely complex topic to study since it is not possible to do controlled experiments and it is hard comparing across geographies/years. She demonstrated the efficacy table that is available in the Arbovirus Surveillance Plan but noted that this aerial spray efficacy table wasn't a direct measurement of human risk, although the size of the vector population is a driver of human risk, so reducing the vector population would theoretically drive a temporary reduction in human risk. Of course, WNV and EEE are both rare, and evaluating the relationship between action and outcome is easier when there is a more frequent outcome.

- Available data online

It is noted that there are city/town data for the most recent mosquito season, mosquito data for the years 2014-2020, and data for positive veterinary specimens. Human cases are subject to privacy and confidentiality policies, and they are reported by county, as well as the likely location of exposure. Not everyone is comfortable sharing information about their cases and that must be respected.

- Communication about aerial spraying

DPH contributes heavily to communications about aerial spraying. There are pre-spray calls with MDAR, notification to environmental groups, outreach to beekeepers and organic farmers, updates to the website, joint press releases with MDAR, FAQs maintained in multiple languages, working with partners on the distribution of information (e.g. to make sure it's accessible), etc.

- Communication challenges

Dr. Brown stated that it's not possible to reach everyone, and people aren't always receptive to messages if afraid of the content. Common message from people who call DPH include: if they want someone to fix the issue, if they have concerns about use of insect repellent, if they want specific information about when and where spraying is happening, and most frequently, if they either support or are against spraying.

- Long term changes likely related to risk

Dr. Brown noted that there are likely relevant ecological changes happening that will affect risk in the future, because we're seeing changes in the timing and spatial distribution of EEE.

Heidi Ricci asked a clarifying question: Is ground-based spraying happening in MCDs initiated based on surveillance data or is it determined independently by the MCDs? Dr. Brown responded that this question was best directed at the districts, since DPH has no regulatory authority over MCDs or pesticide use. Richard Pollack responded to Heidi Ricci's point and stated that MCDs are in close contact with MDAR throughout the mosquito season and usually increase ground spraying when the risk seems to be rising.

Bob Mann asked a question in the chat: "Can you give me some idea what the arbovirus situation would look like if we withdrew all control efforts, including IPM and pesticide use? In our report, the "no control" scenario does not reach back to the pre-pesticide era. What did human morbidity and mortality statistics for mosquito-borne diseases (not necessarily EEE alone) look like in, say, 1900 or before?" Dr. Brown said that there is data on cases going back to ~1938 that DPH can share with MCTF, but she didn't feel like any strong conclusions could be drawn about comparing mortality/morbidity before and after the widespread use of pesticides, since so many things have changed since then including increases in the human population and movement into EEE-prone areas.

Upon completion of Dr. Brown's presentation and Q&A wrap up, Kevin Cranston heard a motion to close out the full Task Force meeting to revert to the Best Practices subcommittee meeting at approximately 1:17 p.m. A motion was made to adjourn by Richard Robinson and seconded by Richard Pollack. All in favor said aye.



The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs
100 Cambridge Street, Suite 900
Boston, MA 02114

Charles D. Baker
GOVERNOR

Karyn E. Polito
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

Kathleen A. Theoharides
SECRETARY

Tel: (617) 626-1000
Fax: (617) 626-1081
<http://www.mass.gov/eea>

Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century Task Force

Monday, November 15, 2021
12:00PM

Meeting to be held via remote participation (details below)

AGENDA

1. Call to order and introductions
2. Routine business
 - a. Vote on minutes from September 28, 2021 and October 21, 2021 meetings
3. MCTF Subcommittee Updates
 - a. Best Practices
 - b. Pesticide Selection
 - c. Mosquito Control Policy Structure
 - d. Local Engagement
4. Post-DPH Presentation questions and discussion
5. Public Listening Session – date and structure
6. Process Updates
 - a. Definitions
 - b. Public Comments

Note: This meeting will be hosted in a webinar format

Topic: Mosquito Control Task Force - Meeting #18

When: Nov 15, 2021 12:00 PM Eastern Time (US and Canada)

Please register in advance for this webinar using the link below. After registering, you will receive a confirmation email containing information about joining the webinar.

https://us02web.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_Nvs9gmb5TqOfqsl4cocqbA

11.15.21 Mosquito Control Task Force (MCTF) Meeting #18 – Minutes

November 15, 2021, 12p.m. via Zoom

Meeting Topics:

- Call to order and introductions
- Routine business
- Subcommittee updates
- Post DPH presentation questions and discussion
- Public listening session
- Process updates
- Next steps
- Meeting close

Beth Card called the meeting to order at 12:01 p.m. and provided an overview for meeting process. The meeting agenda and topics were reviewed with the committee. There was a proposal to vote on meeting minutes for the 9/28 and 10/21 Full Task Force meetings. Meeting minutes from other Task Force meetings and subcommittee meetings are being worked on and are close to completion.

Beth Card asked the group if there were any corrections that Task Force members requested to make to the minutes. There were no responses. Beth Card heard a motion to approve from Jennifer Pederson and Richard Robinson. Eve Schluter asked a question about her vote since she was not at one of the meetings listed for minutes approval. Roll call was conducted to approve both sets of meeting minutes from 9/28 and 10/21. Kevin Cranston (aye), John Lebeaux (aye), Nicole Keleher (aye), Kathy Baskin (none), Eve Schluter (aye for 9/28 abstain from 10/21), Heidi Porter (none), Derek Brindisi (aye), Julia Blatt (none), Tonya Colpitts (none), Anita Deeley (none), Russell Hopping (aye), Kim LeBeau (aye), Bob Mann (aye), Priscilla Matton (aye), Brad Mitchell (none), Jennifer Pederson (aye), Rich Pollack (aye), Helen Poynton (aye), Heidi Ricci (aye), Stephen Rich (aye), Richard Robinson (aye), Sam Telford (aye for 9/28 abstain for 10/21)

- Best practices – Richard Robinson:

This subcommittee conducted the fourth meeting about a week prior. There were short presentations from a few members that focused on the extent to which larvicide and adulticide affect non-target organisms. It was noted that this was critical for the subcommittee as it moves forward with its recommendations. A few highlights: First, lab results are not the same as results from the field. Work in the field deals with a lot of variability. Well-designed field studies are relatively scarce. Second, both mosquito and non-target populations tend to rebound after they are knocked down. Adulticides does not permanently solve problems. Third, it was noted that a lack of data does mean there are no impacts. Many beneficial organisms are as small bodied as mosquitoes. Adulticide, aerial and truck-based spraying are designed to kill insects the size of mosquitoes, and other non-target species could be impacted by that protocol.

Richard Robinson said that Priscilla Matton noted that her MCD gets between 10,000-15,000 spray requests over the three months of the summer. Richard Robinson also made the points there may not be strong data supporting or refuting the idea that aerial applications impact human disease risk. In addition, the data is not very strong to confirm what mosquito spraying accomplishes with regard to WNV and EEE. When we think of first approximations for pollinators, we think of honeybees, but we must also think about other pollinators that may be affected by adulticide. Assumptions we make about honeybees do not necessarily apply to many other species that may be impacted. The directive for the next meeting is to bring together draft outlines of recommendations. Richard Robinson noted that he is eager to continue that discussion. Beth Card asked if there were any other inputs or questions from subcommittee or others. There were no comments made.

- Pesticide Selection - Bob Mann

Bob Mann noted that he was reporting out on meeting number three from November 2nd. The group identified and approved an alternate chair for the subcommittee in case Bob Mann cannot attend (Nicole Keleher). Bob reviewed the three directives that the subcommittee was tasked with reviewing, and summarized the initial discussions on the three directives. Regarding the PFAS directive, the subcommittee discussed having Hotze Wijnja (MDAR Chemist) present on PFAS/Pesticides. Bob Mann asked to make a motion to have Hotze Wijnja come to make a presentation to the full task force.

Bob Mann noted that the subcommittee meeting held on November 16th will dive into submission and directives. Focus will be on directive one and will offer at least the first iteration of the language we would use in our recommendations. Bob Mann asked if anyone wanted to add to the comments. There are no questions or comments from the group. Bob Mann made a formal motion to invite Hotze Wijnja to present on PFAS. Jennifer Pederson seconded that motion. Heidi Ricci commented that she does not object but wanted to note that the task force should be careful whenever it brings in outside expertise, to ensure balanced perspectives. Heidi noted that we need to balance that with expertise from the pesticide registration and regulatory folks.

Beth Card noted that should the committee vote in the affirmative to have a presentation at a future meeting, we can schedule for the next full Task Force meeting, and there will be opportunity for follow up information to be presented. Beth Card noted that the intention would be to not have lengthy presentations. Heidi Ricci noted that she wanted the opportunity to identify another expert with a different perspective for that meeting to create balance. Jennifer Pederson noted that the PFAS presentation was an overview, and not about the entire pesticide registration process. Alisha Bouchard reiterated that the Hotze Wijnja's presentation was an overview of PFAS and was fact based not opinion based. Taryn LaScola added more detail, that the original presentation was an overview to the Pesticide Selection subcommittee of fluorinated compounds and how PFAS fit into fluorinated compounds, including the chemistry of PFAS along with some of the work that EPA has done. Heidi Ricci noted that she has someone in mind as a counter presenter and will check on availability.

Beth Card noted that a vote would need to be taken regarding a presentation from Hotze Wijnja and another individual to be named later. Beth suggested that we vote with the understanding that there will be two presentations at the full Task Force meeting. Richard Robinson asked for confirmation on what the group would learn from the PFAS presentation - if we all agree that PFAS are bad, then what will we gain from the presentation? In response, Bob Mann noted that the presentation serves as an overview, for task force members to more robustly understand what PFAS is and highlights the evolving nature of PFAS. If part of this Task Force's charge is to review pesticide use, then having the factual presentation would be of benefit to the group. Heidi Ricci added that she is happy to see the presentation but noted the PFAS chemicals are of concern from a regulatory perspective. Bob Mann commented that the presentation will address Heidi Ricci's questions.

Beth Card conducted a roll call vote for presentations presumably at the next full Task Force meeting. Kevin Cranston (aye), John Lebeaux (aye), Nicole Keleher (aye), Kathy Baskin (aye), Eve Schluter (aye), Heidi Porter (aye), Derek Brindisi (none), Julia Blatt (none), Tonya Colpitts (none), Anita Deeley (none), Russell Hopping (aye), Kim LeBeau (aye), Bob Mann (aye), Priscilla Matton (aye), Brad Mitchell (none), Jennifer Pederson (aye), Rich Pollack (aye), Helen Poynton (aye), Heidi Ricci (aye), Stephen Rich (aye), Richard Robinson (aye), Sam Telford (aye)

- Policy structure – Stephen Rich

Stephen Rich noted that the subcommittee group has met twice. They were presented with an overview of MGL 252 and have been looking at data gaps identified by the subcommittee. The group has been reviewing policy practices from other states, specifically focusing on how mosquito control is done elsewhere. In addition, subcommittee members are gaining an understanding of the variants and practices amongst the MCDs related to

why they exist and rationale for varying operational practices. The subcommittee's November 18th meeting will include development of questions for the MCDs to assist in filling some of these data gaps.

Stephen Rich noted the topics that the subcommittee identified as gaps that fall outside the scope of this subcommittees, including science-based mosquito management and linkages between human health and pesticides that may be best addressed by pesticide subcommittee. Stephen Rich asked the Task Force group for questions or comments. Heidi Ricci wanted to note there was a minority opinion on the vote of human health and pesticides and is still hopeful that this topic will be addressed.

- Local Engagement – Heidi Ricci

Heidi Ricci noted that the subcommittee had their third meeting and has gone through what information is necessary to address directives and gaps. Several references were provided on efficacy and non-target impacts. On the municipal side, Senator Comerford provided an additional letter and the Uxbridge BOH provided a write-up of its experience, which resonated with some other communities as well. The group has those documents in writing and continues to gather more information on the human health and non-target content, including the future public listening session.

In the last meeting, the group focused on the landowner opt-out process. Russell Hopping gave his perspective on why some landowners opt out, including the cumbersome nature of applying, reapplying, and marking. Should opt-out be broader, including for the exclusions during state-based spraying? These ideas are not yet in the form of recommendations, but the group is gathering perspective. The group is also discussing topics that that cross subcommittees and that belong within this subcommittee, including statewide science-based disease management mosquito control programming, standardized protocols with surveillance, municipal options of available services and cost structuring, public education and ways to measure effectiveness, municipal opt out and need for clear guidance and specific criteria, an opportunity to partner with other organizations like Universities and MassWildlife to pilot programs, opportunities for more transparency and reporting on metrics, and increased transparency for landowners that have special habitats and how to involve them with the spraying/opt out process. Heidi Ricci asked the group if there were any questions or comments and there were none.

Beth Card thanked all subcommittee chairs for their hard work and focus and moved to the next agenda item related to questions and discussion from the DPH presentation. It was noted that the presentation was circulated to Task Force members.

- Post DPH presentation questions and discussion

Richard Robinson commented that he was curious to see if there was more information on DPH's educational processes. Are there ongoing educational efforts about protecting yourself from mosquitos and keeping habitat in check? Dr. Brown noted that DPH discusses risk levels of mosquito borne disease and the steps that people should take to protect themselves as part of a summer campaign. DPH's website is kept up to date to include prevention of mosquito habitat for WNV. In addition to the website, DPH has pamphlets and educational material that can be ordered or downloaded for distribution. Richard Robinson commented that the reason he asked is because he hears that the MCDs use education as part of their mission. Richard Robinson thought there could be opportunity for DPH to amplify the message regarding protection and control of habitat. Dr. Brown noted that this is something that DPH talks about every year and absolutely support the MCDs on that effort. Prior to the pandemic, DPH was able to do presentations for local municipalities. This is a common practice, but DPH does not get to every community every year.

Stephen Rich asked a question regarding a slide discussing private vendors doing mosquito surveillance and/or control in the state. The bullet stated: "private labs don't meet minimum quality standards for what DPH requires." Stephen Rich asked what those minimum requirements are. It is not clear how a private vendor could meet criteria that isn't articulated anywhere. Dr. Brown responded that the slide in question was a step toward outlining what

the criteria would be. State public health lab staff are working on a more granular list of criteria they would expect from a lab specifically. Dr. Brown noted that Stephen Rich's question was fair and in process right now.

Heidi Ricci commented that Uxbridge did succeed in hiring a private company to trap mosquitos and asked if they are working with DPH for testing. Dr. Brown stated that those mosquitos went to Wadsworth which is the NY State Department of Health's lab. Dr. Brown noted that there were challenges identified during the process of working with Uxbridge. There could be ways where individual towns can work and communicate closely with the state system but there are certainly challenges. Dr. Brown did not think we received everything we needed to integrate their data within our system within that first year. Heidi Ricci stated it would be good to have that information as we work to build out recommendations going forward. Heidi Ricci noted there have been good examples of successful surveillance and use of data in Uxbridge. Heidi Ricci noted that Dr. Joann Lindenmayer was able to include this in her report because local trapping enabled them to identify several sites with WNV that had not been documented before. In response, they were able to address a municipal property that was creating WNV breeding habitat. This is a good example of successful surveillance and application of the data in solving a problem.

Dr. Brown noted a lot of lessons learned. There are challenges with (for example) twenty different communities doing their own programming, after which data must be coordinated to be entered into the state system. If the task force expects to make recommendations with regard to this process, thought needs to be devoted to the mechanics of operationalizing it so that it benefits local communities and towns. Heidi asked about the questions that she submitted that were not answered and inquired if anyone from DPH was present to address her questions on environmental health. Heidi Ricci stated that this is still a gap that we need to dig into somehow. Kevin Cranston added that we will find an appropriate time to get DPH to provide our Environmental Health expertise so the committee can get their questions answered. Heidi noted that getting her questions answered in writing would be appreciated. Beth Card asked if there were any further questions on the DPH briefing and there were none.

The meeting content moved to public listening session. It was noted that the next meeting is December 14th and the hope was that the subcommittees would be able to provide an outline of recommendations at that time. The recommendation is that the task force host a listening session after the December 14th Task Force meeting where subcommittee recommendation outlines are shared, such that the public can weigh in on the subcommittee recommendations. An alternate option proposed would be to host the listening session even later. Beth Card opened the proposal for feedback from the group, with a request for input on public listening session structure and timing. Jennifer Pederson commented that January would be better, as she is not available post December 20th. Heidi Ricci noted that she is fine waiting until January, but it is important to have a listening session sometime soon, doing it in January may be challenging. Richard Robinson noted his subcommittee might be too far along in recommendation development at that time. In response, Caroline Higley noted that the comment portal is open, and that information can certainly be used as a benefit to the subcommittee in anticipation. Beth Card noted that if the Task Force chooses to do a mid-January listening session, the announcement of a January meeting could emphasize to the public that they are able to submit comments via the comment portal.

Jennifer Pederson asked if participants will be able to register in advance for a public listening session. Caroline Higley noted that last public listening session, members of the public could sign up on a rolling basis to speak. Heidi Ricci agreed that is a good way to do it as long as people that did not have a chance to sign up get a chance at the end to speak and give people plenty of notice if you are going to ask them to sign up ahead of time. Caroline flagged that there was a question from the public that sought to clarify the public listening session. Beth Card read the question and provided direction. Caroline confirmed there will be both December and January Task Force meetings, in addition to a listening session.

- Process updates:

The first process update is on the topic of definitions of terms across subcommittees. One example of this is “nuisance mosquitoes.” We are proposing that each subcommittee define terms and words they chose to include in their recommendations, such that the full task force can resolve as a group. Eve Schluter asked if the terms that were identified could be passed around to the subcommittee groups. Caroline commented that nuisance is the only example that has really presented itself to date. Going forward we will be paying attention if additional terms are identified. The second process update is on public comments. An index of all public comments has been shared with task force members and will be posted online. ERG manually coded the legislative directive and created a cross walk to assist subcommittee members when drafting recommendations. Open call for feedback on the structure of the index looking ahead.

- Next steps:

The subcommittees will continue over the next four weeks. The next Task Force meeting will have updates from subcommittees and will include an outline of recommendations from each subcommittee. Subcommittees can continue to send agenda topic requests directly to Caroline Higley. The next full Task Force meeting will be on December 14th. Jennifer Pederson asked if the Legislature has extended the deadline past October 31st. Beth Card noted that Legislative liaisons are working on it. Priscilla Matton noted the subcommittee meetings between Christmas and the New Years – would those meetings be canceled? Caroline Higley noted that generally it is left it up to the subcommittee to determine if the meetings need to be canceled, rescheduled, or will continue as planned.

A public comment was made regarding recording the public comments listening session. Caroline Higley noted that we are generally using very detailed meeting minutes in lieu of recording the meeting. Minutes have become a bit of a transcript; however, EEA is looking into the possibility of recording the public listening sessions. Seeing no other agenda items and questions or comments from the Task Force, Beth Card asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting. Jennifer Pederson made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Kathy Baskin. All in favor of adjournment voted aye and there were no dissenters. Meeting was adjourned at 1:39 p.m.



The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs
100 Cambridge Street, Suite 900
Boston, MA 02114

Charles D. Baker
GOVERNOR

Karyn E. Polito
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

Kathleen A. Theoharides
SECRETARY

Tel: (617) 626-1000
Fax: (617) 626-1081
<http://www.mass.gov/eea>

Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century Task Force

Tuesday, December 14, 2021
12:00PM

Meeting to be held via remote participation (details below)

AGENDA

1. Call to order and introductions
2. Routine business
 - a. Vote on minutes from October 13, 2021, November 8, 2021, and November 15, 2021
3. Calendar updates
4. Presentation by DPH on human health impacts
5. Presentations on PFAS/Pesticides
6. MCTF Subcommittee Updates – outline of recommendations
 - a. Pesticide Selection
 - b. Best Practices
 - c. Mosquito Control Policy Structure
 - d. Local Engagement
7. Process Updates

Note: This meeting will be hosted in a webinar format

Topic: Mosquito Control Task Force - Meeting #19

When: Dec 14, 2021 12:00 PM Eastern Time (US and Canada)

Please register in advance for this webinar using the link below. After registering, you will receive a confirmation email containing information about joining the webinar.

https://us02web.zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_kCtaLkRtRz-k78Zjqe1Kuw

12.14.21 Mosquito Control Task Force (MCTF) Minutes

December 14, 2021, 12:00 p.m. via Zoom

Meeting Topics:

- Call to order and introductions
- Routine business
- Calendar updates
- Presentations
- Subcommittee Updates
- Process updates
- Meeting close

Beth Card initiated the meeting at 12:02 p.m. Task force members in attendance included: Kevin Cranston, Nicole Keleher, Kathy Baskin, Eve Schluter, Heidi Porter, Julia Blatt, Russell Hopping, Kim LeBeau, Bob Mann, Priscilla Matton, Richard Pollack, Helen Poynton, Heidi Ricci, Stephen Rich, Richard Robinson, and Sam Telford. Beth provided an overview of the agenda and advised the task force that there would be a vote on meeting minutes from 10/13, 11/8, and 11/15. Beth asked the task force if there were any corrections to the three sets of meeting minutes and no corrections were voiced by the task force members. Beth noted that the task force would be voting on all three sets of meeting minutes. Beth took a motion to approve meeting minutes from Richard Robinson, seconded from Kathy Baskin. A roll call was conducted. Kevin Cranston (aye), John Lebeaux (not present), Nicole Keleher (aye and abstain from 11/8), Kathy Baskin (aye), Eve Schluter (aye and abstain from 11/8), Heidi Porter (aye), Derek Brindisi (not present), Julia Blatt (aye and abstain from 10/13, 11/8) Tonya Colpitts (not present), Anita Deeley (not present), Russell Hopping (aye), Kim LeBeau (aye), Bob Mann (aye), Priscilla Matton (aye), Brad Mitchell (not present), Jennifer Pederson (did not vote), Richard Pollack (aye), Helen Poynton (aye abstain from 11/8), Heidi Ricci (aye), Stephen Rich (aye), Richard Robinson (aye), Sam Telford (aye, abstain from 11/15)

Beth moved into calendar updates and noted that the ARPA bill was signed, which included a task force extension date through 3/31/22. It was noted that due to the timeline there may need to be some additional subcommittee and full task force meetings scheduled. Beth commented on the need for each subcommittee to have volunteers to put pen to paper for key themes and recommendations that subcommittee members wanted reflected. Caroline Higley noted the primary change to the calendar was the removal of April and May timelines. Heidi Ricci commented that she hoped we could meet the compressed timeline and noted one of the difficulties amongst the subcommittee was having a draft goal and framework for mosquito control. Beth clarified that each subcommittee had its focus area that they are charged with and that should be the focus where writing was happening, and recommendations are being made.

Presentation 1: Dr. Marc Nascarella - MA State Toxicologist for the Department of Public Health (DPH)

Dr. Nascarella noted that he advised internal and external stakeholders on scientific matters related to chemicals. Dr. Nascarella's day to day role was to assist local, state, and federal officials related to chemical exposure and working with other state agencies within and outside of MA. Dr. Nascarella commented that chemical exposures take many forms, and any chemical can be toxic. Clarification was provided that the dose makes the poison. Pesticides are poisons that have been designed to kill living things. He provided an example of how other things can be poisons. The example was table salt at a high enough level. Many things determine how harmful it is such as dose and individual characteristics – babies and people with hypertension are a characteristic that could make it harmful. Dr. Nascarella noted that the goal of regulatory toxicologists was to establish safe levels of exposure and estimate how much of a chemical a person might be exposed to over time.

It was discussed that pesticides are a group of chemicals where there is a fair amount known. Pesticide manufacturers are required to submit detailed registration packages to the EPA that describe testing. In addition, a similar approach was conducted in MA where pesticide packages for new active ingredients are submitted to a panel to ensure they can be registered. The application of pesticides from an aircraft triggers another review related to pesticide formulation. Several state agencies are involved in this process to ensure aerial pesticides used are effective and have the least amount of impact to the environment. Dr. Nascarella noted that we should limit the environmental exposure from pesticides but given the risk of mosquito borne illness the continued use of pesticides does not provide a concern.

Presentation Questions:

Heidi Ricci commented that her questions were not answered regarding data and vulnerable populations. Heidi Ricci requested other information be shared and provided a link to a book published by MIT professor Nick Ashford. Dr. Nascarella responded that chemical sensitivities are often like allergies. He provided the example of a peanut allergy and how some individuals could respond differently to peanut proteins than others. When evaluating chemicals in a regulatory review process, testing was designed to protect the most vulnerable individuals.

Richard Robinson asked a question about dose and characteristics of the recipient in relation to aerial spraying exposing a vast population to pesticides. Dr. Nascarella responded that in terms of evaluating risk, an important consideration is the characterization of exposure and was not sure how true the assumption was that a great deal of people are exposed during the aerial application of pesticides. Dr. Nascarella noted the established record of environmental testing that has been done, specifically to surface body water testing. Any levels that were found were lower than any levels capable of causing human health effects. In response, Heidi Ricci referenced that a person became very ill after a spraying event and the person did not report it to the state because they did not know how to. Beth noted that there were a few questions in the Q&A that could be addressed and followed up accordingly. Jennifer Pederson asked Heidi Ricci if the book and link that she distributed to the task force members had new research, as the book cited research from 1998.

Presentation 2: Hotze Wijnja, Ph.D. - MDAR Environmental Chemist

Hotze Wijnja conducted a technical presentation on fluorinated chemicals, and the PowerPoint presentation can also be located on the task force website. Hotze referenced OECD PFAS list and PFAS master list. He indicated that there are several definitions of pesticides from multiple entities. Some definitions incorporate more compounds than EPA current “working” definition. There are two pesticides registered in MA that meet EPA’s definition of PFAS. While PFAS was found in pesticide used for mosquito control, Testing indicated contamination occurred in treating plastic containers and leaching from those containers.

Presentation Questions:

Jennifer Pederson noted that there was one pesticide that MA had approved which now met the standard PFAS definition. Jennifer asked if the SRB looked at that product? Hotze responded that those are not relevant to the MCDs as they are used in the greenhouse industry. In addition, he noted that the Pesticide Board Subcommittee was currently discussing fluorinated compounds.

Presentation 3: Clint Richmond – The Sierra Club

Clint Richmond conducted a presentation on PFAS, and the PowerPoint presentation can also be located on the task force website. Clint Richmond’s presentation included several slides detailing examples of PFAS structures, fluorinated pesticide and pharmaceutical structures, PFAS classification and listings, PFAS working definition and registered pesticides, and pesticides used in mosquito control. Clint noted that the state of MA has approved 87 fluorinated ingredients. Clint commented that he did not think the regulatory framework was sufficient and as a

state and country we were suffering from PFAS exposure. As a result, Clint noted that he felt the goal needed to be the elimination of synthetic pollutants.

Presentation Questions:

Beth Card thanked Clint and noted that it was important to have different viewpoints and opinions. Heidi Ricci asked both Hotze and Clint if the EPA had a roadmap to study PFOS and PFAS. Hotze noted that the roadmap goes through 2024. Hotze commented that the review will group categories to be more efficient in testing to get relevant information. Jennifer Pederson asked if DEP had been looking at the precursor transformation issue or other chemicals into PFAS compounds. Kathy Baskin responded that DEP continues to follow the science of PFAS regularly and they are looking at the data continuously. Kathy Baskin also commented that she would look into the question more specifically and report back to the full task force. Beth noted that in 2022 EEA was expecting to have the legislative report on PFAS and that PFAS was a high priority for all of us.

Subcommittee Updates:

Pesticide selection – Bob Mann

Bob Mann noted that the subcommittee was progressing to complete their directives by late February. The subcommittee was looking at three directives and the PFAS directive will be reviewed last. Bob shared the subcommittee draft timeline with the task force and noted that they were speaking on majority and minority views. The subcommittee was discussing all views and noted that if there was not a complete majority then dissenting views would also be presented. Task Force members commented that it would be good if the document could be circulated as soon as possible. Jennifer Pederson expressed concern with sharing the document because edits were still being made and the document was not finalized. It was agreed that more time will be provided. It was agreed that subcommittees would be able to finalize their draft documentation before sharing content across other subcommittee teams. It was also noted that there would more than likely be a January meeting where there could be a more formal presentation on the outline of recommendations.

Best practices - Richard Robinson

Richard Robinson shared slides with draft recommendations and noted that none of the recommendations had been voted on yet. Richard commented on the charges for the subcommittee related to IPM implementation and trying to establish thresholds for action, data-based decision making, limiting adulticide, and ensuring each MCD employs an entomologist. The remaining charges increased the state's role in providing statewide surveillance and state-based mosquito management. Additional areas focused on protecting water supply, human and ecological health, reducing the number of requests for nuisance calls, and development of an online system for private applicators. The subcommittee was also discussing the use of published research-based criterion for determining a public health emergency, banning aerial based adulticide, protecting organic agriculture, and expanding the availability of opting out to a broader group of landowners.

Policy Structure - Stephen Rich

Stephen Rich noted that the subcommittee was starting to see a consensus in the decision to repeal and revise MGL 252 and enabling legislation. Conversations took place in relation to modifying funding mechanisms and replacing the existing SRB with a cross agency mosquito oversight board (which would include DPH) to conduct reviews, outreach, and engagement. The subcommittee group discussed developing an updated mission statement and creating standards for operation which could include representatives from other states to bring value and perspective. A directive was discussed regarding the creation of a uniform funding structure for MCDs which could allow for municipal participation with DPH responsible for surveillance. This was determined to be an area that may also overlap into the Best Practices subcommittee. Stephen closed out his update discussing the establishment of menu-based mosquito control services.

Local engagement – Heidi Ricci

Heidi Ricci noted that the subcommittee was still drafting recommendations and they had good ideas that are not written up yet. Heidi Ricci discussed the need for an overall goal and framework, as it's important to the development of their recommendations. Heidi addressed the first directive and the difficulty operating under the current constraints of the MCDs. The subcommittee was thinking about ways to get input from the public regarding statewide planning like surveillance, protocols, education, material from the state, and optional structure. One option for structuring would be through the state funding basic services and municipalities would opt in and pay for optional systems. There were also discussions about the municipal opt out process for this year and future years. Heidi suggested the landowner opt out process being centered around IT systems, electronic annual renewal, and using GPS instead of physical markers. Heidi closed with the need for increased transparency of rare species information and a pilot program on non-target impacts in terms of measurements on non-targets and collaborating with other entities.

Process Updates

Beth Card noted that ERG was creating an internal web page to capture all the public comments which would be available for task force members to download for a time. The MCD survey on salt marsh management, adulticiding, and larvaciding was discussed and it was mentioned that it would be made available for all subcommittees to review. A public listening session was being scheduled in January and public comments captured through that session will be brought back to the full task force for final discussion and vote.

Meeting Close:

Beth Card mentioned that there would be a January task force meeting and thanked all the task force members for the work being conducted in the subcommittees. Seeing no other questions or comments from the group Beth took a motion to adjourn the meeting from Richard Robinson. Seconded by Julia Blatt. All those in favor said aye. The meeting was adjourned at 2:00 p.m.



The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs
100 Cambridge Street, Suite 900
Boston, MA 02114

Charles D. Baker
GOVERNOR

Karyn E. Polito
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

Kathleen A. Theoharides
SECRETARY

Tel: (617) 626-1000
Fax: (617) 626-1081
<http://www.mass.gov/eea>

Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century Task Force

Thursday, January 13, 2021
12:00PM

Meeting to be held via remote participation (details below)

AGENDA

1. Call to order and introductions
2. Routine business
 - b. Vote on MCTF meeting minutes from December 14, 2021
2. Calendar updates
 - a. Public Listening Session date confirmation
3. MCTF Subcommittee Updates – presentation on outline of recommendations
 - a. Pesticide Selection
 - b. Best Practices
 - c. Mosquito Control Policy Structure
 - d. Local Engagement
4. Process Updates

Note: This meeting will be hosted in a webinar format

Topic: Mosquito Control Task Force - Meeting #20

When: Jan 13, 2022 12:00 PM Eastern Time (US and Canada)

Please register in advance for this webinar using the link below. After registering, you will receive a confirmation email containing information about joining the webinar.

https://zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_--2LD8X2Ro-R8hGEHtEx1g

Mosquito Control Task Force (MCTF) Meeting #20 – Minutes

January 13, 2022, 12:00 p.m. via Zoom

Meeting Topics:

- Call to order and introductions
- Routine business
- Calendar updates
- MCTF Subcommittee Updates – presentation on outline of recommendations
- Process Updates

Call to order and introductions:

The full task force meeting was initiated at 12:03 p.m. by Beth Card. Task force members in attendance included Kevin Cranston, John Lebeaux, Nicole Keleher, Eve Schluter, Heidi Porter, Julia Blatt, Anita Deeley, Russell Hopping, Kim LeBeau, Bob Mann, Priscilla Matton, Brad Mitchell, Jennifer Pederson, Richard Pollack, Helen Poynton, Heidi Ricci, Stephen Rich, and Richard Robinson.

Routine business – Vote on meeting minutes from 12/14/21:

A motion was made to approve meeting minutes by Richard Robinson. Seconded by John Lebeaux. A roll call was conducted. Kevin Cranston (aye), John Lebeaux (aye), Nicole Keleher (aye), Kathy Baskin (not present), Eve Schluter (aye), Heidi Porter (aye), Derek Brindisi (not present), Julia Blatt (aye) Tonya Colpitts (not present), Anita Deeley (aye), Russell Hopping (aye), Kim LeBeau (aye), Bob Mann (aye), Priscilla Matton (aye), Brad Mitchell (not present), Jennifer Pederson (aye), Richard Pollack (aye), Helen Poynton (aye), Heidi Ricci (aye), Stephen Rich (aye), Richard Robinson (aye), Sam Telford (not present)

Beth Card encouraged the group to attend subcommittee meetings to ensure quorums were met, as time was tight and rescheduling meetings would be a challenge to the group. Beth Card asked subcommittee members to complete the scheduling poll that ERG had distributed regarding the establishment of additional subcommittee meetings. It was noted that some subcommittee members were interested in discussing the general goal of mosquito control and that would be a topic of conversation at the task force meeting in March before the final report was drafted.

Calendar updates:

Caroline Higley presented the working calendar and gave an update on task force and public listening session timelines. Additional meeting times were noted through March to allow for completion of the task force by the deadline. Julia Blatt voiced her concern in relation to discussing goals in March and suggested that it would be helpful if the topic of a framework and goal be earlier in the schedule. Beth Card noted that the subcommittees have targeted tasks ahead of finalizing everything and she would look at the calendar to see if accommodations could be made. Heidi Ricci added that the struggle to come to consensus in subcommittees was because there wasn't a goal and framework. Beth Card commented that the opinions and information shared in the task force meeting by subcommittees was preliminary and recommendations continue to evolve as items are added and removed. It was noted that there were some discussion questions to assist in guiding conversation if needed.

MCTF Subcommittee Updates – presentation on outline of recommendations:

Pesticide Selection – Bob Mann

Bob Mann noted that the subcommittee had perfect attendance and good engagement and added that the recommendation material was a living document that was still under development. The first topic that was discussed was minimum risk pesticides. The subcommittee was looking towards formalizing the review of

mosquito control pesticides use and would like to see DEP more involved in the process, ensure the selection process considered the impact on drinking water, and avoided the use of PFAS containing pesticides. Bob Mann noted that the subcommittee was proposing to not make a recommendation on active ingredients due to EPA and FIFRA testing. It was added that there was no recommendation for inert disclosure; however, the subcommittee was looking at amending the pesticide control act and adding DEP to the pesticide board subcommittee. Bob Mann noted that the subcommittee was struggling with inerts and discussed the EPA regulation process and entrusting EPA to handle that registration process, in addition to the consideration of CBI and the fact that manufacturers would not be pleased and may choose to not register their product in MA.

Questions/Comments:

Julia Blatt commented on the material that was received and that potentially one product approved by the state may have an impact on aquatic ecosystems. Bob Mann noted that point may be addressed through adherence to the label direction but could take Julia Blatt's question back to the subcommittee for discussion. Heidi Ricci discussed the regulatory process and ongoing controversies regarding the Center for Biological Diversity filing a notice of intent to sue EPA for failure to comply with the endangered species act and asked if the subcommittee had taken that information into account. Bob Mann commented that the center was very vocal against the use of pesticides and used the court system as a means for checks and balances. Bob Mann discussed his perspective on holding the EPA accountable to make the process better and noted that he did not believe that the process was flawed.

In reference to Julia Blatt's comments, Helen Poynton asked Julia Blatt for more information about her concerns, as Helen serves as the representative for ecological risk assessment as an ecotoxicologist on the subcommittee. Julia Blatt noted that what she read may not have been from the pesticide subcommittee, and detailed that her reading related to what was safe for aquatic ecosystems and there was enough concern and doubt if the product was safe. Julia Blatt added that she was not feeling very confident that was being addressed. Richard Robinson made general points about the process and noted that he thought the legislature had the responsibility of determining if what was recommended was cost-effective and he was interested in recommending things that do the best towards the charge the subcommittee was focused on.

John Lebeaux discussed the documenting of a transparent selection process and as the chair of the SRB had a few questions. John Lebeaux mentioned that if the SRB or subcommittee of the SRB would further review pesticide products and asked about the review itself in terms of what would it look like and what was being reviewed. It was also noted that because of the review, if the SRB had a concern about a product, what would the outcome of the review result in. John Lebeaux commented on the suggestion to develop an outreach campaign and noted that resources would be necessary. Bob Mann commented that those questions would be taken back to the subcommittee for consideration.

Richard Robinson discussed inert ingredients and lack of state information. Bob Mann noted that there were opportunities for improvement related to equal access and the ability to integrate IPM more successfully so the necessity for aerial spraying would be greatly reduced and the selection process for products for aerial spraying would be done in a better way. Bob Mann pointed out that inerts are a known universe by EPA and EPA considered those inert ingredients as part of a registration process. It was added that the process may lack transparency and perhaps that would change. There was a suggestion made that added costs associated with change in existing process should be pointed out to the legislature so they can make an informed decision.

Best Practices – Richard Robinson

Richard Robinson presented seven recommendations to the task force. Recommendations under Directive I, facilitating use of IPM, were introduced which included recommendations on statewide mosquito surveillance, improved consistency on the implementation of IPM, and limiting truck-based application of pesticides. There was discussion on establishing clear thresholds and objective data. Directive VI was presented, and it was noted that

the first recommendation on vulnerable population and non-target species would be split into two recommendation. Richard Robinson commented on the online reporting for private applicators recommendation and added this was developed to capture and provide data to inform on better ways to conduct mosquito control. Richard Robinson commented on recommendations under Directive IV, protecting organic agriculture from pesticide use, and touched on the agricultural opt-out recommendation and discussed the protected status of certified organic farms in the context of adding protection against aerial spraying through legislation and not just policy. It was noted the subcommittee was discussing criteria for the declaration of aerial spraying, education, and protection of arbovirus as statewide responsibility, and a multi part recommendation on protecting public water bodies.

Questions/Comments:

Kevin Cranston noted that conceptually DPH would welcome statewide mosquito control surveillance and commented on the detailed legal requirements. Criteria for a public health emergency was discussed and it was noted as challenge related to objectivity and application in a consistent way in a changing ecology. Kevin Cranston asked a question about thresholds related to truck-based application and what the subcommittee was focused on. Richard Robinson commented that the subcommittee was looking at thresholds for current practices. John Lebeaux noted that to implement would require resources not just for MCDs but for the SRB and DPH. John Lebeaux added that MCDs currently utilize IPM and called out that if MCDs aren't spraying for nuisance then private industry would be doing it. It was noted that MDAR receives a fair number of complaints related to private applicators making applications for mosquitoes but rarely does MDAR receive complaints about the MCDs. Richard Robinson commented on the IPM question and the limiting of truck-based spraying. It was also noted that it was not lost on the subcommittee that there was risk for having more private sector spraying. It was not currently part of the recommendation, but it was suggested standards should also exist for the private sector. Heidi Ricci commented that some of the practices that currently take place are not IPM and referenced nuisance spraying.

John Lebeaux discussed vulnerable populations and non-target species and asked what those terms meant. He also commented on the feasibility of removing all agriculture from pesticide application related to the difficulty of effectively conducting an aerial spray operation. He added that organic farms are excluded to protect their business model (so they could continue to sell their product as organic) and not because of any risk the application posed. Heidi Ricci mentioned that there are organic farms that are not certified that use organic farming practice and there could be impacts to the soils, not just impacts on the crops for that year.

Mosquito Control Policy Structure – Co-Chair Julia Blatt presenting on behalf of Chair Stephen Rich

Julia Blatt noted subcommittee Directives V and X. Julia Blatt discussed the subcommittee recommendation related to the repeal and revision of MGL 252 and enabling legislation. Julia Blatt commented that the legislation was enacted in 1918 and parts of the legislation are out of date. There was discussion about the creation of a new mosquito control oversight board that would include other state agencies. In addition, there was recommendation to change and modernize funding mechanisms for membership to unify and make mosquito control more consistent across the state. Julia Blatt discussed the recommendation to amend the stormwater handbook and relevant building codes was still being discussed and could potentially belong on another subcommittee.

Questions/Comments:

Kevin Cranston noted the concern about legislation that was over 100 years old and urged members to make rationale, clear, and convincing recommendations for legislative consideration. A question was posed in relation to revising the structure and function of the MCDs and would baseline mosquito control surveillance be part of that process. Julia Blatt commented on the MCD survey results and the concern in the variation across districts as coherent policy for the state. Julia Blatt added that the subcommittee recommendation would make it so everyone could join an MCD and have baseline services with menu-based items included as well.

John Lebeaux commented that as chair of the SRB, he needed to note that the Repeal of MGL 252 would eliminate the SRB and MCDs. He emphasized that those organizations must be preserved or recreated in this new structure. John Lebeaux added that it would be much easier to have a state agency or division be responsible for mosquito control and there was a need to think about transitioning staff from their current system to the state system. It was added there would also need to be thought about regional MCD commissioners. John Lebeaux suggested looking at the Pesticide Board and how it was organized as a potential example.

Local Engagement – Heidi Ricci

Heidi Ricci commented that there was a lack of a municipal perspective on the subcommittee and noted the group has done the best that they can in Derek Brindisi's absence. Heidi Ricci mentioned that they had ten recommendations under three directives and the subcommittee had reached a conceptual consensus on some of the recommendations. Heidi Ricci noted that the subcommittee's first recommendation for an online pesticide use reporting system had strong consensus. It was mentioned that the second recommendation related to marking methods could be modernized with GPS technology and the two recommendations are linked and would need funding. Heidi Ricci discussed the next two recommendations as being related to a new mosquito control management plan that would be based in science and have public input. Heidi Ricci noted that the subcommittee recognized that there would need to be plans in place for the transition to a new process where the MCDs would still exist.

Heidi Ricci noted that there was not consensus on the next set of recommendations on things like pesticide application and how that would link back to an IPM based approach. There were discussions about a municipal survey or other processes for public input. The next recommendation looked at the municipal opt-out process and it was mentioned that there had been some comments from the public and legislators regarding what the process would be for this year. Additional recommendations were discussed regarding the pilot evaluation of environmental impacts, increased sharing of data on pesticide application location, and increased transparency on operational exclusions for rare species and sensitive habitat.

Questions/Comments:

John Lebeaux commented on the first two recommendations related to an online system and requesting property exclusion and discussed the current process related to opting out. It was noted that AGR had not received many complaints about the current opt out system. Relative to the marking methods recommendation, he noted that not all MCDs may have the ability to use GIS coordinates for spraying. It was added that current marking methods for landowners may provide additional options to ensure spraying does not impact properties. Heidi Ricci appreciated the feedback and noted that the current system works well for small landowners but for large landowners it was not a great process and could take up to one whole day to input information.

Process Updates:

Beth Card asked the subcommittees, generally, if they were encountering any problems throughout their efforts to develop recommendations. Richard Robinson noted OML requirements as a challenge and referenced supreme judicial court documentation that may be pertinent to the conversation of what could be posted for review under OML as a potential solution. Jessica Burgess noted the nuance in the interpretation of OML and discussed that there have been different opinions from the AGO. Jessica Burgess noted that she consults with a number of attorneys and discussed that opportunities to share information in advance to ensure productivity and efficiency would be reviewed.

Heidi Ricci thanked ERG and agency staff for the work that had been done. Heidi Ricci noted some concern on the lack of municipal representation in Derek Brindisi's absence and added a request that EEA provide some further information and guidance on this year's opt out process. Beth Card discussed Derek Brindisi's future availability and noted the opt out was still being worked on.

Caroline Higley asked the group if there were any policy challenges the full task force should be considering ahead of draft recommendations. Some members of the task force discussed complexities and that the science was still evolving. A question was asked about recommendation submission timeline for the public listening session. Caroline Higley provided clarification on the timeline. It was noted that there was one opt out question in the Q&A that was flagged and addressed. Priscilla Matton asked about providing comments on other subcommittee recommendations that were presented. Caroline Higley noted that comments could be filtered through ERG and then to the subcommittees.

Vote to adjourn:

Beth took a motion to adjourn from Richard Robinson. Seconded by John Lebeaux. All in favor said aye. The meeting was adjourned at 1:50 p.m.



The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs
100 Cambridge Street, Suite 900
Boston, MA 02114

Charles D. Baker
GOVERNOR

Karyn E. Polito
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

Kathleen A. Theoharides
SECRETARY

Tel: (617) 626-1000
Fax: (617) 626-1081
<http://www.mass.gov/eea>

Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century Task Force

Monday, February 7, 2022
12:00PM

Meeting to be held via remote participation (details below)

AGENDA

1. Call to order and introductions
2. Routine business
 - a. Vote on MCTF meeting minutes from January 13, 2022
 - b. Calendar
3. Goals for Mosquito Control
 - a. Vote to determine if MCTF should set goals
 - b. Discussion on process
4. MCTF Subcommittee Updates – presentation on draft recommendations
 - a. Mosquito Control Policy Structure
 - b. Local Engagement
 - c. Best Practices
 - d. Pesticide Selection
5. Reminders
 - a. Public Listening Session on Feb 10; 4-6pm on draft recommendations
 - ii. Register for listening session here:
https://zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_q0sghooZQxSQ5EVtSyuvsg
 - iii. Register to speak at listening session here:
<https://forms.office.com/g/HS5RFrnHza>

Note: This meeting will be hosted in a webinar format

Topic: Mosquito Control Task Force - Meeting #21

When: Feb 7, 2022 12:00 PM Eastern Time (US and Canada)

Please register in advance for this webinar using the link below. After registering, you will receive a confirmation email containing information about joining the webinar.

https://zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_YLlp9c6_SbuT9Ir-IBvwJg

02.07 22 Mosquito Control Task Force (MCTF) Meeting #21 – Minutes

February 7, 2022, 12:00 p.m. via Zoom

Meeting Topics:

- Call to order and introductions
- Routine business
- Goals for Mosquito Control
- MCTF Subcommittee Updates – presentation on draft recommendations
- Reminders

Call to order and introductions:

The full task force meeting was initiated at 12:02 p.m. by Beth Card. Subcommittee members in attendance included Kevin Cranston, John Lebeaux, Nicole Keleher, Kathy Baskin, Eve Schluter, Heidi Porter, Julia Blatt, Tonya Colpitts, Anita Deeley, Russell Hopping, Kim LeBeau, Bob Mann, Priscilla Matton, Jennifer Pederson, Richard Pollack, Helen Poynton, Heidi Ricci, Stephen Rich, Richard Robinson, Sam Telford.

Routine business:

A motion was entertained by Beth Card to approve the 1/13/22 meeting minutes from Richard Robinson. Seconded by John Lebeaux. A roll call was conducted. Kevin Cranston (aye), John Lebeaux (aye), Nicole Keleher (aye), Kathy Baskin (aye), Eve Schluter (aye), Heidi Porter (aye), Derek Brindisi (not present), Julia Blatt (aye) Tonya Colpitts (not present), Anita Deeley (abstain), Russell Hopping (aye), Kim LeBeau (aye), Bob Mann (aye), Priscilla Matton (aye), Brad Mitchell (not present), Jennifer Pederson (aye), Richard Pollack (aye), Helen Poynton (did not vote), Heidi Ricci (aye), Stephen Rich (abstain), Richard Robinson (aye), Sam Telford (abstain)

Beth Card discussed the opt out process for the 2022 season and noted that EEA was working on the process based on the feedback that had been received. There were no notable updates, but information would be provided as the team worked through the development process. Beth Card noted the calendar for the remaining task force time frame through 3/31 and commented that it was a tight timeline and that the task force members and participants would do their best to ensure the meetings were as efficient and productive as possible to meet task force goals. The calendar was also available on the website in case task force members need to access it.

Goals for Mosquito Control:

Discussion on Process:

Beth Card provided an overview of the legislation and presented a slide on the goal process for mosquito control. Beth Card opened it up to the group for questions/comments on the process. Jennifer Pederson commented on what the difference would be between goals and recommendations and wanted to hear from those that posed the recommendation to create goals. Julia Blatt responded and provided her overview on the helpfulness of creating guiding goals and a purpose and believed that all the recommendations should align with a set of goals. Richard Robinson noted that his subcommittee had been wrestling with this question related to the state level mosquito control efforts and if these efforts should be about reducing disease risk or if they should encompass nuisance mosquito issues as well. Richard Pollack commented that he thought subcommittees needed an understanding of what was trying to be accomplished. Richard Pollack added that he is participating on three subcommittees and was listening to a lot of useful discussion and everyone had a different idea of what they wanted to get to. It was noted that some saw the goal as limiting or eliminating mosquito control. Richard Pollack mentioned that there was not a fine line in the sand between disease and nuisance mosquitoes and suggested that we try to figure out what the group does agree on and what direction the group wants to go. Heidi Ricci agreed with the commentary and thought it was important to what subcommittees were trying to accomplish. Bob Mann noted that goals

should have been considered at the beginning and noted that there was limited time left for the task force, and developing mission statements and goals takes time. John Lebeaux commented that great work had been done by the task force and the subcommittees to date and noted the time constraint related to the task force end date. It was added that the legislation provided detailed directives to the task force that led to many great ideas under discussion, but there may not be enough time to address goals and complete the task force work. Stephen Rich added that this was more about figuring out the pressure points of where there were disagreements, and it was not too late to be explicit about the goals we had in mind.

Beth Card provided her perspective on establishing goals. Jennifer Pederson noted timing as a concern and commented that she wouldn't feel comfortable voting until she heard from those on what their process was and what goals they came up with. Stephen Rich responded and discussed the role of disease versus nuisance mosquitoes and noted that the policy structure subcommittee moved past that to focus on protecting public health and the environment. Stephen Rich added that there was agreement that the goal should use best available science in mosquito management and a strong emphasis on the need for transparency within a modified mosquito management board. It was noted that the policy structure subcommittee did not come to an agreement on the definition of what was and was not a nuisance mosquito. Helen Poynton noted timing as a concern as well but suggested that the goals would help prioritize the rest of the process and make it more efficient going forward. Task force members discussed the goal voting process and the sequence of events. Richard Robinson suggested that each subcommittee come up with two or three goal sentences for mosquito management and spend no more than a half hour to see if there was majority consensus.

Vote to Determine if MCTF Should Set Goals:

A motion was entertained by Beth Card to establish goals for the MCTF by Julia Blatt. Seconded by Richard Pollack. A roll call was conducted. Kevin Cranston (aye), John Lebeaux (no), Nicole Keleher (no), Kathy Baskin (no), Eve Schluter (no), Heidi Porter (aye), Derek Brindisi (not present), Julia Blatt (aye) Tonya Colpitts (not present), Anita Deeley (no), Russell Hopping (aye), Kim LeBeau (no), Bob Mann (no), Priscilla Matton (no), Brad Mitchell (not present), Jennifer Pederson (no), Richard Pollack (aye), Helen Poynton (aye), Heidi Ricci (aye), Stephen Rich (aye), Richard Robinson (aye), Sam Telford (aye). The majority of the task force members ruled in favor of creating goals. It was noted that time would be dedicated at the March meeting for the goal discussion and follow up information would be distributed to the subcommittees.

MCTF Subcommittee Updates – Presentation on draft recommendations:

Policy Structure – Stephen Rich:

It was noted that there was subcommittee consensus that MGL 252 was not meeting 21st century needs. There was discussion related to the newly constituted SRB including representatives from DPH, MDAR, and other state agencies in addition to giving the reconstituted board the ability to create subcommittees as needed. Stephen Rich noted that there was a lot of conversations related to the benefit of a centralized structure to mosquito control. It was added that time was spent making sure there was a bridge for the MCDs to ensure they continue to exist if there was a repeal and replace of the existing legislation. Stephen Rich commented on amending the stormwater handbook and noted that the subcommittee was universally in support that this needed to be part of task force business. Stephen Rich discussed recommendations that focused on revising the structure and funding of MCDs, tiered options to provide and menu of services to municipalities, and the establishment of baseline mosquito services, such as, education and surveillance, which would put more control in the hands of municipalities.

Questions/Comments:

Julia Blatt pointed out that the policy structure subcommittee was still discussing the third and fourth recommendations. John Lebeaux commented on the recommendation for a centralized process and noted that currently the SRB handles HR and Payroll functions. Richard Robinson commented on the reporting of mosquito

control activities and spraying of pesticides may overlap with recommendations the best practices subcommittee was working on. Kevin Cranston discussed funding and structure related to the third and fourth draft recommendations. Heidi Ricci noted some overlap with base funding and the option for communities to paying for other services if they chose to do so. Jennifer Pederson had a question regarding the stormwater recommendation and where the subcommittee was thinking about heading with the recommendation. Heidi Ricci added that what was being discussed was consistent with what DEP was already recommending and referenced mapping of privately owned properties. Heidi Ricci noted that when new developments were built, they should not be creating new mosquito habitat. Jennifer Pederson cautioned the subcommittee to not make it too difficult and to think about for municipal implementation of the recommendation. John Lebeaux commented on a suggested recommendation and referenced the Pioneer Valley MCD as a case study as a district that was set up with a menu-based approach. It was noted that the Pioneer Valley MCD has struggled to get buy in in a way that would allow them to operate. It was suggested that there would need to be a funding provision at the state level or with the cherry sheet to support a menu-based practice.

Local Engagement – Heidi Ricci:

Heidi Ricci highlighted where the subcommittee had agreement and where there was still some work to do. Heidi Ricci discussed the online system recommendation and acknowledged that this new approach would require funding and time to implement. Public engagement with DPH and public input into the process was noted as a recommendation area for the subcommittee. Heidi Ricci discussed a menu-based approach with baseline services related to surveillance, education, and source reduction. Heidi Ricci commented on wetland restoration and culvert replacement and noted this was an area that having the MCDs available was a benefit. Pilot opportunities with universities and NGOs was mentioned in addition to a desire to get more information on where pesticides were being applied by both MCD's and private applicators. It was noted that there would need to be funding included in the recommendation language. Heidi Ricci commented on the exclusion of rare species and habitat and noted that discussions and input from Eve Schluter were ongoing related to the information that could be made public versus what could not be made public.

Questions/Comments:

John Lebeaux flagged the timeframe for the public comment process as it related to public engagement and suggested that there be language included in the recommendation to ensure the time involved to do this was built into the process. Pioneer Valley MCD was referenced as an example of a menu-based approach and there was discussion on the need for funding and resources to ensure projects and investigations could be done in the right way. Heidi Ricci noted that there was no public input process on the state arbovirus plan and the emergency response plan and discussed the view for the process moving forward. Richard Robinson asked about points of contention within the subcommittee and Heidi Ricci commented that she would not characterize it as contention but more difficulty in the details of how to implement.

Eve Schluter commented on the seventh recommendation and determining if the recommendations added value or made the process more onerous and noted a potential opportunity to leverage existing processes for improvement rather than creating a new system. Bob Mann elaborated on the recommendation and discussed the EPA registration process as it related to the endangered species act. Bob Mann made the point that this could be something coming from outside of the task force. Eve Schluter commented that the EPA would only be reviewing federally listed species and may not lead to an exclusion in the Commonwealth. It was pointed out that there was a nuance there.

Best Practices – Richard Robinson:

It was noted that there were fifteen draft recommendation with themes related to science based best practices on a variety of different aspects of mosquito management. Richard Robinson commented on the extensive discussions on the goal of mosquito management at the state level and disease versus nuisance. There was

mention of the points on aerial application of pesticides and it was noted that there was not complete agreement amongst the subcommittee. Richard Robinson referenced the recommendation points that dealt with the protection of public water supplies, the protection of vulnerable populations and non-target species, the criteria for the establishment of a public health emergency, and the last two recommendations that had to do with agricultural opt out, and protection of organic farms. Richard Robinson commented on the issues related to certified organic farms and that there were other farms that utilize organic farming practices but do not get certified federally. Commercial farms were mentioned related to what opt out options should exist for them. Richard Robinson added that his opinion was that every farm should be certified organic.*

Questions/Comments:

Jennifer Pederson noted the focus on drinking water and commented on the challenges related to the private applicator conversation. John Lebeaux noted that IPM did not mean no pesticides used and flagged that any changes to the IPM definition language in statute might result in a disruption to the pesticide regulation process. John Lebeaux added commentary to the recommendation on limiting ground based adulticides and the emergency application scenario and emphasized that the use of pesticides was a tool and not the automatic last resort in the process. There was commentary on the September 2019 spray data efficacy versus the August 2019 spray data efficacy related to aerial application. John Lebeaux discussed the water monitoring process in previous years, annual reporting, and the EPA registration process. It was added that resources would be needed for any additional testing and it was noted that the overall consideration on the distinction of what was nuisance control and what was disease control could include overlapping components in both cases.

Bob Mann commented on private applicators and acknowledged the concerns being expressed were valid and discussed the work being done in many different states. Bob Mann added that the more IPM was emphasized, the more best management practices could be utilized to drive down the necessity of aerial application. He noted he would be more in favor if aerial applications were a last resort, but removing them all together would not be agreeable. It was noted that the more you squeeze the regulated space the more you will push people into a non-regulated space. Kevin Cranston discussed local opinions on aerial adulticiding and noted concerns with establishing a fixed criterion for establishing a public health emergency.

Heidi Ricci clarified the subcommittee was not suggesting redefining IPM and commented on non-target impact monitoring. It was added that the ERG report stated there was no quantifiable data available on efficacy and it was recommended that everyone on the task force review the legislative hearings that provided additional information on chemicals and how they affect the environment and people. Heidi Ricci commented on the written response provided by DPH and requested the response be put on DPH letter head, signed, and posted to the website for viewing. Richard Robinson noted several comments in the Zoom Q&A, and he noted that the best practices subcommittee had a meeting on 2/8 and requested access to notes for that meeting. Caroline Higley agreed to follow-up.

Pesticide Selection – Bob Mann:

Bob Mann discussed the selection process for pesticides and moved into the consideration of synergists and CBI and noted that the subcommittee was still working through these points. Bob Mann addressed PFAS and it was noted that there was consideration related to the pesticide containers and that PFAS found in the mosquito control products was still a bit of a moving target. It was noted that there were mechanisms in place for review of PFAS and there were resolutions in place for stop orders if something were to be discovered in the pesticide products.

Questions/Comments:

John Lebeaux commented on the change in law and regulations and noted current MDAR staff and resources. It was added to accomplish the desired recommendations would require resources for MDAR. Richard Robinson

asked a clarification question regarding ingredients that were referenced. It was noted that there were currently 4,500 inert ingredients related to pesticides and Richard Robinson asked if that number was related to pesticides for mosquito control. MDAR team noted that they would get clarification to answer the question.

Reminders:

Beth Card updated the group on the public listening session which would be taking place on Thursday 2/10/22. It was noted that the listening session would be recorded and there was discussion related to the timeline for incorporating public listening session feedback into draft recommendation. Heidi Ricci discussed the public comment submission website and suggested that there be a filter added to allow the public to submit general comments if they needed to. Helen Poynton had a process question related to reconciling subcommittee recommendations that may have similarities or overlap. Caroline Higley discussed the subcommittee reconciliation process and noted that it would be addressed. Taryn LaScola commented on the 4,500 inert ingredients that were previously referenced and clarified that number represented the entire universe of pesticides. Kim LeBeau added to Helen Poynton's comments and suggested that ERG pull content together to determine overlap in subcommittee recommendations.

Meeting Close and Vote to Adjourn:

Seeing no other questions or comments from the group a motion was made to adjourn the meeting from Jennifer Pederson. Seconded by Eve Schluter. All in favor said aye. The full task force meeting was adjourned at 2:04 p.m.

** Update 3/3/2022: Given that this was a general subcommittee update, R. Robinson requested that his personal opinion be eliminated from this portion of record.*



The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs
100 Cambridge Street, Suite 900
Boston, MA 02114

Charles D. Baker
GOVERNOR

Karyn E. Polito
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

Kathleen A. Theoharides
SECRETARY

Tel: (617) 626-1000
Fax: (617) 626-1081
<http://www.mass.gov/eea>

Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century Task Force

Thursday, March 3, 2022
12:00PM

Meeting to be held via remote participation (details below)

AGENDA

1. Call to order and introductions
2. Routine business
 - a. Vote on MCTF meeting minutes from February 7, 2022
3. Goals for Mosquito Control
 - a. Presentation, discussion, and revision of goal statement
 - b. Vote on a goal statement for mosquito control
4. MCTF Recommendations
 - a. Presentation on proposed ground rules
 - b. Presentation on polling results
 - c. Discussion on recommendations

Note: This meeting will be hosted in a webinar format

Topic: Mosquito Control Task Force - Meeting #22

When: Mar 3, 2022 12:00 PM Eastern Time (US and Canada)

Please register in advance for this webinar using the link below. After registering, you will receive a confirmation email containing information about joining the webinar.

https://zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_Luwy7bIiRluksb0Vn3I9iQ

03.03.22 Mosquito Control Task Force (MCTF) Meeting #22 – Minutes

March 3, 2022, 12:00 p.m. via Zoom

Meeting Topics:

- Call to order and introductions
- Routine business
- Goals for Mosquito Control
- MCTF Recommendations

Call to order and introductions:

The full task force meeting was called to order at 12:02 p.m. by Beth Card. A housekeeping and agenda update was provided. Members in attendance included Kevin Cranston, John Lebeaux, Nicole Keleher, Kathy Baskin, Brad Mitchell, Heidi Porter, Julia Blatt, Anita Deeley, Derek Brindisi, Russell Hopping, Kim LeBeau, Bob Mann, Priscilla Matton, Jennifer Pederson, Richard Pollack, Helen Poynton, Heidi Ricci, Richard Robinson, and Sam Telford.

Routine business:

A motion was entertained by Beth Card to approve the 2/07/22 meeting minutes as amended. A motion was made by Jennifer Pederson. Seconded by Richard Robinson. A roll call was conducted. Kevin Cranston (aye), John Lebeaux (aye), Nicole Keleher (aye), Kathy Baskin (aye), Eve Schluter (not present for vote), Heidi Porter (aye), Derek Brindisi (not present for vote), Julia Blatt (aye) Tonya Colpitts (not present for vote), Anita Deeley (aye), Russell Hopping (aye), Kim LeBeau (aye), Bob Mann (aye), Priscilla Matton (aye), Brad Mitchell (abstain), Jennifer Pederson (aye), Richard Pollack (aye), Helen Poynton (aye), Heidi Ricci (aye), Stephen Rich (not present for vote), Richard Robinson (aye), Sam Telford (not present for vote)

Beth Card discussed the ERG polling process and noted that ERG would be assuming the role of meeting facilitator in order to allow her to participate as a member of the task force. It was mentioned that Friday, March 25th from 2:00-4:00 p.m. should be reserved in case an additional meeting was needed before final voting on March 29th. Beth Card commented on questions that were received about what would go to the Legislature at the end of the task force process and noted that the last task force meeting would be reserved for closing statements and recommendation voting.

Heidi Ricci commented with request for inclusion of a task force narrative section with a description of process and a summary to capture the key issues that were identified in addition to capturing the many public comments that were received. Heidi Ricci also discussed her concerns related to minority opinions and wanted to ensure that task force members would be able to submit key issues that were not addressed in the recommendation language. Beth Card provided a clarification in relation to a summary of task force work and commented on the inclusion of public input. It was noted that the team would work with ERG to see what could be prepared. Beth Card added that she thought it made sense to tell the story of how the task force members conducted their work. Richard Robinson asked how the report would be provided to the Legislature and task force members. Caroline Higley read aloud the legislative language requirements.

Goals for Mosquito Control:

Presentation, discussion, and revision of goal statement:

Diana Pietri, ERG Facilitator, shared a slide deck with the task force members and provided an overview on the development of a goal statement for the MCTF. A reminder was provided that the goal statement would need majority task force support to be included in the report to the Legislature. Abby Burton, ERG Facilitator, shared the results of the goal statement poll with the task force members and noted the proposal that 2/3 task force member support be the threshold for inclusion. Abby Burton presented the proposed goal statement: *Massachusetts*

mosquito control program and control decisions should follow the best available science, follow an Integrated Pest Management (IPM) approach, be designed to minimize impacts on non-target species, be transparent, actively engage with the public and minimize the incidence of mosquito borne diseases in humans.

Questions/Comments:

Brad Mitchell agreed with all the goals but had a concern with the stated goal on minimizing the incidence of mosquito borne diseases and noted his concern that some would read the goal precluded nuisance control. Richard Pollack agreed with Brad Mitchell's comments and noted the wording seemed to indicate that the goal of the program was a single goal, which was not what was discussed in the subcommittee meeting. Richard Robinson noted that addressing human health was a large missing piece in the proposed goal statement and added there was no statements related to concern for a group of people that the task force was charged with addressing. Heidi Ricci agreed with Richard Robinson and noted the human health impacts of pesticides needed to be addressed. Heidi Ricci referenced Dr. Oliver's studies and noted that there needed to be something added about public health and efficacy. Julia Blatt noted that the focus on human health was a unanimous decision in the subcommittee and should be included. Russell Hopping discussed gaps and commented on filling gaps to ensure the best available science was used.

Beth Card commented on considering the inclusion of all of the proposed goal information and statements that were listed. Helen Poynton commented on what was missing from the list related to research to fill gaps and addressing vulnerable populations. Diana Pietri and Abby Burton noted that the list was everything that was put forward by the subcommittees. Helen Poynton noted that the research was not part of the poll. Diana Pietri discussed the four proposals that the task force members were considering. Brad Mitchell noted that the concern was the way the goal was written related to minimizing the incidence of mosquito-borne diseases in humans. Richard Pollack proposed that the goal of the program wording be revised to "a" goal of the program as opposed to "the" goal of the program.

Diana Pietri took a poll via a show of virtual hands to see who was in favor of including impacts to human health in the goal statement. Heidi Ricci, Richard Robinson, Anita Deeley, Julia Blatt, Russell Hopping, Derek Brindisi, Kim LeBeau, Heidi Porter, Nicole Keleher, Helen Poynton, Jennifer Pederson, Beth Card, Kathy Baskin, and John Lebeaux supported the suggestion. Heidi Ricci suggested including to protect public/human health. Richard Robinson suggested including information from the enabling legislation and read the legislation language to the task force members. Jennifer Pederson suggested leaving the language broad and noted that she liked Heidi Ricci's suggestion. An additional poll was conducted to determine support for language on protecting public health. Kevin Cranston, Jennifer Pederson, Bob Mann, Kathy Baskin, Heidi Ricci, Helen Poynton, Richard Pollack, Julia Blatt, Richard Robinson, Sam Telford, Russell Hopping, Beth Card, Heidi Porter, Anita Deeley, Brad Mitchell, Priscilla Matton, and John Lebeaux supported the suggestion.

There was discussion on the inclusion of research to fill gaps in the goal statement. A poll was conducted. Helen Poynton, Richard Pollack, Kevin Cranston, Kathy Baskin, Julia Blatt, Russell Hopping, Nicole Kelleher, Helen Poynton, Sam Telford, Richard Robinson, Bob Mann, Brad Mitchell, Heidi Ricci, Anita Deeley, Kim LeBeau, Jennifer Pederson, and Derek Brindisi supported the suggestion. Another poll was conducted to assess support for including all the statements in the goal. Four people raised their hand, and it was noted that this was not something that would be pursued. Diana Pietri discussed the final item that was proposed, on the removal of "the" from "minimize the incidence of mosquito-borne diseases in humans". A poll was conducted. Heidi Ricci, Priscilla Matton, Jennifer Pederson, Brad Mitchell, Nicole Keleher, Kevin Cranston, Derek Brindisi, Sam Telford, John Lebeaux, Beth Card, Kathy Baskin, Richard Robinson, Richard Pollack, Brad Mitchell, Kim LeBeau, Helen Poynton, and Russell Hopping supported the suggestion. Heidi Ricci commented on the polling results and asked if all of the items that received a majority result in polling should be included. A poll was conducted. Julia Blatt, Russell Hopping, Richard Robinson, Anita Deeley, Heidi Ricci, and Derek Brindisi supported inclusion.

Vote on goal statement for mosquito control:

A motion was entertained by Beth Card to seek a vote on the goal statement as modified based on conversations from task force members. A motion was made by Kevin Cranston. Seconded by Jennifer Pederson. A roll call was conducted. Kevin Cranston (aye), John Lebeaux (aye), Nicole Keleher (aye), Kathy Baskin (aye), Eve Schluter (not present), Heidi Porter (aye), Derek Brindisi (aye), Julia Blatt (aye) Tonya Colpitts (not present), Anita Deeley (aye), Russell Hopping (aye), Kim LeBeau (aye), Bob Mann (aye), Priscilla Matton (aye), Brad Mitchell (aye), Jennifer Pederson (aye), Richard Pollack (aye), Helen Poynton (aye), Heidi Ricci (aye), Stephen Rich (not present), Richard Robinson (no), Sam Telford (aye). The motion was accepted. Heidi Ricci noted her opinion that the goal should have also included efficacy and accountability.

MCTF Recommendations:

Presentation on proposed ground rules:

Diana Pietri shared a slide deck with the group and provided an overview and a summary flow chart of the tiered recommendations and voting process. Helen Poynton asked what percentage of the task force responded to the poll and commented that there was less than twenty-four hours to respond. Abby Burton noted that there was a 65% response rate from the task force. Heidi Ricci commented that she thought all the recommendations put forth by the subcommittees should be considered and she was concerned that the Local Engagement subcommittee did not have municipal representation and commented that there were several recommendations that were split 2-2 votes. Heidi Ricci suggested a process for task force members to draft minority opinions to present at the next task force meeting.

Beth Card asked for clarification from Heidi Ricci on recommendations that were minority opinion, and Heidi Ricci noted the things that she wanted to raise were central to the task force and that she would like to present those for consideration in the next meeting. Heidi Ricci discussed the instructions that were provided in subcommittees regarding voting on the recommendations as they were written. Beth Card added that for items that did not become recommendations, there were mechanisms in which either the Legislature could become apprised of those items or in which individuals could seek to provide information to the Legislature, and as a result and in light of timing, she did not recommend addressing these things in the next task force meeting. Richard Robinson suggested seeing all of the votes in a recommendation before moving forward. Jennifer Pederson agreed with Beth Card that it was hard to bring into the process recommendations that people may have initially thought were important but did not make it through the subcommittee processes. Jennifer Pederson noted in other task force groups that she has been involved with, in instances where task force members were not happy, they put together a minority opinion report or sent letters to pass onto the Legislature. Priscilla Matton added that there were challenges associated with contacting legislators as a state employee and she was hopeful to address concerns.

Presentation on polling results:

Abby Burton shared a slide deck and provided an overview to the group of the poll results based on the responses that were received. Heidi Ricci discussed her concerns and noted that the menu-based approach was included to give local control and she thought it was very important for the group as a whole discuss this topic. Heidi Ricci added that all tier 2 recommendations needed consideration here. Kevin Cranston asked a clarification question about the partial poll response that was captured in the slide deck. Abby Burton noted that one person started the survey and did not finish. Kevin Cranston asked about the threshold for what was considered ready to vote and Abby Burton clarified that the proposal was 67%. Kim LeBeau noted that she would like to see the information emailed to the task force members so it could be digested, and she wanted to see the comments that people left in the poll. Caroline Higley mentioned that all of the content would be shared.

Beth Card noted that there would need to be a way to ensure that the minority opinions existed and added that in the report itself there could be a summary narrative to acknowledge the list of ideas as potential

recommendations but not endorsed by the task force. Heidi Ricci suggested offering Derek Brindisi the opportunity to vote on those Local Engagement recommendations where he was not present and noted that Derek Brindisi was the municipal representative on that subcommittee and was key to the municipal interests. Heidi Ricci added that she was concerned with relegating these items to an appendix based on the way two people voted on the whole task force. Beth Card noted that she was not sure that a special public meeting could be established to accommodate a vote that did not happen but if there was a way to give Derek Brindisi the opportunity to weigh in, it would be considered.

Heidi Ricci commented on the way she thought subcommittees were told to vote on recommendations and how it changed in the middle and she wanted to register her objections. Russell Hopping asked for clarification on the minority opinion recommendations and if they were the same as tier 2. Diana Pietri provided clarification on tier 2 recommendations. Russell Hopping noted that he did find it problematic that seven task force members had not voted in the poll and proposed having more time to complete the poll to see if it changed the tier 2 recommendations. Julia Blatt agreed with Russell Hopping's suggestion. Jennifer Pederson suggested that the minority supported recommendations be put to a vote. Caroline Higley discussed taking the less than 50% task force poll response recommendations and calling them a tier 3 recommendation that would be moved to the full task force meeting on 3/29 for a vote. A poll was conducted to move those recommendations into a tier 3 bucket. Jennifer Pederson, Beth Card, Anita Deeley, Helen Poynton, Nicole Keleher, Kevin Cranston, John Lebeaux, Kathy Baskin, Russell Hopping, Richard Robinson, Heidi Ricci, Derek Brindisi, and Julia Blatt supported the suggestion.

Discussion on recommendations:

- Policy Structure Subcommittee:

POL-1: Repeal and replace M.G.L. c. 252 and enabling MCD legislation or amend M.G.L. c. 252 and repeal MCD enabling legislation: Diana Pietri shared the recommendation draft with the task force members and provided a recap of the content and language. Comments from the poll were provided to the task force members. Items were reviewed that were still under consideration in relation to recommendation discussion, clarification, funding, personnel, continuity of public health protection, and the need to support current services and equipment within the MCDs.

Questions/comments:

Jennifer Pederson discussed repealing the existing legislation and noted that it would be a huge effort and asked for clarification if it was truly a repeal of the legislation or amending certain areas. Priscilla Matton discussed the current SRB structure, services, and funding process through the state versus member towns and noted she did not see the funding needs specified in the recommendation language. Richard Robinson noted that additional information and caution was needed since it was challenging to break down and rebuild a whole structure. Heidi Ricci recognized that the recommendation was a big change and would require funding and asked EEA what the intention was with regard to how the recommendations would be proposed to the Legislature. Beth Card provided clarification related to the report and recommendations being provided directly to the Legislature. Jessica Burgess addressed the previous comments related to the amend versus repeal process of MGL 252.

Meeting Close and Vote to Adjourn:

Beth Card commented on the collaboration of the task force members and noted there was follow up required based on conversations from the meeting. It was noted that the question of feasibility would be addressed. Seeing no other questions or comments from the group, Beth Card entertained a motion to adjourn the meeting from John Lebeaux. Seconded by Kevin Cranston. All in favor said aye. The full task force meeting was adjourned at 2:01 p.m.



The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs
100 Cambridge Street, Suite 900
Boston, MA 02114

Charles D. Baker
GOVERNOR

Karyn E. Polito
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

Kathleen A. Theoharides
SECRETARY

Tel: (617) 626-1000
Fax: (617) 626-1081
<http://www.mass.gov/eea>

Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century Task Force

Monday, March 21, 2022
12:00PM

Meeting to be held via remote participation (details below)

AGENDA

1. Call to order and introductions
2. Routine business
 - a. Vote on MCTF meeting minutes from March 3, 2022
3. MCTF Recommendations
 - a. Discussion on recommendations (with goal to discuss the following; subject to change)
 - ii. POL-1; continued
 - iii. PS-6
 - iv. BP-13
 - v. BP-14
 - vi. POL-3
 - vii. LE-6
 - viii. BP-2

Note: This meeting will be hosted in a webinar format

Topic: Mosquito Control Task Force - Meeting #23

When: March 21, 2022 12:00 PM Eastern Time (US and Canada)

Please register in advance for this webinar using the link below. After registering, you will receive a confirmation email containing information about joining the webinar.

https://zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_5yvsyDpdTBeFxCbqohVYig

03.21.22 Mosquito Control Task Force (MCTF) Meeting #23 – Minutes

March 21, 2022, 12:00 p.m. via Zoom

Meeting Topics:

- Call to Order and Introductions
- Routine Business
- MCTF Recommendations
 - Discussion on recommendations

Call to Order and Introductions:

The task force meeting was called to order at 12:02 p.m. by Beth Card. An agenda update was provided. It was noted that ERG would continue taking the lead on meeting logistics. Task force members in attendance included Kevin Cranston, John Lebeaux, Kathy Baskin, Eve Schluter, Heidi Porter, Derek Brindisi, Julia Blatt, Anita Deeley, Russell Hopping, Kim LeBeau, Bob Mann, Priscilla Matton, Brad Mitchell, Jennifer Pederson, Richard Pollack, Helen Poynton, Heidi Ricci, Stephen Rich, Richard Robinson, and Sam Telford.

Routine Business:

A motion was entertained by Beth Card to approve the 3/03/22 task force meeting minutes as written. A motion was made by John Lebeaux. Seconded by Jennifer Pederson. A roll call was conducted. Kevin Cranston (aye), John Lebeaux (aye), Nicole Keleher (not present for vote), Kathy Baskin (aye), Eve Schluter (abstain), Heidi Porter (aye), Derek Brindisi (aye), Julia Blatt (aye) Tonya Colpitts (not present for vote), Anita Deeley (not present for vote), Russell Hopping (aye), Kim LeBeau (aye), Bob Mann (aye), Priscilla Matton (aye), Brad Mitchell (not present for vote), Jennifer Pederson (aye), Richard Pollack (aye), Helen Poynton (aye), Heidi Ricci (aye), Stephen Rich (abstain), Richard Robinson (aye), Sam Telford (aye).

MCTF Recommendations:

The agenda was shared with task force members. It was noted that the Friday 3/25 task force meeting would focus on completing discussion of tier 1 recommendations and that there would be an additional sixty minutes allotted for recommendations that task force members may want to discuss. It was added that the task force meeting on 3/29 would be held to conduct voting on all recommendations that were put forth by the subcommittees. Caroline Higley discussed the report structure and noted the aggregation of materials and the new addition of an appendix to include all of the meeting minutes and content that was voted on by task force members. It was noted that ERG copy editors were reviewing the report and would share a tracked changes copy before the task force meeting on Friday 3/25. Diana Pietri discussed the structure and goal for the task force meeting.

Discussion on Recommendations:

POL-1: Repeal and replace M.G.L. c. 252 and enabling MCD legislation or amend M.G.L. c. 252 and repeal MCD enabling legislation – (Continued): Diana Pietri commented that the recommendation was a continued discussion from the 3/3 task force meeting. Slides were presented to the group that provided a content overview of the recommendation language.

Questions/Comments:

Richard Robinson asked if the recommendation did not pass or if the legislature did not entertain it, were there other recommendations that would cover similar ground. Kevin Cranston noted that the recommendation had a lot of detail and discussed the legislative proposal process and noted that the legislature would act or not act on this recommendation as it so chooses. The group circled back to Richard Robinson's question and Stephen Rich

provided a response. Heidi Ricci added that she thought there were other recommendations that included similar content. Heidi Ricci noted that the Local Engagement subcommittee recommendation on a menu-based approach had the explicit statement that it would replace the current state authority with a municipal opt-in. Brad Mitchell noted that the existing legislation was out of date with norms, nomenclature, and goals and suggested that it would be much more efficient to rewrite the legislation and start from scratch.

PS-6: Consideration of Novel Risk/Exposure Scenarios: Diana Pietri presented slides to the group that provided an overview of recommendation content and task force member poll comments.

Questions/Comments:

Priscilla Matton commented that she voted against the recommendation but was not against research. Priscilla Matton noted that she felt that the recommendation was too broad related to who would be making decisions and how funding would be allocated. Priscilla Matton added that she supported the idea of research and risk analysis but not in this form. Heidi Ricci asked how the subcommittee defined novel risk exposure scenarios and if there were any considerations in regard to the registration system and things it did not capture. Brad Mitchell commented that the recommendation was meant for exposure scenarios and risks that were not captured by the registration standard. It was added that the subcommittee tried to broaden out the recommendation to address things that were raised by subcommittee members.

BP-13: Research the Impacts of Pesticides on Vulnerable Populations: Diana Pietri presented slides to the group that provided an overview of recommendation content and task force member poll comments.

Questions/Comments:

Kevin Cranston reflected on the content from Dr. Nascarella's presentation to the task force related to the fundamental challenges in naming and evaluating size of populations and chemical sensitivities. It was added that this was a large undertaking to identify and quantify the populations at risk being identified by this recommendation. Richard Robinson pointed out that this was one of the few recommendations that actually addressed something that was in the enabling legislation that the task force was charged with. Beth Card provided a general comment related to funding and suggested caution with providing the burden on how to pay for things through this process. It was noted that the job of the task force was to make recommendations on what the group thought was the best approach. Heidi Ricci agreed with Richard Robinson that this was one of the few recommendations that began to get at a key charge of the task force. Richard Pollack commented on the mandate to discuss this issue and noted to the task force that this recommendation had been discussed and debated quite a bit.

BP-14: Criteria for Declaring a Public Health Hazard: Diana Pietri presented slides to the group that provided an overview of recommendation content and task force member poll comments.

Questions/Comments:

Julia Blatt asked if someone from the subcommittee could discuss what they saw as a gap in current practices. Priscilla Matton discussed her viewpoint and experience related to the information that went into the decision-making process and noted that transparency was more of what the subcommittee was trying to address. Richard Robinson added that there was much discussion and over the course of time the insistence on rigor of a published criteria to determine a public health hazard mellowed a bit.

POL-3: Revise the structure, function, and funding of MCDs to ensure a comprehensive and cohesive framework for mosquito control across Massachusetts that establishes baseline mosquito control services for all towns/municipalities in the commonwealth, allows towns to join MCDs at lower costs, and allows people/member towns to add services as they wish/as needed: Diana Pietri presented slides to the group that provided an overview of recommendation content and task force member poll comments.

Questions/Comments:

Priscilla Matton asked a question on funding for towns that were not part of an MCD and noted that how the funding from cities, towns, and the state would get divided up was a concern. Richard Pollack commented that Priscilla Matton raised a good point and that it was a bit beyond what the subcommittee reviewed. Richard Pollack added that the recommendation centralized services and was to an extent the status quo. Heidi Ricci noted that the thinking was that every community should have access to basic services without signing up for things that they didn't want, and education/surveillance would need to be coordinated and funded by the state and the MCDs could still use resources that were provided by the state. Richard Robinson noted that he liked the proposal since it put the menu-based approach in the purview of the towns. Richard Robinson added that he had concern regarding funding since the proposal was funding neutral but had the ability to disrupt the way mosquito control was done. Priscilla Matton discussed state-based education, surveillance, and who would be doing source reduction and water management. Kevin Cranston noted public health education as a DPH responsibility; however, mosquito management would fall outside of DPH scope. It was added that DPH had some limited roles with collection, but the full scale of collection fell on the MCDs.

BP-2: Limiting Ground-Based Applications of Adulticides: Diana Pietri presented slides to the group that provided an overview of recommendation content and task force member poll comments.

Questions/Comments:

Julia Blatt noted that she was the person who wanted to know why people voted against this recommendation and commented that she was interested in hearing the pros and cons of the debate. Richard Robinson responded that the subcommittee spent a lot of time on this recommendation and noted that the intent was to highlight the situations in which adulticiding would be acceptable, and by contrast, the situations in which it was not acceptable. Kevin Cranston asked if it was an intentional exclusion of mosquito infection data as one of the factors of the decision. Priscilla Matton commented that threshold had not officially been determined and it was left vague since it would be determined within the policy of the new mosquito management plan, which would be an aggregate of the GEIR and the state surveillance response plan. It was added that finding virus first was left out as a criteria because that was a more reactive than proactive action in terms of reducing risk. Priscilla Matton addressed Julia Blatt's question and noted that some of the comments on the task force had been related to concerns about spraying but that was not reflective of reality. Priscilla Matton added that her MCD gets 15,000 spray requests per year and she did not think that there was a dislike of the service from those towns that were part of an MCD. Russell Hopping noted that he did not vote for the recommendation because it didn't provide clarity in allowing for the aggregation of complaints and it didn't seem to change the status quo very much.

LE-6: Increased sharing of pesticide application locations: Diana Pietri presented slides to the group that provided an overview of recommendation content and task force member poll comments.

Questions/Comments:

Richard Robinson noted that this recommendation had some synergy with the *BP-7: Online Reporting for Commercial Applicators*, as a way to get data on where pesticides were being applied to an environment over the course of many seasons. Heidi Ricci added that the interest here was to better track for the purposes of measuring efficacy as there isn't a current mechanism for mapping applications and other activities being done related to surveillance data on mosquito populations. Heidi Ricci noted that it was about efficacy as much as it was about impacts and bringing mosquito control into the 21st century. Russell Hopping commented that the Trustees could not get an answer on how much of their salt marshes were applied with BTI and this recommendation was about doing a better job monitoring of where these products were applied. Brad Mitchell discussed prior legislation related to pesticide use in schools and school property and the provision related to reporting requirements. It was added that several other states have implemented similar programs and NY had spent several million dollars to collect this data and no one had used it. Brad Mitchell noted that there should be confirmation that the data is in

fact easy to collect and to confirm there is demand for the data. Bob Mann added to Brad Mitchell's commentary and noted that the last time he checked the state of NY was five years behind in compiling and publishing the information that they were required to collect. Heidi Ricci discussed MCDs spraying from trucks that had GPS and the ability to collect information via GIS. Heidi Ricci added that if it was not known where pesticide applications were being done then we would not be able to get a handle on efficacy and non-target impacts. Bob Mann commented that the state of NY collected information across all uses and noted if only mosquito control products were being evaluated then you were only getting part of the picture and the data would not be useful if you were not looking at the entirety of uses across the product.

BP-9: QA/QC testing of chemicals uses in mosquito control: Diana Pietri presented slides to the group that provided an overview of recommendation content and task force member poll comments.

Questions/Comments:

Richard Pollack provided an example of an aerial application process and noted it would be impossible to implement the recommendation unless there was a dedicated high-tech laboratory to analyze the material at the time of procurement or before delivery. Richard Pollack thought this needed to be left to the manufacturers and the EPA to review. Heidi Ricci noted that it was clear based on what happened with PFAS in containers that we would not have known about that issue if other individuals didn't take the initiative to get the testing done. Kim LeBeau noted that she drafted this recommendation based on her years of experience working in the drinking water industry and interactions with chemical manufacturers, distributors, and transporters. Kim LeBeau added through past experiences that there were possible avenues for contamination and vulnerabilities did exist. Kim LeBeau mentioned that when the state is placing orders for bulk chemicals there could be some review made in advance with plenty of time before orders are placed.

BP-15: Agricultural opt out: Diana Pietri presented slides to the group that provided an overview of recommendation content and task force member poll comments.

Questions/Comments:

Brad Mitchell discussed the need to weigh the risk to individual landowners and the general public and noted that he could not support the recommendation and that the risk of people dying or getting seriously ill needed to be considered here. John Lebeaux commented that this recommendation would cause so many exclusions that aerial spraying would become ineffective and it seemed like the recommendation was taking the tool of aerial spraying off the table. Heidi Ricci questioned the effectiveness of aerial spraying and commented on the public health trade-offs when you look at the medical doctor's comments about the public health risks of pesticides. Heidi Ricci noted that the recommendation was addressing that commercial farmers and individuals were using organic practices to grow their own food and it was a form of trespass to have the government overrule that. Richard Robinson commented that a lot of time was spent in the subcommittee discussing this recommendation and two acres seemed to be a reasonable threshold at which you might be a significant commercial operation producing food. It was noted that there were about 170-180 certified organic farms in the state and that beekeepers could not become certified organic because of the nature of their operation and that was why there was a special clause about beekeeping.

Richard Pollack noted that he would argue with comments made by a task force member that there was no efficacy in aerial application of adulticides. Richard Pollack added that there was aerial efficacy data, and this was discussed in detail during various subcommittee meetings. Richard Pollack noted that the way the recommendation was written many more properties could be excluded from the use of adulticides from an aerial platform and that was one item of concern. Priscilla Matton discussed her concern on the inclusion of apiary information which would make it very difficult to provide an aerial application. John Lebeaux added that if there were criteria to establish a farm that was two acres or more in size that produced food for sale or donation that it would need to be verified. It was added that the creation of so many exclusions would make an aerial application

ineffective. Anita Deeley noted that in the public listening session that there were a number of small farmers that wanted to be opted out that were not certified organic. Anita Deeley commented that pesticides do impact bees, and the recommendation would opt-out beekeepers that have hives on properties of two acres or more. Richard Robinson discussed the opt-out process for organic farms and the attestation of those who apply. Priscilla Matton commented that the recommendation language did not make any reference of an apiary needing to be part of a two-acre farm. Richard Robinson noted that this could use some clarification and added that it would apply if you were using generally accepted organic practices on two or more acres and producing goods for sale or donation.

Diana Pietri noted that based on Anita Deeley's comments, clarification may be needed on recommendation language related to apiaries on two or more acres of land. Anita Deeley clarified that the recommendation language related to apiaries was for commercial beekeepers and not hobbyist beekeepers. Priscilla Matton noted that she would need to know how a commercial beekeeper was defined. Brad Mitchell provided an overview of the registry process for beekeepers and that there was still a need to determine a commercial versus non-commercial operation. Anita Deeley added that there was currently no way for beekeepers to become certified organic and that was another reason for the additional recommendation language. Brad Mitchell discussed the rationale for the reason why beekeepers could not become certified organic. Anita Deeley commented that it was not just about the foraging bees and that it was about protecting beehives from spraying.

Caroline Higley and Richard Robinson discussed the possibility of collecting additional information from the subcommittee on this topic so it could be discussed at the 3/25 task force meeting. John Lebeaux discussed the beekeeper registration process and noted that it was difficult for MDAR to know where hives were located. Anita Deeley added that she would be ok if there was a registration process for MDAR to know where hives were located.

LE - 5a: Comprehensive Evaluation Program: Diana Pietri presented slides to the group that provided an overview of recommendation content. It was noted that as a tier 2 recommendation there were no poll comments collected.

Questions/Comments:

Heidi Ricci commented that there was no quantifiable way to measure efficacy and non-target impacts and that the recommendation was addressing that there needed to be a systematic consistent approach across the MCDs and the state so things could be analyzed in a more quantifiable fashion. Russell Hopping asked a question on how the recommendation started and noted that there was very little data on non-target impacts and there was value to be able to answer questions related to non-target impacts. Heidi Ricci discussed the recommendation and noted that this was a more comprehensive recommendation on non-target impacts and efficacy. Heidi Ricci added that this recommendation was a split vote, and that the Local Engagement subcommittee did not have municipal representation in the subcommittee at the time of the vote. Caroline Higley noted that for the next meeting perhaps it made sense to review this recommendation language further.

Meeting Close and Vote to Adjourn:

Diana Pietri discussed process for the upcoming 3/25 task force meeting. Heidi Ricci inquired if the slides with recommendation overview and poll commentary that were discussed in the meeting would be distributed to task force members. Caroline Higley commented that the slide content that was reviewed in the session would be distributed to task force members to recap what was discussed. Jennifer Pederson asked if the remaining subcommittee meeting minutes would be distributed as well. Caroline Higley noted that the remaining subcommittee meeting minutes would be distributed ahead of the last task force meeting on 3/29 so they could be voted on. Jennifer Pederson commented that it would be helpful to have the meeting minutes to reflect and look back on subcommittee content. Seeing no additional commentary from the group Beth Card entertained a motion to adjourn the meeting from John Lebeaux. Seconded by Richard Robinson. All in favor said aye. The task force meeting was adjourned at 1:59 p.m.



The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs
100 Cambridge Street, Suite 900
Boston, MA 02114

Charles D. Baker
GOVERNOR

Karyn E. Polito
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

Kathleen A. Theoharides
SECRETARY

Tel: (617) 626-1000
Fax: (617) 626-1081
<http://www.mass.gov/eea>

Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century Task Force

Friday, March 25, 2022
2:00PM

Meeting to be held via remote participation (details below)

AGENDA

1. Call to order and introductions
2. Routine business
 - a. Vote on MCTF meeting minutes from March 21, 2022
 - b. Voting procedure review for final MCTF meeting
3. MCTF Recommendations - Discussion on remainder
 - a. Proposed revision to BP-15
 - b. Finalize discussion on LE-5a
 - c. Open discussion on remaining majority supported recommendations
 - d. Open discussion on remaining minority supported recommendations

Note: This meeting will be hosted in a webinar format

Topic: Mosquito Control Task Force - Meeting #24

When: March 25, 2022 2:00 PM Eastern Time (US and Canada)

Please register in advance for this webinar using the link below. After registering, you will receive a confirmation email containing information about joining the webinar.

https://zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_MY53QNsTTYCU5sLoAPb7wg

03.25.22 Mosquito Control Task Force (MCTF) Meeting #24 – Minutes

March 25, 2022, 2:00 p.m. via Zoom

Meeting Topics:

- Call to Order and Introduction
- Routine Business
 - Vote on MCTF meeting minutes from March 21, 2022
 - Voting procedure review for final MCTF meeting
- MCTF Recommendations – Discussion on Remainder
 - Proposed Revision to BP-15
 - Finalize Discussion on LE-5a
 - Open Discussion on Remaining Majority Supported Recommendations
 - Open Discussion on Remaining Minority Supported Recommendations

Call to Order and Introductions:

The full task force meeting was called to order at 2:03 p.m. by Beth Card. A housekeeping and logistics update was provided. Task force members in attendance included. Kevin Cranston, John Lebeaux, Nicole Keleher, Kathy Baskin, Eve Schluter, Julia Blatt, Anita Deeley, Russell Hopping, Kim LeBeau, Bob Mann, Priscilla Matton, Jennifer Pederson, Richard Pollack, Helen Poynton, Heidi Ricci, Stephen Rich, Richard Robinson, and Sam Telford.

Routine Business:

Vote on MCTF Meeting Minutes from March 21, 2022:

A motion was entertained by Beth Card to approve the 3/21/22 meeting minutes as written. A motion was made by Kevin Cranston. Seconded by Richard Robinson. A roll call was conducted. Kevin Cranston (aye), John Lebeaux (aye), Nicole Keleher (abstain), Kathy Baskin (aye), Eve Schluter (aye), Heidi Porter (not present for vote), Derek Brindisi (not present for vote), Julia Blatt (aye) Tonya Colpitts (not present for vote), Anita Deeley (not present for vote), Russell Hopping (aye), Kim LeBeau (aye), Bob Mann (aye), Priscilla Matton (aye), Brad Mitchell (not present for vote), Jennifer Pederson (aye), Richard Pollack (aye), Helen Poynton (aye), Heidi Ricci (aye), Stephen Rich (aye), Richard Robinson (aye), Sam Telford (aye).

Voting Procedure Review for Final MCTF Meeting:

Diana Pietri provided an overview of the agenda and discussed voting process for the task force meeting on Tuesday 3/29. Caroline Higley addressed logistics and provided an overview of the voting process at the final task force meeting. It was noted that Beth Card would call for motion and as a best practice, after which it was encouraged that the subcommittee chair and co-chair would make a motion and a second, where appropriate.

Stephen Rich commented that he would not be able to vote on Tuesday 3/29 due to a prior scheduling commitment and he thought that it was unfortunate that an absentee vote could not be provided. Task force members discussed absentee voting and Beth Card noted that this would be taken back and reviewed to ensure an opportunity was not being missed to allow Stephen Rich to cast a vote.

Caroline Higley provided an update on the report structure and the inclusion of an appendix D which would provide all existing legislation related to mosquito control. Heidi Ricci noted that the report should document terms that had majority agreement and areas where the committee could not reach consensus. Heidi Ricci added that the minority recommendations didn't capture all big picture items such as nuisance versus disease, efficacy, and non-target impacts. Caroline Higley noted that subcommittee meeting minutes should have captured these discussions. Julia Blatt inquired if the report would include all public comments and it was noted that public comments would be captured in one of the report appendices. Kevin Cranston asked a question about voting

information that would be captured in the appendix and Caroline Higley addressed the question. Task force members asked what would be included in the appendix related to public comments and Caroline Higley responded that all public comments (summary document and raw comments) would be portrayed within the appendix. Abby Burton presented a slide to the task force members that provided an overview of the copyediting document. It was noted that the document was distributed to the task force on the morning of 3/24. Heidi Ricci commented on the document language and noted the terms “should” and “shall” had a different legal meaning. Beth Card noted that the terms would make a difference to the legislature. Jessica Burgess added that the language in the document could be looked at and change if needed, and the EEA team noted that the terms would be reverted back to original form.

MCTF Recommendations – Discussion on Remainder:

Proposed Revision to BP-15 Agriculture Opt-Out:

Richard Robinson provided a summary overview of the revised language regarding beehives. It was noted that because beehives were spread far and wide, there was not a practical way to opt-out all of the locations of where beehives may be kept. The recommendation suggested a slight increase in the notification requirement for beekeepers and it was noted that the state response plan provided information on the proposed timing to allow beekeepers to move their hives. Richard Robinson discussed the objections related to the proposed recommendation and noted through informal calculations that excluding less than 1% of the area of Bristol and Plymouth counties would not make aerial spraying infeasible. Richard Robinson added commentary on the application and attestation process for reporting information and noted the purpose for the recommendation was to provide for the small number of farms who are not certified but use the same set of practices and to give them the same protection as certified farms.

Questions/Comments:

Anita Deeley commented that the changes on the recommendation language removed the opt out for beekeepers, and changed it to a notification-only process, and that entire Agricultural Opt-Out recommendation was written for commercial farms selling products, not hobbyists. Richard Robinson discussed the first iteration of the recommendation for commercial beekeepers and noted that there was no reason to not have all beekeepers who wished to register for notification to get the same ability to protect their hives as any other beekeeper. Anita Deeley noted that she was disappointed with how the recommendation was rewritten. Diana Pietri commented that there would be a poll to determine if the original recommendation or revised recommendation would move forward for task force voting. Richard Pollack asked if the recommendation was referring to just honeybees. Richard Robinson responded that as far as he knew, people only kept hives for honeybees. Richard Pollack inquired about the delaying of application time. Richard Robinson discussed that the initial spray application would trigger a 48-hour notice to beekeepers and if a spray application had to be delayed the state apiarist would give as timely a notice as possible. Richard Pollack suggested that the recommendation language could be tightened up and it was added that how notification was given needed to be considered. Richard Robinson discussed the notification process that was in place in the state response plan.

Jennifer Pederson discussed recommendation version BP-15b that was presented to the task force. It was noted that the recommendation started out as an agricultural opt-out and morphed into a notification process. Richard Robinson noted that he looked at what was available for beekeepers and suggested adding the notification in so there was enough time for beekeepers to protect their hives. Heidi Ricci added that this would address the concern for many farms that produce food for sale or donation but were not certified organic. John Lebeaux discussed his disagreement with the recommendation and noted that the task force should not be making recommendations based on informal calculations. John Lebeaux commented on the differences on the attestation process and noted that too many property exclusions in a given area could render it very difficult to spray. John Lebeaux provided an example of owning two-acres of land and having a garden that provided minimal produce for sale and donation and added that the state definition of a farm can be found in chapter 128 section 1A. Richard

Robinson and John Lebeaux continued their discussions on the definition of a farm, threshold acreage, and a state form attestation process.

Anita Deeley suggested a proposed change to the original recommendation language for BP-15 to read “AND any beekeeper that produces for sale or donation over \$2,000 of honey, pollen, live bees, or other products derived from bees, that has registered their hive locations with MDAR.” Anita Deeley noted that the 48-hour notification to beekeepers was good, but she still wanted an opt-out process. Jennifer Pederson mentioned that there was an existing process to be notified and cited the language from the SRB website. Alisha Bouchard noted that chapter 2A did sunset at the end of the calendar year related to communications for aerial spraying. Heidi Ricci discussed the 48-hour communication process and noted the whole section of the legislation was scheduled to sunset at the end of the calendar year. Richard Pollack discussed his concern with the suggested change to beekeepers in the recommendation language because many beehives were moved around, and it could be difficult to track where and when hives were moved. Russell Hopping asked if the changed recommendation language implied that a beekeeper did not need to be on a minimum of two-acres. Anita Deeley provided clarification on the content changes.

Diana Pietri discussed the proposed polling process related to the versions of the recommendation BP-15. The first poll was conducted for the original recommendation with the added edits from Anita Deeley. Anita Deeley, Sam Telford, Julia Blatt, Heidi Ricci, and Kevin Cranston indicated support in the first poll. It was noted that the proposed changes would not move forward. A second poll was conducted to replace the original recommendation with the two revised recommendation that were proposed by Richard Robinson. Richard Robinson, Heidi Ricci, Helen Poynton, Nicole Keleher, Kevin Cranston, and Julia Blatt indicated support in the second poll. It was noted that this version of the recommendation also did not have majority support. Diana Pietri noted that the original recommendation language for BP-15 would proceed forward for voting during the last task force meeting. Heidi Ricci commented that the 48-hour notification requirement was very important to continue when this all went away. Bob Mann suggested language to support the readoption of section 2A and offered that up as a compromise since there were a number of task force members that still wanted notification ahead of time. Jennifer Pederson agreed with Bob Mann’s suggestion.. Heidi Ricci discussed the 2A language. She noted it conferred broad powers on the state to spray anywhere based only on a determination that there may be an elevated risk of mosquito-borne disease in the next year and was why the task force was created in the first place. Heidi Ricci noted that the one part of this section that she supported was the 48-hour notification and commented that the notification was important.

Jennifer Pederson commented that she was in favor of individuals requesting notification and noted that it should be open to all people not just beekeepers. Abby Burton shared a slide with recommendation version BP-15b that included revised language that addressed “any individual” related to notification. Jessica Burgess discussed the process and clarified the notice requirements. A poll was proposed for the recommendation as amended for recommendation version BP-15b. Anita Deeley, Heidi Ricci, Jennifer Pederson, Richard Robinson, Helen Poynton, Julia Blatt, Russell Hopping, Kim LeBeau, Kathy Baskin, Eve Schluter, and Beth Card indicated support. It was noted that the poll reflected a majority of task force attendees and this version of the recommendation would be voted on during the final task force meeting on 3/29. Caroline Higley clarified this recommendation should be titled BP-18.

Finalize Discussion on LE-5a Comprehensive Evaluation Program:

It was noted that this was a tier 2 recommendation, but poll respondents had provided comments that the recommendation had merit for additional discussion and clarification. It was added the recommendation would be voted upon during the final task force meeting on Tuesday 3/29. There were no further comments or questions related to the recommendation from task force members.

Open Discussion on Remaining Majority and Minority Supported Recommendations:

Diana Pietri shared a slide with the group that presented all of the majority and minority recommendations. Majority recommendations were reviewed first and questions and comments were opened up to the task force members.

Questions/Comments:

Kathy Baskin offered thoughts and suggestion on the recommendation language associated with *BP-8: Communication with Public Water Systems*. Kathy Baskin discussed DEP's role and practices regarding public water system notification, and suggested striking the background content in favor of adding "Public water systems could benefit from enhanced communication in order to better prepare for the impacts of these events". Edits were made to the recommendation language during the task force meeting. Jennifer Pederson discussed the communication process during the 2019 aerial sprays and noted that processes did not go as they should have and there were opportunities for communication improvements. Kim LeBeau echoed what Jennifer Pederson stated about the 2019 aerial applications and noted that she was ok with the recommendation language as presented by Kathy Baskin. Kathy Baskin responded to the points made by Jennifer Pederson and Kim LeBeau. A poll was conducted to determine if the task force agreed with the recommendation language changes. Beth Card, Eve Schluter, Kathy Baskin, Jennifer Pederson, Russell Hopping, Bob Mann, Helen Poynton, Richard Pollack, Julia Blatt, Anita Deeley, Stephen Rich, Richard Robinson, Kim LeBeau, Priscilla Matton, and John Lebeaux indicated support for the amendment, which was a majority of task force attendees so the amended recommendation as proposed by Kathy Baskin was incorporated.

Jennifer Pederson asked a question about *LE-3: Public Engagement* and noted that she thought much of this was already being done. Heidi Ricci noted the subcommittee didn't think engagement was happening in any standardized way and discussed communities that were not in MCDs not having access to outreach. Jennifer Pederson discussed the potential for a centralized website of resources and noted that she would not want to see state resources being spent on something that already existed. Heidi Ricci commented that there were currently no opportunities for public input on statewide plans and noted difficulties in attending regional MCD meetings and the recommendation addressed those concerns.

Heidi Ricci discussed recommendation *POL-2: Amend the MA Stormwater Handbook (and relevant local land use and stormwater regulations)*. It was noted that the thrust of the recommendation was to help municipalities take advantage of the best practices that were already happening at the state. Heidi Ricci also discussed recommendations *PS-1: Active Ingredients* and *PS-2: Inert Ingredients (Option 1) [no action]* and noted that there were minority opinion recommendations that suggested taking a look at inert ingredients to address protecting public health and the environment. Heidi Ricci discussed minority recommendation *LE-4: Menu Based Approach* and noted that it would replace the opt out with an opt in. Richard Robinson discussed the prohibition of aerial applications and commented on the need to let people manage their own risk and to focus on education against the risk of arboviruses. Heidi Ricci referenced directive six and noted the overall directive was central to the committee and didn't think any recommendation did anything meaningful to address those individuals with chemical sensitivities or other at-risk people. Heidi Ricci commented that personal choice was important and there would always be the presence of mosquitos no matter how much we spray. Jennifer Pederson thanked EEA, MDAR, and ERG staff for keeping the task force on track. Priscilla Matton and Julia Blatt had procedural questions related to the distribution of a recommendation list ahead of the final task force meeting. Caroline Higley noted that a recommendation template could be shared with the task force members to prepare for voting during the final task force meeting. Julia Blatt thanked Heidi Ricci and Richard Robinson for their leadership during the task force. Heidi Ricci asked if the task force members would see the compiled report before it was submitted to the legislature. Beth Card responded that the task force would get the report before it was submitted to the legislature.

Meeting Close and Vote to Adjourn:

Beth Card extended her thanks to the task force and staff members for all their time, detail, and collaboration on the work that was conducted. Seeing no other comments from the group, Beth Card entertained a motion to adjourn the meeting from John Lebeaux. Seconded by Julia Blatt. All in favor said aye. The meeting was adjourned at 3:49 p.m.



The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs
100 Cambridge Street, Suite 900
Boston, MA 02114

Charles D. Baker
GOVERNOR

Karyn E. Polito
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

Kathleen A. Theoharides
SECRETARY

Tel: (617) 626-1000
Fax: (617) 626-1081
<http://www.mass.gov/eea>

Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century Task Force

Tuesday, March 29, 2022
12:00PM

Meeting to be held via remote participation (details below)

AGENDA

1. Call to order and introductions
2. Routine business
 - a. Vote on MCTF meeting minutes from March 25, 2022
3. Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century Task Force Votes
 - a. Vote on remaining subcommittee meeting minutes
 - b. Vote on task force recommendations to send to Legislature

Note: This meeting will be hosted in a webinar format

Topic: Mosquito Control Task Force - Meeting #25

When: March 29, 2022 12:00 PM Eastern Time (US and Canada)

Please register in advance for this webinar using the link below. After registering, you will receive a confirmation email containing information about joining the webinar.

https://zoom.us/webinar/register/WN_Unr2etyRRlygvafGsOuCTg

03.29.22 Mosquito Control Task Force (MCTF) Meeting #25 – Minutes

March 29, 2022, 12:00 p.m. via Zoom

[Please note: these minutes will remain in draft form indefinitely due to conclusion of the task force]

Meeting Topics:

- Call to Order and Introduction
- Routine Business
 - Vote on MCTF meeting minutes from March 25, 2022
- Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century Task Force Votes
 - Vote on remaining subcommittee meeting minutes
 - Vote on task force recommendations to send to Legislature

Call to Order and Introductions:

The full task force meeting was called to order at 12:02 p.m. by Beth Card. Routine updates were provided. Task force members in attendance included Kevin Cranston, John Lebeaux, Nicole Keleher, Kathy Baskin, Eve Schluter, Heidi Porter, Julia Blatt, Anita Deeley, Russell Hopping, Kim LeBeau, Bob Mann, Priscilla Matton, Brad Mitchell, Jennifer Pederson, Richard Pollack, Helen Poynton, Heidi Ricci, Richard Robinson, and Sam Telford. Beth Card offered her thanks to the task force members, ERG, MDAR, Caroline Higley, Legislators, and members of the public for all of the work, time, and energy brought to the task force effort.

Routine Business:

Vote on MCTF Meeting Minutes from March 25, 2022:

A motion was entertained by Beth Card to approve the 3/25/22 meeting minutes as amended by Heidi Ricci and Anita Deeley. A motion was made by Jennifer Pederson. Seconded by John Lebeaux. A roll call was conducted. Kevin Cranston (aye), John Lebeaux (aye), Nicole Keleher (aye), Kathy Baskin (aye), Eve Schluter (aye), Heidi Porter (aye), Derek Brindisi, Julia Blatt (aye), Anita Deeley (aye), Russell Hopping (aye), Kim LeBeau (aye), Bob Mann (aye), Priscilla Matton (aye), Brad Mitchell (aye), Jennifer Pederson (aye), Richard Pollack (aye), Helen Poynton (aye), Heidi Ricci (aye), Stephen Rich, Richard Robinson (aye), Sam Telford (aye), Beth Card (aye).

Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century Task Force Votes:

Vote on remaining subcommittee meeting minutes:

- ➔ Policy Structure 1/21, 2/4, 2/25, 3/1
 - ➔ Local Engagement 1/10, 1/18, 1/27, 2/2, 2/10, 2/24
 - ➔ Best Practices 1/19, 1/31, 2/8, 2/14, 2/28
 - ➔ Pesticide Selection 1/11, 1/25, 2/2, 2/8, 2/22
- Policy Structure Subcommittee: Julia Blatt called for a motion to approve the subcommittee meeting minutes as written. Richard Pollack made a motion. Seconded by Russell Hopping. A roll call was conducted. Julia Blatt (aye), Russell Hopping (aye), Brad Mitchell (aye), Richard Pollack (aye), Heidi Ricci (aye), Heidi Porter (aye).
 - Local Engagement Subcommittee: Heidi Ricci called for a motion to approve the minutes from the remaining subcommittee meetings. Priscilla Matton made a motion. Seconded by Eve Schluter. Russell Hopping (aye), Priscilla Matton (abstain from 1/27 and aye to all other minutes), Eve Schluter (aye), Heidi Ricci (aye).
 - Best Practices Subcommittee: Richard Robinson called for a motion to approve the subcommittee meeting minutes as written. Richard Pollack made a motion. Seconded by Kathy Baskin. A roll call was

conducted, Richard Robinson (aye), Anita Deeley (aye), Russell Hopping (aye), Kim LeBeau (aye), Priscilla Matton (aye), Richard Pollack (aye), Helen Poynton (aye), Heidi Ricci (aye), Kathy Baskin (aye).

- Pesticide Selection Subcommittee: Bob Mann called for a motion to approve the meeting minutes as written. A motion was made by Brad Mitchell. Seconded by Richard Pollack. A roll call was conducted. Priscilla Matton (aye), Brad Mitchell (aye), Jennifer Pederson (aye), Richard Pollack (aye), Helen Poynton (aye), Nicole Keleher (aye), Bob Mann (aye).

Vote on Task Force recommendations to send to Legislature:

POL-1: Repeal and replace M.G.L. c. 252 and Mosquito Control District (MCD) enabling legislation or amend M.G.L. c. 252 and repeal MCD enabling legislation:

A motion was entertained by Beth Card to vote on the recommendation. A motion was made by Julia Blatt Seconded by Russell Hopping. A roll call was conducted. Kevin Cranston (yes), John Lebeaux (yes), Nicole Keleher (yes), Kathy Baskin (yes), Eve Schluter (yes), Heidi Porter (yes), Derek Brindisi (not present for vote), Julia Blatt (yes), Tonya Colpitts (not present for vote), Anita Deeley (yes), Russell Hopping (yes), Kim LeBeau (yes), Bob Mann (yes), Priscilla Matton (no), Brad Mitchell (yes), Jennifer Pederson (yes), Richard Pollack (yes), Helen Poynton (yes), Heidi Ricci (yes), Stephen Rich (not present for vote), Richard Robinson (yes), Sam Telford (no), Beth Card (yes).

POL-1	Yes	18
	No	2
	Abstain	0
Name	Absent	Vote
Kathleen Baskin		y
Julia Blatt		y
Derek Brindisi	absent	
Bethany Card		y
Tonya Colpitts	absent	
Kevin Cranston		y
Anita Deeley		y
Russell Hopping		y
Nicole Keleher		y
Kimberly LeBeau		y
John Lebeaux		y
Bob Mann		y
Priscilla Matton		n
Brad Mitchell		y
Jennifer Pederson		y
Richard Pollack		y
Heidi Porter		y
Helen Poynton		y
Heidi Ricci		y
Stephen Rich	absent	
Richard Robinson		y
Eve Schluter		y
Sam Telford		n
	Vote Count	20

POL-2: Amend the Massachusetts Stormwater Handbook (and relevant local land use and stormwater regulations):

A motion was entertained by Beth Card to vote on the recommendation. A motion was made by Julia Blatt. Seconded by Russell Hopping. A roll call was conducted. Kevin Cranston (yes), John Lebeaux (yes), Nicole Keleher (yes), Kathy Baskin (yes), Eve Schluter (yes), Heidi Porter (yes), Derek Brindisi (note present for vote), Julia Blatt (yes), Tonya Colpitts (not present for vote), Anita Deeley (yes), Russell Hopping (yes), Kim LeBeau (no), Bob Mann (yes), Priscilla Matton (yes), Brad Mitchell (yes), Jennifer Pederson (no), Richard Pollack (yes), Helen Poynton (yes), Heidi Ricci (yes), Stephen Rich (not present for vote), Richard Robinson (yes), Sam Telford (yes), Beth Card (yes).

POL-2	Yes	18
	No	2
	Abstain	0
TF member name	absent	vote
Kathleen Baskin		y
Julia Blatt		y
Derek Brindisi	absent	
Bethany Card		y
Tonya Colpitts	absent	
Kevin Cranston		y
Anita Deeley		y
Russell Hopping		y
Nicole Keleher		y
Kimberly LeBeau		n
John Lebeaux		y
Bob Mann		y
Priscilla Matton		y
Brad Mitchell		y
Jennifer Pederson		n
Richard Pollack		y
Heidi Porter		y
Helen Poynton		y
Heidi Ricci		y
Stephen Rich	absent	
Richard Robinson		y
Eve Schluter		y
Sam Telford		y
	Vote Count	20

POL-3: Revise the structure, function, and funding of MCDs to ensure a comprehensive and cohesive framework for mosquito control across Massachusetts that establishes baseline mosquito control services for all municipalities in the Commonwealth, allows municipalities to join MCDs at lower costs, and allows member municipalities to add services as they wish or as needed:

A motion was entertained by Beth Card to vote on the recommendation. A motion was made by Julia Blatt. Seconded by Russell Hopping. A roll call was conducted. Kevin Cranston (yes), John Lebeaux (yes), Nicole Keleher (yes), Kathy Baskin (yes), Eve Schluter (yes), Heidi Porter (yes), Derek Brindisi (not present for vote), Julia Blatt (yes), Tonya Colpitts (not present for vote), Anita Deeley (yes), Russell Hopping (yes), Kim LeBeau (yes), Bob Mann (yes), Priscilla Matton (no), Brad Mitchell (yes), Jennifer Pederson (yes), Richard Pollack (yes), Helen Poynton (yes), Heidi Ricci (yes), Stephen Rich (not present for vote), Richard Robinson (yes), Sam Telford (no), Beth Card (yes).

POL-3	Yes	18
	No	2
	Abstain	0
Name	Absent	Vote
Kathleen Baskin		y
Julia Blatt		y
Derek Brindisi	absent	
Bethany Card		y
Tonya Colpitts	absent	
Kevin Cranston		y
Anita Deeley		y
Russell Hopping		y
Nicole Keleher		y
Kimberly LeBeau		y
John Lebeaux		y
Bob Mann		y
Priscilla Matton		n
Brad Mitchell		y
Jennifer Pederson		y
Richard Pollack		y
Heidi Porter		y
Helen Poynton		y
Heidi Ricci		y
Stephen Rich	absent	
Richard Robinson		y
Eve Schluter		y
Sam Telford		n
	Vote Count	20

BP-1: Improving Consistency in the Implementation of Integrated Pest Management:

A motion was entertained by Beth Card to vote on the recommendation. A motion was made by Richard Robinson. Seconded by Priscilla Matton. A roll call was conducted. Kevin Cranston (yes), John Lebeaux (yes), Nicole Keleher (yes), Kathy Baskin (yes), Eve Schluter (yes), Heidi Porter (yes), Derek Brindisi (not present for vote), Julia Blatt (yes), Tonya Colpitts (not present for vote), Anita Deeley (yes), Russell Hopping (yes), Kim LeBeau (yes), Bob Mann (yes), Priscilla Matton (no), Brad Mitchell (yes), Jennifer Pederson (yes), Richard Pollack (no), Helen Poynton (yes), Heidi Ricci (yes), Stephen Rich (not present for vote), Richard Robinson (yes), Sam Telford (no), Beth Card (yes).

BP-1	Yes	17
	No	3
	Abstain	0
Name	Absent	Vote
Kathleen Baskin		y
Julia Blatt		y
Derek Brindisi	absent	
Bethany Card		y
Tonya Colpitts	absent	
Kevin Cranston		y
Anita Deeley		y
Russell Hopping		y
Nicole Keleher		y
Kimberly LeBeau		y
John Lebeaux		y
Bob Mann		y
Priscilla Matton		n
Brad Mitchell		y
Jennifer Pederson		y
Richard Pollack		n
Heidi Porter		y
Helen Poynton		y
Heidi Ricci		y
Stephen Rich	absent	
Richard Robinson		y
Eve Schluter		y
Sam Telford		n
	Vote Count	20

BP-2: Limiting Ground-Based Applications of Adulticides:

A motion was entertained by Beth Card to vote on the recommendation. A motion was made by Richard Robinson. Seconded by Priscilla Matton. A roll call was conducted. Kevin Cranston (no), John Lebeaux (no), Nicole Keleher (no), Kathy Baskin (no), Eve Schluter (no), Heidi Porter (no), Derek Brindisi (not present for vote), Julia Blatt (no) Tonya Colpitts (not present for vote), Anita Deeley (yes), Russell Hopping (yes), Kim LeBeau (yes), Bob Mann (no), Priscilla Matton (no), Brad Mitchell (no), Jennifer Pederson (yes), Richard Pollack (yes), Helen Poynton (abstain), Heidi Ricci (yes), Stephen Rich (not present for vote), Richard Robinson (yes), Sam Telford (no), Beth Card (no).

BP-2	Yes	7
	No	12
	Abstain	1
Name	Absent	Vote
Kathleen Baskin		n
Julia Blatt		n
Derek Brindisi	absent	
Bethany Card		n
Tonya Colpitts	absent	
Kevin Cranston		n
Anita Deeley		y
Russell Hopping		y
Nicole Keleher		n
Kimberly LeBeau		y
John Lebeaux		n
Bob Mann		n
Priscilla Matton		n
Brad Mitchell		n
Jennifer Pederson		y
Richard Pollack		y
Heidi Porter		n
Helen Poynton		a
Heidi Ricci		y
Stephen Rich	absent	
Richard Robinson		y
Eve Schluter		n
Sam Telford		n
	Vote Count	20

BP-3: State-Wide Mosquito Surveillance:

A motion was entertained by Beth Card to vote on the recommendation. A motion was made by Richard Robinson. Seconded by Priscilla Matton. A roll call was conducted. Kevin Cranston (yes), John Lebeaux (yes), Nicole Keleher (yes), Kathy Baskin (yes), Eve Schluter (yes), Heidi Porter (yes), Derek Brindisi (not present for vote), Julia Blatt (yes), Tonya Colpitts (not present for vote), Anita Deeley (no), Russell Hopping (yes), Kim LeBeau (yes), Bob Mann (yes), Priscilla Matton (yes), Brad Mitchell (yes), Jennifer Pederson (yes), Richard Pollack (yes), Helen Poynton (yes), Heidi Ricci (yes), Stephen Rich (not present for vote), Richard Robinson (yes), Sam Telford (yes), Beth Card (yes).

BP-3	Yes	19
	No	1
	Abstain	0
Name	Absent	Vote
Kathleen Baskin		y
Julia Blatt		y
Derek Brindisi	absent	
Bethany Card		y
Tonya Colpitts	absent	
Kevin Cranston		y
Anita Deeley		n
Russell Hopping		y
Nicole Keleher		y
Kimberly LeBeau		y
John Lebeaux		y
Bob Mann		y
Priscilla Matton		y
Brad Mitchell		y
Jennifer Pederson		y
Richard Pollack		y
Heidi Porter		y
Helen Poynton		y
Heidi Ricci		y
Stephen Rich	absent	
Richard Robinson		y
Eve Schluter		y
Sam Telford		y
	Vote Count	20

BP-4: Improving Consistency in MCD Staffing:

A motion was entertained by Beth Card to vote on the recommendation. A motion was made by Richard Robinson. Seconded by Priscilla Matton. A roll call was conducted. Kevin Cranston (yes), John Lebeaux (yes), Nicole Keleher (yes), Kathy Baskin (yes), Eve Schluter (yes), Heidi Porter (yes), Derek Brindisi (not present for vote), Julia Blatt (yes), Tonya Colpitts (not present for vote), Anita Deeley (yes), Russell Hopping (yes), Kim LeBeau (yes), Bob Mann (yes), Priscilla Matton (yes), Brad Mitchell (yes), Jennifer Pederson (yes), Richard Pollack (yes), Helen Poynton (yes), Heidi Ricci (yes), Stephen Rich (not present for vote), Richard Robinson (yes), Sam Telford (yes), Beth Card (yes).

BP-4	Yes	20
	No	0
	Abstain	0
Name	Absent	Vote
Kathleen Baskin		y
Julia Blatt		y
Derek Brindisi	absent	
Bethany Card		y
Tonya Colpitts	absent	
Kevin Cranston		y
Anita Deeley		y
Russell Hopping		y
Nicole Keleher		y
Kimberly LeBeau		y
John Lebeaux		y
Bob Mann		y
Priscilla Matton		y
Brad Mitchell		y
Jennifer Pederson		y
Richard Pollack		y
Heidi Porter		y
Helen Poynton		y
Heidi Ricci		y
Stephen Rich	absent	
Richard Robinson		y
Eve Schluter		y
Sam Telford		y
	Vote Count	20

BP-5: Statewide Education on Mosquito Management:

A motion was entertained by Beth Card to vote on the recommendation. A motion was made by Richard Robinson. Seconded by Priscilla Matton. A roll call was conducted. Kevin Cranston (yes), John Lebeaux (yes), Nicole Keleher (yes), Kathy Baskin (yes), Eve Schluter (yes), Heidi Porter (yes), Derek Brindisi (not present for vote), Julia Blatt (yes), Tonya Colpitts (not present for vote), Anita Deeley (yes), Russell Hopping (yes), Kim LeBeau (yes), Bob Mann (yes), Priscilla Matton (yes), Brad Mitchell (yes), Jennifer Pederson (yes), Richard Pollack (yes), Helen Poynton (yes), Heidi Ricci (yes), Stephen Rich (not present for vote), Richard Robinson (yes), Sam Telford (yes), Beth Card (yes).

BP-5	Yes	20
	No	0
	Abstain	0
Name	Absent	Vote
Kathleen Baskin		y
Julia Blatt		y
Derek Brindisi	absent	
Bethany Card		y
Tonya Colpitts	absent	
Kevin Cranston		y
Anita Deeley		y
Russell Hopping		y
Nicole Keleher		y
Kimberly LeBeau		y
John Lebeaux		y
Bob Mann		y
Priscilla Matton		y
Brad Mitchell		y
Jennifer Pederson		y
Richard Pollack		y
Heidi Porter		y
Helen Poynton		y
Heidi Ricci		y
Stephen Rich	absent	
Richard Robinson		y
Eve Schluter		y
Sam Telford		y
	Vote Count	20

BP-6: Prohibit Aerial Applications of Adulticides:

A motion was entertained by Beth Card to vote on the recommendation. A motion was made by Richard Robinson. Seconded by Priscilla Matton. A roll call was conducted. Kevin Cranston (no), John Lebeaux (no), Nicole Keleher (no), Kathy Baskin (no), Eve Schluter (no), Heidi Porter (no), Derek Brindisi (not present for vote), Julia Blatt (yes), Tonya Colpitts (not present for vote), Anita Deeley (yes), Russell Hopping (yes), Kim LeBeau (no), Bob Mann (no), Priscilla Matton (no), Brad Mitchell (no), Jennifer Pederson (no), Richard Pollack (no), Helen Poynton (no), Heidi Ricci (yes), Stephen Rich (not present for vote), Richard Robinson (yes), Sam Telford (no), Beth Card (no).

BP-6	Yes	5
	No	15
	Abstain	0
Name	Absent	Vote
Kathleen Baskin		n
Julia Blatt		y
Derek Brindisi	absent	
Bethany Card		n
Tonya Colpitts	absent	
Kevin Cranston		n
Anita Deeley		y
Russell Hopping		y
Nicole Keleher		n
Kimberly LeBeau		n
John Lebeaux		n
Bob Mann		n
Priscilla Matton		n
Brad Mitchell		n
Jennifer Pederson		n
Richard Pollack		n
Heidi Porter		n
Helen Poynton		n
Heidi Ricci		y
Stephen Rich	absent	
Richard Robinson		y
Eve Schluter		n
Sam Telford		n
	Vote Count	20

BP-7: Online Reporting for Commercial Applicators:

A motion was entertained by Beth Card to vote on the recommendation. A motion was made by Richard Robinson. Seconded by Priscilla Matton. A roll call was conducted. Kevin Cranston (yes), John Lebeaux (abstain), Nicole Keleher (yes), Kathy Baskin (yes), Eve Schluter (yes), Heidi Porter (yes), Derek Brindisi (not present for vote), Julia Blatt (yes), Tonya Colpitts (not present for vote), Anita Deeley (yes), Russell Hopping (yes), Kim LeBeau (yes), Bob Mann (no), Priscilla Matton (yes), Brad Mitchell (no), Jennifer Pederson (yes), Richard Pollack (yes), Helen Poynton (yes), Heidi Ricci (yes), Stephen Rich (not present for vote), Richard Robinson (yes), Sam Telford (yes), Beth Card (yes).

BP-7	Yes	17
	No	2
	Abstain	1
Name	Absent	Vote
Kathleen Baskin		y
Julia Blatt		y
Derek Brindisi	absent	
Bethany Card		y
Tonya Colpitts	absent	
Kevin Cranston		y
Anita Deeley		y
Russell Hopping		y
Nicole Keleher		y
Kimberly LeBeau		y
John Lebeaux		a
Bob Mann		n
Priscilla Matton		y
Brad Mitchell		n
Jennifer Pederson		y
Richard Pollack		y
Heidi Porter		y
Helen Poynton		y
Heidi Ricci		y
Stephen Rich	absent	
Richard Robinson		y
Eve Schluter		y
Sam Telford		y
	Vote Count	20

BP-8: Communication with Public Water Systems:

A motion was entertained by Beth Card to vote on the recommendation. A motion was made by Richard Robinson. Seconded by Priscilla Matton. A roll call was conducted. Kevin Cranston (yes), John Lebeaux (yes), Nicole Keleher (yes), Kathy Baskin (yes), Eve Schluter (yes), Heidi Porter (yes), Derek Brindisi (not present for vote), Julia Blatt (yes), Tonya Colpitts (not present for vote), Anita Deeley (yes), Russell Hopping (yes), Kim LeBeau (yes), Bob Mann (yes), Priscilla Matton (no), Brad Mitchell (no), Jennifer Pederson (yes), Richard Pollack (yes), Helen Poynton (yes), Heidi Ricci (yes), Stephen Rich (not present for vote), Richard Robinson (yes), Sam Telford (yes), Beth Card (yes).

BP-8	Yes	18
	No	2
	Abstain	0
Name	Absent	Vote
Kathleen Baskin		y
Julia Blatt		y
Derek Brindisi	absent	
Bethany Card		y
Tonya Colpitts	absent	
Kevin Cranston		y
Anita Deeley		y
Russell Hopping		y
Nicole Keleher		y
Kimberly LeBeau		y
John Lebeaux		y
Bob Mann		y
Priscilla Matton		n
Brad Mitchell		n
Jennifer Pederson		y
Richard Pollack		y
Heidi Porter		y
Helen Poynton		y
Heidi Ricci		y
Stephen Rich	absent	
Richard Robinson		y
Eve Schluter		y
Sam Telford		y
	Vote Count	20

BP-9: QA/QC Testing of Chemicals Used in Mosquito Control:

A motion was entertained by Beth Card to vote on the recommendation. A motion was made by Richard Robinson. Seconded by Priscilla Matton. A roll call was conducted. Kevin Cranston (no), John Lebeaux (no), Nicole Keleher (no), Kathy Baskin (no), Eve Schluter (no), Heidi Porter (no), Derek Brindisi (not present for vote), Julia Blatt (yes), Tonya Colpitts (not present for vote), Anita Deeley (yes), Russell Hopping (yes), Kim LeBeau (yes), Bob Mann (no), Priscilla Matton (no), Brad Mitchell (no), Jennifer Pederson (yes), Richard Pollack (no), Helen Poynton (yes), Heidi Ricci (yes), Stephen Rich (not present for vote), Richard Robinson (no), Sam Telford (no), Beth Card (no).

BP-9	Yes	7
	No	13
	Abstain	0
Name	Absent	Vote
Kathleen Baskin		n
Julia Blatt		y
Derek Brindisi	absent	
Bethany Card		n
Tonya Colpitts	absent	
Kevin Cranston		n
Anita Deeley		y
Russell Hopping		y
Nicole Keleher		n
Kimberly LeBeau		y
John Lebeaux		n
Bob Mann		n
Priscilla Matton		n
Brad Mitchell		n
Jennifer Pederson		y
Richard Pollack		n
Heidi Porter		n
Helen Poynton		y
Heidi Ricci		y
Stephen Rich	absent	
Richard Robinson		n
Eve Schluter		n
Sam Telford		n
	Vote Count	20

BP-10: Protection of Receptor Areas from Pesticide Run-Off:

A motion was entertained by Beth Card to vote on the recommendation. A motion was made by Richard Robinson. Seconded by Priscilla Matton. A roll call was conducted. Kevin Cranston (yes), John Lebeaux (yes), Nicole Keleher (yes), Kathy Baskin (yes), Eve Schluter (yes), Heidi Porter (no), Derek Brindisi (not present for vote), Julia Blatt (yes), Tonya Colpitts (not present for vote), Anita Deeley (yes), Russell Hopping (yes), Kim LeBeau (yes), Bob Mann (no), Priscilla Matton (no), Brad Mitchell (no), Jennifer Pederson (yes), Richard Pollack (no), Helen Poynton (yes), Heidi Ricci (yes), Stephen Rich (not present for vote), Richard Robinson (yes), Sam Telford (no), Beth Card (yes).

BP-10	Yes	14
	No	6
	Abstain	0
Name	Absent	Vote
Kathleen Baskin		y
Julia Blatt		y
Derek Brindisi	absent	
Bethany Card		y
Tonya Colpitts	absent	
Kevin Cranston		y
Anita Deeley		y
Russell Hopping		y
Nicole Keleher		y
Kimberly LeBeau		y
John Lebeaux		y
Bob Mann		n
Priscilla Matton		n
Brad Mitchell		n
Jennifer Pederson		y
Richard Pollack		n
Heidi Porter		n
Helen Poynton		y
Heidi Ricci		y
Stephen Rich	absent	
Richard Robinson		y
Eve Schluter		y
Sam Telford		n
	Vote Count	20

BP-11: Reduce Pesticide Applications for Nuisance Control:

A motion was entertained by Beth Card to vote on the recommendation. A motion was made by Richard Robinson. Seconded by Priscilla Matton. A roll call was conducted. Kevin Cranston (no), John Lebeaux (no), Nicole Keleher (no), Kathy Baskin (no), Eve Schluter (no), Heidi Porter (no), Derek Brindisi (not present for vote), Julia Blatt (abstain), Tonya Colpitts (not present for vote), Anita Deeley (yes), Russell Hopping (yes), Kim LeBeau (no), Bob Mann (no), Priscilla Matton (no), Brad Mitchell (abstain), Jennifer Pederson (no), Richard Pollack (no), Helen Poynton (abstain), Heidi Ricci (yes), Stephen Rich (not present for vote), Richard Robinson (yes), Sam Telford (no), Beth Card (no).

BP-11	Yes	4
	No	13
	Abstain	3
Name	Absent	Vote
Kathleen Baskin		n
Julia Blatt		a
Derek Brindisi	absent	
Bethany Card		n
Tonya Colpitts	absent	
Kevin Cranston		n
Anita Deeley		y
Russell Hopping		y
Nicole Keleher		n
Kimberly LeBeau		n
John Lebeaux		n
Bob Mann		n
Priscilla Matton		n
Brad Mitchell		a
Jennifer Pederson		n
Richard Pollack		n
Heidi Porter		n
Helen Poynton		a
Heidi Ricci		y
Stephen Rich	absent	
Richard Robinson		y
Eve Schluter		n
Sam Telford		n
	Vote Count	20

BP-12: Monitoring and Evaluations After Spraying:

A motion was entertained by Beth Card to vote on the recommendation. A motion was made by Richard Robinson. Seconded by Priscilla Matton. A roll call was conducted. Kevin Cranston (yes), John Lebeaux (yes), Nicole Keleher (yes), Kathy Baskin (yes), Eve Schluter (yes), Heidi Porter (yes), Derek Brindisi (not present for vote), Julia Blatt (yes), Tonya Colpitts (not present for vote), Anita Deeley (yes), Russell Hopping (yes), Kim LeBeau (yes), Bob Mann (yes), Priscilla Matton (yes), Brad Mitchell (yes), Jennifer Pederson (yes), Richard Pollack (yes), Helen Poynton (yes), Heidi Ricci (yes), Stephen Rich (not present for vote), Richard Robinson (yes), Sam Telford (yes), Beth Card (yes).

BP-12	Yes	20
	No	0
	Abstain	0
Name	Absent	Vote
Kathleen Baskin		y
Julia Blatt		y
Derek Brindisi	absent	
Bethany Card		y
Tonya Colpitts	absent	
Kevin Cranston		y
Anita Deeley		y
Russell Hopping		y
Nicole Keleher		y
Kimberly LeBeau		y
John Lebeaux		y
Bob Mann		y
Priscilla Matton		y
Brad Mitchell		y
Jennifer Pederson		y
Richard Pollack		y
Heidi Porter		y
Helen Poynton		y
Heidi Ricci		y
Stephen Rich	absent	
Richard Robinson		y
Eve Schluter		y
Sam Telford		y
	Vote Count	20

BP-13: Research the Impacts of Pesticides on Vulnerable Populations:

A motion was entertained by Beth Card to vote on the recommendation. A motion was made by Richard Robinson. Seconded by Priscilla Matton. A roll call was conducted. Kevin Cranston (abstain), John Lebeaux (abstain), Nicole Keleher (abstain), Kathy Baskin (abstain), Eve Schluter (abstain), Heidi Porter (abstain), Derek Brindisi (not present for vote), Julia Blatt (yes), Tonya Colpitts (not present for vote), Anita Deeley (yes), Russell Hopping (yes), Kim LeBeau (abstain), Bob Mann (no), Priscilla Matton (no), Brad Mitchell (no), Jennifer Pederson (abstain), Richard Pollack (no), Helen Poynton (yes), Heidi Ricci (yes), Stephen Rich (not present for vote), Richard Robinson (yes), Sam Telford (no), Beth Card (abstain).

BP-13	Yes	6
	No	5
	Abstain	9
Name	Absent	Vote
Kathleen Baskin		a
Julia Blatt		y
Derek Brindisi	absent	
Bethany Card		a
Tonya Colpitts	absent	
Kevin Cranston		a
Anita Deeley		y
Russell Hopping		y
Nicole Keleher		a
Kimberly LeBeau		a
John Lebeaux		a
Bob Mann		n
Priscilla Matton		n
Brad Mitchell		n
Jennifer Pederson		a
Richard Pollack		n
Heidi Porter		a
Helen Poynton		y
Heidi Ricci		y
Stephen Rich	absent	
Richard Robinson		y
Eve Schluter		a
Sam Telford		n
	Vote Count	20

BP-14: Criteria for Declaring a Public Health Hazard:

A motion was entertained by Beth Card to vote on the recommendation. A motion was made by Richard Robinson. Seconded by Priscilla Matton. A roll call was conducted. Kevin Cranston (no), John Lebeaux (no), Nicole Keleher (no), Kathy Baskin (no), Eve Schluter (no), Heidi Porter (no), Derek Brindisi (not present for vote), Julia Blatt (yes) Tonya Colpitts (not present for vote), Anita Deeley (yes), Russell Hopping (yes), Kim LeBeau (yes), Bob Mann (no), Priscilla Matton (no), Brad Mitchell (no), Jennifer Pederson (yes), Richard Pollack (no), Helen Poynton (yes), Heidi Ricci (yes), Stephen Rich (not present for vote), Richard Robinson (yes), Sam Telford (no), Beth Card (no).

BP-14	Yes	8
	No	12
	Abstain	0
Name	Absent	Vote
Kathleen Baskin		n
Julia Blatt		y
Derek Brindisi	absent	
Bethany Card		n
Tonya Colpitts	absent	
Kevin Cranston		n
Anita Deeley		y
Russell Hopping		y
Nicole Keleher		n
Kimberly LeBeau		y
John Lebeaux		n
Bob Mann		n
Priscilla Matton		n
Brad Mitchell		n
Jennifer Pederson		y
Richard Pollack		n
Heidi Porter		n
Helen Poynton		y
Heidi Ricci		y
Stephen Rich	absent	
Richard Robinson		y
Eve Schluter		n
Sam Telford		n
	Vote Count	20

BP-15: Agriculture Opt-Out:

A motion was entertained by Beth Card to vote on the recommendation. A motion was made by Richard Robinson. Seconded by Priscilla Matton. A roll call was conducted. Kevin Cranston (no), John Lebeaux (no), Nicole Keleher (no), Kathy Baskin (no), Eve Schluter (no), Heidi Porter (no), Derek Brindisi (not present for vote), Julia Blatt (yes) Tonya Colpitts (not present for vote), Anita Deeley (yes), Russell Hopping (abstain), Kim LeBeau (no), Bob Mann (no), Priscilla Matton (no), Brad Mitchell (no), Jennifer Pederson (yes), Richard Pollack (no), Helen Poynton (yes), Heidi Ricci (yes), Stephen Rich (not present for vote), Richard Robinson (yes), Sam Telford (no), Beth Card (no).

BP-15	Yes	6
	No	13
	Abstain	1
Name	Absent	Vote
Kathleen Baskin		n
Julia Blatt		y
Derek Brindisi	absent	
Bethany Card		n
Tonya Colpitts	absent	
Kevin Cranston		n
Anita Deeley		y
Russell Hopping		a
Nicole Keleher		n
Kimberly LeBeau		n
John Lebeaux		n
Bob Mann		n
Priscilla Matton		n
Brad Mitchell		n
Jennifer Pederson		y
Richard Pollack		n
Heidi Porter		n
Helen Poynton		y
Heidi Ricci		y
Stephen Rich	absent	
Richard Robinson		y
Eve Schluter		n
Sam Telford		n
	Vote Count	20

BP-16: Protected Status of Certified Organic Farms:

A motion was entertained by Beth Card to vote on the recommendation. A motion was made by Richard Robinson. Seconded by Priscilla Matton. A roll call was conducted. Kevin Cranston (yes), John Lebeaux (yes), Nicole Keleher (yes), Kathy Baskin (yes), Eve Schluter (yes), Heidi Porter (yes), Derek Brindisi (not present for vote), Julia Blatt (yes), Tonya Colpitts (not present for vote), Anita Deeley (yes), Russell Hopping (abstain), Kim LeBeau (yes), Bob Mann (no), Priscilla Matton (no), Brad Mitchell (no), Jennifer Pederson (yes), Richard Pollack (no), Helen Poynton (yes), Heidi Ricci (yes), Stephen Rich (not present for vote), Richard Robinson (yes), Sam Telford (no), Beth Card (yes).

BP-16	Yes	14
	No	5
	Abstain	1
Name	Absent	Vote
Kathleen Baskin		y
Julia Blatt		y
Derek Brindisi	absent	
Bethany Card		y
Tonya Colpitts	absent	
Kevin Cranston		y
Anita Deeley		y
Russell Hopping		a
Nicole Keleher		y
Kimberly LeBeau		y
John Lebeaux		y
Bob Mann		n
Priscilla Matton		n
Brad Mitchell		n
Jennifer Pederson		y
Richard Pollack		n
Heidi Porter		y
Helen Poynton		y
Heidi Ricci		y
Stephen Rich	absent	
Richard Robinson		y
Eve Schluter		y
Sam Telford		n
	Vote Count	20

BP-17: Enhancing and Updating Wetlands Management within Integrated Pest Management:

A motion was entertained by Beth Card to vote on the recommendation. A motion was made by Richard Robinson. Seconded by Priscilla Matton. A roll call was conducted. Kevin Cranston (yes), John Lebeaux (yes), Nicole Keleher (yes), Kathy Baskin (yes), Eve Schluter (yes), Heidi Porter (yes), Derek Brindisi (not present for vote), Julia Blatt (yes), Tonya Colpitts (not present for vote), Anita Deeley (yes), Russell Hopping (yes), Kim LeBeau (yes), Bob Mann (yes), Priscilla Matton (yes), Brad Mitchell (yes), Jennifer Pederson (yes), Richard Pollack (no), Helen Poynton (yes), Heidi Ricci (yes), Stephen Rich (not present for vote), Richard Robinson (yes), Sam Telford (yes), Beth Card (yes).

BP-17	Yes	19
	No	1
	Abstain	0
Name	Absent	Vote
Kathleen Baskin		y
Julia Blatt		y
Derek Brindisi	absent	
Bethany Card		y
Tonya Colpitts	absent	
Kevin Cranston		y
Anita Deeley		y
Russell Hopping		y
Nicole Keleher		y
Kimberly LeBeau		y
John Lebeaux		y
Bob Mann		y
Priscilla Matton		y
Brad Mitchell		y
Jennifer Pederson		y
Richard Pollack		n
Heidi Porter		y
Helen Poynton		y
Heidi Ricci		y
Stephen Rich	absent	
Richard Robinson		y
Eve Schluter		y
Sam Telford		y
	Vote Count	20

BP-18: Notification:

A motion was entertained by Beth Card to vote on the recommendation. A motion was made by Richard Robinson. Seconded by Priscilla Matton. A roll call was conducted. Kevin Cranston (yes), John Lebeaux (yes), Nicole Keleher (yes), Kathy Baskin (yes), Eve Schluter (yes), Heidi Porter (yes), Derek Brindisi (not present for vote), Julia Blatt (yes), Tonya Colpitts (not present for vote), Anita Deeley (yes), Russell Hopping (yes), Kim LeBeau (yes), Bob Mann (no), Priscilla Matton (yes), Brad Mitchell (no), Jennifer Pederson (yes), Richard Pollack (no), Helen Poynton (yes), Heidi Ricci (yes), Stephen Rich (not present for vote), Richard Robinson (yes), Sam Telford (no), Beth Card (yes).

BP-18	Yes	16
	No	4
	Abstain	0
Name	Absent	Vote
Kathleen Baskin		y
Julia Blatt		y
Derek Brindisi	absent	
Bethany Card		y
Tonya Colpitts	absent	
Kevin Cranston		y
Anita Deeley		y
Russell Hopping		y
Nicole Keleher		y
Kimberly LeBeau		y
John Lebeaux		y
Bob Mann		n
Priscilla Matton		y
Brad Mitchell		n
Jennifer Pederson		y
Richard Pollack		n
Heidi Porter		y
Helen Poynton		y
Heidi Ricci		y
Stephen Rich	absent	
Richard Robinson		y
Eve Schluter		y
Sam Telford		n
	Vote Count	20

LE-1: Online system for requesting property exclusions and property opt-outs:

A motion was entertained by Beth Card to vote on the recommendation. A motion was made by Heidi Ricci. Seconded by Russell Hopping. A roll call was conducted. Kevin Cranston (yes), John Lebeaux (yes), Nicole Keleher (yes), Kathy Baskin (yes), Eve Schluter (yes), Heidi Porter (yes), Derek Brindisi (not present for vote), Julia Blatt (yes), Tonya Colpitts (not present for vote), Anita Deeley (yes), Russell Hopping (yes), Kim LeBeau (yes), Bob Mann (yes), Priscilla Matton (yes), Brad Mitchell (yes), Jennifer Pederson (yes), Richard Pollack (yes), Helen Poynton (yes), Heidi Ricci (yes), Stephen Rich (not present for vote), Richard Robinson (yes), Sam Telford (yes), Beth Card (yes).

LE-1	Yes	20
	No	0
	Abstain	0
Name	Absent	Vote
Kathleen Baskin		y
Julia Blatt		y
Derek Brindisi	absent	
Bethany Card		y
Tonya Colpitts	absent	
Kevin Cranston		y
Anita Deeley		y
Russell Hopping		y
Nicole Keleher		y
Kimberly LeBeau		y
John Lebeaux		y
Bob Mann		y
Priscilla Matton		y
Brad Mitchell		y
Jennifer Pederson		y
Richard Pollack		y
Heidi Porter		y
Helen Poynton		y
Heidi Ricci		y
Stephen Rich	absent	
Richard Robinson		y
Eve Schluter		y
Sam Telford		y
	Vote Count	20

LE-2: Marking methods for property exclusions and property opt-outs:

A motion was entertained by Beth Card to vote on the recommendation. A motion was made by Heidi Ricci. Seconded by Russell Hopping. A roll call was conducted. Kevin Cranston (yes), John Lebeaux (abstain), Nicole Keleher (yes), Kathy Baskin (yes), Eve Schluter (yes), Heidi Porter (yes), Derek Brindisi (not present for vote), Julia Blatt (yes,) Tonya Colpitts (not present for vote), Anita Deeley (yes), Russell Hopping (yes), Kim LeBeau (yes), Bob Mann (yes), Priscilla Matton (yes), Brad Mitchell (yes), Jennifer Pederson (yes), Richard Pollack (yes), Helen Poynton (yes), Heidi Ricci (yes), Stephen Rich (not present for vote), Richard Robinson (yes), Sam Telford (yes), Beth Card (yes).

LE-2	Yes	19
	No	0
	Abstain	1
Name	Absent	Vote
Kathleen Baskin		y
Julia Blatt		y
Derek Brindisi	absent	
Bethany Card		y
Tonya Colpitts	absent	
Kevin Cranston		y
Anita Deeley		y
Russell Hopping		y
Nicole Keleher		y
Kimberly LeBeau		y
John Lebeaux		a
Bob Mann		y
Priscilla Matton		y
Brad Mitchell		y
Jennifer Pederson		y
Richard Pollack		y
Heidi Porter		y
Helen Poynton		y
Heidi Ricci		y
Stephen Rich	absent	
Richard Robinson		y
Eve Schluter		y
Sam Telford		y
	Vote Count	20

LE-3: Public engagement:

A motion was entertained by Beth Card to vote on the recommendation. A motion was made by Heidi Ricci. Seconded by Russell Hopping. A roll call was conducted. Kevin Cranston (yes), John Lebeaux (yes), Nicole Keleher (yes), Kathy Baskin (yes), Eve Schluter (yes), Heidi Porter (yes), Derek Brindisi (not present for vote), Julia Blatt (yes), Tonya Colpitts (not present for vote), Anita Deeley (yes), Russell Hopping (yes), Kim LeBeau (yes), Bob Mann (yes), Priscilla Matton (no), Brad Mitchell (yes), Jennifer Pederson (yes), Richard Pollack (no), Helen Poynton (yes), Heidi Ricci (yes), Stephen Rich (not present for vote), Richard Robinson (yes), Sam Telford (no), Beth Card (yes).

LE-3	Yes	17
	No	3
	Abstain	0
Name	Absent	Vote
Kathleen Baskin		y
Julia Blatt		y
Derek Brindisi	absent	
Bethany Card		y
Tonya Colpitts	absent	
Kevin Cranston		y
Anita Deeley		y
Russell Hopping		y
Nicole Keleher		y
Kimberly LeBeau		y
John Lebeaux		y
Bob Mann		y
Priscilla Matton		n
Brad Mitchell		y
Jennifer Pederson		y
Richard Pollack		n
Heidi Porter		y
Helen Poynton		y
Heidi Ricci		y
Stephen Rich	absent	
Richard Robinson		y
Eve Schluter		y
Sam Telford		n
	Vote Count	20

LE-4: Menu-based approach:

A motion was entertained by Beth Card to vote on the recommendation. A motion was made by Heidi Ricci. Seconded by Russell Hopping. A roll call was conducted. Kevin Cranston (no), John Lebeaux (no), Nicole Keleher (no), Kathy Baskin (no), Eve Schluter (no), Heidi Porter (no), Derek Brindisi (not present for vote), Julia Blatt (yes), Tonya Colpitts (not present for vote), Anita Deeley (no), Russell Hopping (yes), Kim LeBeau (no), Bob Mann (no), Priscilla Matton (no), Brad Mitchell (no), Jennifer Pederson (no), Richard Pollack (no), Helen Poynton (yes), Heidi Ricci (yes), Stephen Rich (not present for vote), Richard Robinson (yes), Sam Telford (no), Beth Card (no).

LE-4	Yes	5
	No	15
	Abstain	0
Name	Absent	Vote
Kathleen Baskin		n
Julia Blatt		y
Derek Brindisi	absent	
Bethany Card		n
Tonya Colpitts	absent	
Kevin Cranston		n
Anita Deeley		n
Russell Hopping		y
Nicole Keleher		n
Kimberly LeBeau		n
John Lebeaux		n
Bob Mann		n
Priscilla Matton		n
Brad Mitchell		n
Jennifer Pederson		n
Richard Pollack		n
Heidi Porter		n
Helen Poynton		y
Heidi Ricci		y
Stephen Rich	absent	
Richard Robinson		y
Eve Schluter		n
Sam Telford		n
	Vote Count	20

LE-4a: Alternative Menu-based Approach:

A motion was entertained by Beth Card to vote on the recommendation. A motion was made by Heidi Ricci. Seconded by Russell Hopping. A roll call was conducted. Kevin Cranston (no), John Lebeaux (no), Nicole Keleher (no), Kathy Baskin (no), Eve Schluter (no), Heidi Porter (no), Derek Brindisi (not present for vote), Julia Blatt (no), Tonya Colpitts (not present for vote), Anita Deeley (yes), Russell Hopping (no), Kim LeBeau (no), Bob Mann (no), Priscilla Matton (no), Brad Mitchell (no), Jennifer Pederson (no), Richard Pollack (no), Helen Poynton (no), Heidi Ricci (no), Stephen Rich (not present for vote), Richard Robinson (no), Sam Telford (no), Beth Card (no).

LE-4a	Yes	1
	No	19
	Abstain	0
Name	Absent	Vote
Kathleen Baskin		n
Julia Blatt		n
Derek Brindisi	absent	
Bethany Card		n
Tonya Colpitts	absent	
Kevin Cranston		n
Anita Deeley		y
Russell Hopping		n
Nicole Keleher		n
Kimberly LeBeau		n
John Lebeaux		n
Bob Mann		n
Priscilla Matton		n
Brad Mitchell		n
Jennifer Pederson		n
Richard Pollack		n
Heidi Porter		n
Helen Poynton		n
Heidi Ricci		n
Stephen Rich	absent	
Richard Robinson		n
Eve Schluter		n
Sam Telford		n
	Vote Count	20

LE-5: Pilot evaluation of environmental impacts:

A motion was entertained by Beth Card to vote on the recommendation. A motion was made by Heidi Ricci. Seconded by Russell Hopping. A roll call was conducted. Kevin Cranston (no), John Lebeaux (no), Nicole Keleher (no), Kathy Baskin (no), Eve Schluter (no), Heidi Porter (no), Derek Brindisi (not present for vote), Julia Blatt (no), Tonya Colpitts (not present for vote), Anita Deeley (yes), Russell Hopping (no), Kim LeBeau (no), Bob Mann (no), Priscilla Matton (no), Brad Mitchell (no), Jennifer Pederson (no), Richard Pollack (no), Helen Poynton (no), Heidi Ricci (yes), Stephen Rich (not present for vote), Richard Robinson (yes), Sam Telford (no), Beth Card (no).

LE-5	Yes	3
	No	17
	Abstain	0
Name	Absent	Vote
Kathleen Baskin		n
Julia Blatt		n
Derek Brindisi	absent	
Bethany Card		n
Tonya Colpitts	absent	
Kevin Cranston		n
Anita Deeley		y
Russell Hopping		n
Nicole Keleher		n
Kimberly LeBeau		n
John Lebeaux		n
Bob Mann		n
Priscilla Matton		n
Brad Mitchell		n
Jennifer Pederson		n
Richard Pollack		n
Heidi Porter		n
Helen Poynton		n
Heidi Ricci		y
Stephen Rich	absent	
Richard Robinson		y
Eve Schluter		n
Sam Telford		n
	Vote Count	20

LE-5a: Comprehensive Evaluation Program:

A motion was entertained by Beth Card to vote on the recommendation. A motion was made by Heidi Ricci. Seconded by Russell Hopping. A roll call was conducted. Kevin Cranston (no), John Lebeaux (no), Nicole Keleher (no), Kathy Baskin (no), Eve Schluter (no), Heidi Porter (no), Derek Brindisi (not present for vote), Julia Blatt (yes), Tonya Colpitts (not present for vote), Anita Deeley (yes), Russell Hopping (yes), Kim LeBeau (no), Bob Mann (no), Priscilla Matton (no), Brad Mitchell (no), Jennifer Pederson (no), Richard Pollack (no), Helen Poynton (yes), Heidi Ricci (yes), Stephen Rich (not present for vote), Richard Robinson (yes), Sam Telford (no), Beth Card (no).

LE-5a	Yes	6
	No	14
	Abstain	0
Name	Absent	Vote
Kathleen Baskin		n
Julia Blatt		y
Derek Brindisi	absent	
Bethany Card		n
Tonya Colpitts	absent	
Kevin Cranston		n
Anita Deeley		y
Russell Hopping		y
Nicole Keleher		n
Kimberly LeBeau		n
John Lebeaux		n
Bob Mann		n
Priscilla Matton		n
Brad Mitchell		n
Jennifer Pederson		n
Richard Pollack		n
Heidi Porter		n
Helen Poynton		y
Heidi Ricci		y
Stephen Rich	absent	
Richard Robinson		y
Eve Schluter		n
Sam Telford		n
	Vote Count	20

LE-6: Increased sharing of pesticide application locations:

A motion was entertained by Beth Card to vote on the recommendation. A motion was made by Heidi Ricci. Seconded by Russell Hopping. A roll call was conducted. Kevin Cranston (yes), John Lebeaux (abstain), Nicole Keleher (yes), Kathy Baskin (yes), Eve Schluter (yes), Heidi Porter (yes), Derek Brindisi (not present for vote), Julia Blatt (yes), Tonya Colpitts (not present for vote), Anita Deeley (yes), Russell Hopping (yes), Kim LeBeau (yes), Bob Mann (no), Priscilla Matton (no), Brad Mitchell (no), Jennifer Pederson (yes), Richard Pollack (no), Helen Poynton (yes), Heidi Ricci (yes), Stephen Rich (not present for vote), Richard Robinson (yes), Sam Telford (no), Beth Card (yes).

LE-6	Yes	14
	No	5
	Abstain	1
Name	Absent	Vote
Kathleen Baskin		y
Julia Blatt		y
Derek Brindisi	absent	
Bethany Card		y
Tonya Colpitts	absent	
Kevin Cranston		y
Anita Deeley		y
Russell Hopping		y
Nicole Keleher		y
Kimberly LeBeau		y
John Lebeaux		a
Bob Mann		n
Priscilla Matton		n
Brad Mitchell		n
Jennifer Pederson		y
Richard Pollack		n
Heidi Porter		y
Helen Poynton		y
Heidi Ricci		y
Stephen Rich	absent	
Richard Robinson		y
Eve Schluter		y
Sam Telford		n
	Vote Count	20

LE-7: Increased transparency on sensitive habitat/rare species exclusions:

A motion was entertained by Beth Card to vote on the recommendation. A motion was made by Heidi Ricci. Seconded by Russell Hopping. A roll call was conducted. Kevin Cranston (no), John Lebeaux (no), Nicole Keleher (no), Kathy Baskin (no), Eve Schluter (no), Heidi Porter (no), Derek Brindisi (not present for vote), Julia Blatt (yes), Tonya Colpitts (not present for vote), Anita Deeley (yes), Russell Hopping (no), Kim LeBeau (no), Bob Mann (no), Priscilla Matton (no), Brad Mitchell (yes), Jennifer Pederson (no), Richard Pollack (no), Helen Poynton (yes), Heidi Ricci (yes), Stephen Rich (not present for vote), Richard Robinson (abstain), Sam Telford (no), Beth Card (no).

LE-7	Yes	5
	No	14
	Abstain	1
Name	Absent	Vote
Kathleen Baskin		n
Julia Blatt		y
Derek Brindisi	absent	
Bethany Card		n
Tonya Colpitts	absent	
Kevin Cranston		n
Anita Deeley		y
Russell Hopping		n
Nicole Keleher		n
Kimberly LeBeau		n
John Lebeaux		n
Bob Mann		n
Priscilla Matton		n
Brad Mitchell		y
Jennifer Pederson		n
Richard Pollack		n
Heidi Porter		n
Helen Poynton		y
Heidi Ricci		y
Stephen Rich	absent	
Richard Robinson		a
Eve Schluter		n
Sam Telford		n
	Vote Count	20

PS-1: Active Ingredients:

A motion was entertained by Beth Card to vote on the recommendation. A motion was made by Bob Mann. Seconded by Nicole Keleher. A roll call was conducted. Kevin Cranston (yes), John Lebeaux (yes), Nicole Keleher (yes), Kathy Baskin (yes), Eve Schluter (yes), Heidi Porter (yes), Derek Brindisi (not present for vote), Julia Blatt (abstain), Tonya Colpitts (not present for vote), Anita Deeley (yes), Russell Hopping (yes), Kim LeBeau (yes), Bob Mann (yes), Priscilla Matton (yes), Brad Mitchell (yes), Jennifer Pederson (yes), Richard Pollack (yes), Helen Poynton (yes), Heidi Ricci (no), Stephen Rich (not present for vote), Richard Robinson (yes), Sam Telford (yes), Beth Card (yes).

PS-1	Yes	18
	No	1
	Abstain	1
Name	Absent	Vote
Kathleen Baskin		y
Julia Blatt		a
Derek Brindisi	absent	
Bethany Card		y
Tonya Colpitts	absent	
Kevin Cranston		y
Anita Deeley		y
Russell Hopping		y
Nicole Keleher		y
Kimberly LeBeau		y
John Lebeaux		y
Bob Mann		y
Priscilla Matton		y
Brad Mitchell		y
Jennifer Pederson		y
Richard Pollack		y
Heidi Porter		y
Helen Poynton		y
Heidi Ricci		n
Stephen Rich	absent	
Richard Robinson		y
Eve Schluter		y
Sam Telford		y
	Vote Count	20

PS-2: Inert Ingredients (Option 1):

A motion was entertained by Beth Card to vote on the recommendation. A motion was made by Bob Mann. Seconded by Nicole Keleher. A roll call was conducted. Kevin Cranston (yes), John Lebeaux (yes), Nicole Keleher (yes), Kathy Baskin (yes), Eve Schluter (yes), Heidi Porter (yes), Derek Brindisi (not present for vote), Julia Blatt (no) Tonya Colpitts (not present for vote), Anita Deeley (no), Russell Hopping (no), Kim LeBeau (yes), Bob Mann (yes), Priscilla Matton (yes), Brad Mitchell (yes), Jennifer Pederson (yes), Richard Pollack (yes), Helen Poynton (no), Heidi Ricci (no), Stephen Rich (not present for vote), Richard Robinson (no), Sam Telford (yes), Beth Card (yes).

PS-2	Yes	14
	No	6
	Abstain	0
Name	Absent	Vote
Kathleen Baskin		y
Julia Blatt		n
Derek Brindisi	absent	
Bethany Card		y
Tonya Colpitts	absent	
Kevin Cranston		y
Anita Deeley		n
Russell Hopping		n
Nicole Keleher		y
Kimberly LeBeau		y
John Lebeaux		y
Bob Mann		y
Priscilla Matton		y
Brad Mitchell		y
Jennifer Pederson		y
Richard Pollack		y
Heidi Porter		y
Helen Poynton		n
Heidi Ricci		n
Stephen Rich	absent	
Richard Robinson		n
Eve Schluter		y
Sam Telford		y
	Vote Count	20

PS-3: Inert Ingredients (Option 2):

A motion was entertained by Beth Card to vote on the recommendation. A motion was made by Bob Mann. Seconded by Nicole Keleher. A roll call was conducted. Kevin Cranston (no), John Lebeaux (no), Nicole Keleher (no), Kathy Baskin (no), Eve Schluter (no), Heidi Porter (no), Derek Brindisi (not present for vote), Julia Blatt (yes), Tonya Colpitts (not present for vote), Anita Deeley (yes), Russell Hopping (yes), Kim LeBeau (no), Bob Mann (no), Priscilla Matton (no), Brad Mitchell (no), Jennifer Pederson (no), Richard Pollack (no), Helen Poynton (yes), Heidi Ricci (yes), Stephen Rich (not present for vote), Richard Robinson (yes), Sam Telford (no), Beth Card (no).

PS-3	Yes	6
	No	14
	Abstain	0
Name	Absent	Vote
Kathleen Baskin		n
Julia Blatt		y
Derek Brindisi	absent	
Bethany Card		n
Tonya Colpitts	absent	
Kevin Cranston		n
Anita Deeley		y
Russell Hopping		y
Nicole Keleher		n
Kimberly LeBeau		n
John Lebeaux		n
Bob Mann		n
Priscilla Matton		n
Brad Mitchell		n
Jennifer Pederson		n
Richard Pollack		n
Heidi Porter		n
Helen Poynton		y
Heidi Ricci		y
Stephen Rich	absent	
Richard Robinson		y
Eve Schluter		n
Sam Telford		n
	Vote Count	20

PS-4: Selecting Pesticides and Ensuring a Transparent Selection Process:

A motion was entertained by Beth Card to vote on the recommendation. A motion was made by Bob Mann. Seconded by Nicole Keleher. A roll call was conducted. Kevin Cranston (yes), John Lebeaux (yes), Nicole Keleher (yes), Kathy Baskin (yes), Eve Schluter (yes), Heidi Porter (yes), Derek Brindisi (not present for vote), Julia Blatt (yes), Tonya Colpitts (not present for vote), Anita Deeley (yes), Russell Hopping (yes), Kim LeBeau (yes), Bob Mann (yes), Priscilla Matton (yes), Brad Mitchell (yes), Jennifer Pederson (yes), Richard Pollack (no), Helen Poynton (abstain), Heidi Ricci (yes), Stephen Rich (not present for vote), Richard Robinson (yes), Sam Telford (yes), Beth Card (yes).

PS-4	Yes	18
	No	1
	Abstain	1
Name	Absent	Vote
Kathleen Baskin		y
Julia Blatt		y
Derek Brindisi	absent	
Bethany Card		y
Tonya Colpitts	absent	
Kevin Cranston		y
Anita Deeley		y
Russell Hopping		y
Nicole Keleher		y
Kimberly LeBeau		y
John Lebeaux		y
Bob Mann		y
Priscilla Matton		y
Brad Mitchell		y
Jennifer Pederson		y
Richard Pollack		n
Heidi Porter		y
Helen Poynton		a
Heidi Ricci		y
Stephen Rich	absent	
Richard Robinson		y
Eve Schluter		y
Sam Telford		y
	Vote Count	20

PS-6: Consideration of Novel Risk/Exposure Scenarios:

A motion was entertained by Beth Card to vote on the recommendation. A motion was made by Bob Mann. Seconded by Nicole Keleher. A roll call was conducted. Kevin Cranston (no), John Lebeaux (no), Nicole Keleher (no), Kathy Baskin (no), Eve Schluter (no), Heidi Porter (no), Derek Brindisi (not present for vote), Julia Blatt (yes), Tonya Colpitts (not present for vote), Anita Deeley (yes), Russell Hopping (yes), Kim LeBeau (yes), Bob Mann (no), Priscilla Matton (no), Brad Mitchell (no), Jennifer Pederson (yes), Richard Pollack (no), Helen Poynton (yes), Heidi Ricci (yes), Stephen Rich (not present for vote), Richard Robinson (yes), Sam Telford (no), Beth Card (no).

PS-6	Yes	8
	No	12
	Abstain	0
Name	Absent	Vote
Kathleen Baskin		n
Julia Blatt		y
Derek Brindisi	absent	
Bethany Card		n
Tonya Colpitts	absent	
Kevin Cranston		n
Anita Deeley		y
Russell Hopping		y
Nicole Keleher		n
Kimberly LeBeau		y
John Lebeaux		n
Bob Mann		n
Priscilla Matton		n
Brad Mitchell		n
Jennifer Pederson		y
Richard Pollack		n
Heidi Porter		n
Helen Poynton		y
Heidi Ricci		y
Stephen Rich	absent	
Richard Robinson		y
Eve Schluter		n
Sam Telford		n
	Vote Count	20

PS-7: Avoiding Use of Pesticides Containing PFAS and Other Contaminants:

A motion was entertained by Beth Card to vote on the recommendation. A motion was made by Bob Mann. Seconded by Nicole Keleher. A roll call was conducted. Kevin Cranston (yes), John Lebeaux (yes), Nicole Keleher (yes), Kathy Baskin (yes), Eve Schluter (yes), Heidi Porter (yes), Derek Brindisi (not present for vote), Julia Blatt (yes), Tonya Colpitts (not present for vote), Anita Deeley (yes), Russell Hopping (yes), Kim LeBeau (yes), Bob Mann (yes), Priscilla Matton (yes), Brad Mitchell (yes), Jennifer Pederson (yes), Richard Pollack (no), Helen Poynton (yes), Heidi Ricci (yes), Stephen Rich (not present for vote), Richard Robinson (yes), Sam Telford (yes), Beth Card (yes).

	Yes	19
	No	1
	Abstain	0
Name	Absent	Vote
Kathleen Baskin		y
Julia Blatt		y
Derek Brindisi	absent	
Bethany Card		y
Tonya Colpitts	absent	
Kevin Cranston		y
Anita Deeley		y
Russell Hopping		y
Nicole Keleher		y
Kimberly LeBeau		y
John Lebeaux		y
Bob Mann		y
Priscilla Matton		y
Brad Mitchell		y
Jennifer Pederson		y
Richard Pollack		n
Heidi Porter		y
Helen Poynton		y
Heidi Ricci		y
Stephen Rich	absent	
Richard Robinson		y
Eve Schluter		y
Sam Telford		y
	Vote Count	20

Meeting Close and Vote to Adjourn:

Beth Card noted that the next steps would be to compile the report with the tally of the voting results and the goal would be to circulate the content to the task force members ahead of the 3/31 deadline. Heidi Ricci asked if the recommendation voting tally sheet could be distributed right away and Caroline Higley responded that it could be distributed right away to task force members. Beth Card adjourned the final task force meeting at 1:02 p.m.

**Policy Structure Subcommittee
Meeting Minutes**

MCTF Policy Structure Subcommittee Meeting Minutes 09 30 21

Minutes for the Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century (MCTF) Task Force Meeting

Subcommittee Meeting: Policy Structure

September 30, 2021, 12:00 p.m. via Zoom

Meeting Topics:

- Meeting Opening, Welcome and Roll Call (chair)
- Housekeeping Notes (EEA representatives)
- Introductions (facilitator)
- Clarify the Process for Recommendations Development: Stage 1—Review and Discuss Information
- Begin the Process of Developing Recommendations (if time allows)
- Wrap Up (Facilitator)
- Closing Remarks and Vote to Adjourn (facilitator and chair)

Chair Stephen Rich called the meeting to order at 12:00pm. Roll call was taken with subcommittee members: Stephen Rich (Chair), Brad Mitchell, Derek Brindisi (left meeting), Heidi Porter, Richard Pollack, Heidi Ricci. Julia Blatt was unable to attend. The ERG Facilitator was Diana Pietri, and state staff in attendance were Jessica Burgess and Alisha Bouchard. Additional meeting attendees included: Aubrey Paolino, Brian Farless, Cheryl Keenan, Jan Connery, Jennifer Forman Orth, Jenny Helmick, Ross Rossetti, Taryn LaScola-Miner, and Timothy Deschamps.

The subcommittee had a quorum present.

The agenda and a recap of the subcommittee guidance document was reviewed to ensure that all members were clear about subcommittee purpose, charge, process, and ground rules. The subcommittee agreed that it would meet every two weeks, attend monthly Mosquito Control Task Force (MCTF) meetings, and report on the subcommittee's progress. In addition, the subcommittee agreed to cover a wide area of topics related to assessing the need to update the composition of policy. Conversations can be expansive, doesn't need to be only about how many people are on the committee. The subcommittee agreed they would collaborate to identify challenges and make recommendations.

Jessica Burgess, SRB General Counsel and MDAR Legal Counsel, began the meeting with an overview of M.G.L. Chapter 252, which deals with the improvement of low land and swamps, stating that it has not been amended very frequently. Jessica Burgess explained the current structure doesn't address a lot of present-day concerns, and it might be helpful to have a more in-depth review of M.G.L. Chapter 252, as the existing legislation is narrow and outdated. M.G.L. Chapter 252 was a major talking point throughout the entirety of the meeting. There was an emphasis to review M.G.L. Chapter 252 to discuss and determine what mosquito control is and to determine what sections of M.G.L. Chapter 252 are most relevant to the present conversation.

Brad Mitchell suggested that the group should make recommendations as well as discuss statutes and potential changes. Heidi Ricci suggested a need to look beyond structure. Heidi Ricci also raised the question of what is the purpose and goal of mosquito control in Massachusetts? To protect people.

Heidi Ricci noted that we presently have a fragmented system that does not include Massachusetts Wildlife Agency (DFG). There was an emphasis that we need to look at the joint statement of the CDC and EPA.

Diana Pietri presented slides related to local engagement, mosquito control policy structure, and pesticide selection. Jessica Burgess explained one of the existing goals for the subcommittee is to address information sources, or might it be better tackled by a subcommittee who is getting into how mosquito control is done. There are two legislative avenues that control the structure: M.G.L. Chapter 252, has not been amended very frequently and is not very specific or relevant. The purpose behind M.G.L. Chapter 252 is reclaiming wetlands and controlling mosquitoes, nuisance, and disease; enabling legislation that establishes all but two of the Mosquito Control Districts (MCDs). We are reviewing how M.G.L. Chapter 252 set up mosquito control in Commonwealth, and then you have other legislation that the MCDs and the State Reclamation Board (SRB) provide services. Jessica Burgess explained it might be helpful to have a more in-depth review of policy and structure. The Subcommittee needs to identify existing legislative structure that would need to change to meet goals and objectives. There are existing legislative documents, but the legislative language is narrow and might not address everything. Brad Mitchell agreed with Heidi Ricci that mosquito control policy and structure is created through the statutes and there needs to be discussion if we should change those status and what those statutes should be.

Diana Pietri reiterated the key focus of the meeting was to review task force subcommittee guidance: review purpose, charge, and ground rules. Ultimately, the whole task force will vote on subcommittee recommendations. The MCTF report is a primary source of information for the subcommittee, other materials and presentations may be introduced, however the schedule for drafting recommendations does not allow for time to be spent gathering or discussing additional info sources. Heidi Ricci asked if DPH or other agencies have a role in this, or are they available if there are questions and the subcommittee members want Agency information? Diana Pietri explained that other agencies have not been scheduled to be part of the subcommittee meetings, but that it can be talked through how to insert other info into the process if the subcommittee feels the need for other information.

A four-phase schedule was discussed with the group in relation to review, discussions, outlining recommendations, and development of final recommendations. The expectation is this can all happen in nine meetings, unless it is determined that there will be an extension of the deadline for recommendations. If this happens, the meeting schedule will be updated accordingly.

Diana Pietri addressed protocols for drafting recommendations and voting. Recommendations should take the form of one to two sentences that are clear and actionable, with two to three paragraphs of rationale and evidence. There was an option to include minority discussion (two to three paragraphs) that can be forwarded to the full task force. Heidi Ricci asked whether the subcommittee should check in with legislators and have them weigh in. Jessica Burgess replied that the current legislation says they can be invited to meetings but cannot participate in an official capacity and if they want to offer their services, if we recommend something with legislative language, it is up to them to outline/write it. Legislature is supposed to be aware and able to participate as needed. Brad Mitchell questioned if it was the work of this group or of the larger task force to draft legislation, since legislation requires a lot of time and consensus and seems beyond the scope of this group.

Stephen Rich noted the optional inclusion of minority discussion points. Do we vote on to carry those discussion points forward? When would a minor point not be carried forward? Diana Pietri wants to make sure that if there is a strong minority, the point can be moved forward, or if there is a recommendation that has options for goal language that could be presenting various options to the task force, they could do so. Diana Pietri explained that the subcommittee will be voting when to provide recommendations and when the voting is final. Members must be present, voting will happen by simple majority, and if a majority is reached, that recommendation is moved forward.

Diana Pietri communicated the rules and expectations for subcommittee members:

- Work constructively and respectfully
- Follow ground rules
- Follow Open Meeting Law (OML)
- Facilitator does not contribute to content discussions or the recommendations; prepares agenda; helps keep focused on the agenda and makes sure that there is opportunity for everyone to speak, captures additional notes for a detailed “parking lot”, and monitors meeting time and schedule in terms of progress. Facilitator also manages drafting of notes and recommendations, monitors for input during discussions on recommendations, and shape recommendations into draft text
- Chair may recognize other attendees and members of public may listen in. Members of public can provide comments via the comment portal
- Stay focused on meeting goals, make sure input is relevant to making recommendations on the assigned directives, ensure that any additional information is relevant to the recommendations, and that this information is presented as succinctly as possible
- Maintain positive, inclusive, solution-focused environment
- Work towards finding common ground
- Notify the chair if you would like to call on a meeting attendee that is not on the panel, and clearly state the purpose of that input
- No side conversations between subcommittee members due to OML

Diana Pietri asked the subcommittee members to confirm that they would follow these rules and expectations, all agreed.

Heidi Porter asked if the subcommittee would not be allowed to meet without a quorum, or if they could meet but just not be able to vote. Jessica Burgess responded that generally, when you have a quorum, that triggers OML, whereas if you do not have a quorum, the meeting would be informational only and no decisions or official discussions can occur. If a subcommittee is not expected to have a quorum for an upcoming meeting, that meeting will be rescheduled. From a best practices standpoint, it is better to have quorum whenever possible, so it can be an official meeting. Heidi Ricci asked if there is anything like the Mullin rule (the ability for municipal officials to review the minutes of a meeting they did not attend) applicable to state bodies. Jessica Burgess said it was her understanding that this is only for municipal boards, so that they can participate in a vote at a later meeting.

Heidi Ricci requested a presentation on underlying laws and structure, with an explanation of how some districts differ in terms of the services they provide. Brad Mitchell noted that mosquito control projects

often take different approaches to mosquito control, for example the Cape Cod district doesn't use adulticide. Examples of where MCD's differ in their practices would be helpful and that is something that should be highlighted. Jessica noted that could be covered, and to let us know and we can do our best to answer those questions and explain them.

Brad Mitchell said that we may see a push for organic control and that topic might cross over into the pesticide selection committee, as that falls under structure and practices. Diana Pietri encouraged all members to review the subcommittee directives, and if there is overlap, it can be discussed at a future subcommittee meeting or task force meeting.

Diana Pietri presented detailed context and suggested an approach regarding the process for recommendations development; stage one—discuss information relevant to recommendations. During this stage, identify information that is relevant to each directive, other sources, and critical data gaps.

Schedule and timeframe - Three meetings (six hours total) to complete review and discussion information relevant to the directives, with three hours per directive. For this subcommittee, the directives are strongly linked and need to be considered in tandem, as that will be the most useful way to guide the discussion. There will be a need for people to do work in between meetings.

Subcommittee members should read and consider the understory questions that were provided, and read the sections of report relevant to the directives. ERG will provide cross walk of the report sections that are most relevant to the directives, in order to guide members to the subsections that are most relevant. Subcommittee members should think about critical data gaps that exist for developing recommendations, and if they can provide sources to close those gaps. They should also assess the overall strength of information in the MCTF report and additional information/knowledge that can be provided and determine whether this is sufficient to use to make recommendations.

Heidi Ricci asked for clarification on understory question: what are the goals, existing goals, and what the statement should be? Diana Pietri noted that there is room to discuss both. It is important that what the group wants to move forward as a recommendation is discussed. Heidi noted that there are data gaps that can't be filled.

Brad Mitchell noted Heidi Ricci brought up a good point about identifying goals and purpose of mosquito control. To create a structure around mosquito control, one needs to know what the goals are. Stephen Rich noted that it is imperative that the subcommittee have an idea of what the goals are in order to discuss policy, and that it is important to get agenda items ahead of time, as these are the guidelines of how the meeting will take place and will guide the process in terms of the time constraints but also what we think is most important. Jessica Burgess noted the goal is to keep agenda as broad as possible but keep in compliance with OML.

Heidi Ricci wondered about an iterative process and coordinating across subcommittees and the full task force; Diana Pietri noted that the MCTF will have monthly meetings and there will be presentations from chair of each committee on progress updates and those meeting. Additionally, every subcommittee has meeting minutes posted. If there is overlap from another subcommittee meeting, it should be brought up. Richard Pollack noted that as the subcommittee strives to set goals for what might happen in the future, it would be helpful to reread M.G.L. 252 and associated documents, so members are on the same page as to what mosquito control was all about to begin with.

Next agenda topics:

- Hearing more about policy so the subcommittee can be clear about that (presentation from Jessica Burgess)
- Overlap with other subcommittees

Stephen Rich said that he hoped the subcommittee could incorporate as many agenda items as people feel should be brought forward, and that he looked forward to working with everyone.

Diana Pietri asked for additional agenda topics to consider for next meeting. None were raised.

The next meeting was confirmed for October 14th. Discuss Information Relevant to Developing Recommendations. Closing Remarks (Facilitator and Chair) were made at 1:55 pm.

Chair Rich entertained a motion to adjourn. Brad Mitchell made a motion to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Richard Pollack. The motion to adjourn was approved via roll call vote at 2:00pm.

MCTF Policy Structure Subcommittee Meeting Minutes 10 14 21

Minutes for the Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century (MCTF) Task Force Meeting

Subcommittee Meeting: Policy Structure

October 14, 2021, 12:00 p.m. via Zoom

Subcommittee Chair Stephen Rich called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m. and a quorum was established. Subcommittee members in attendance included Brad Mitchell, Richard Pollack, Heidi Ricci, Heidi Porter, Russell Hopping, Derek Brindisi, and Julia Blatt. Housekeeping items were addressed by EEA Staff Lead, Alisha Bouchard. Stephen Rich inquired about the approval of meeting minutes. Jessica Burgess responded that meeting minutes would be distributed to the group in the future.

Diana Pietri, ERG Facilitator, provided an overview of the purpose of the meeting, which included the following topic areas:

1. Review of current policy structure, existing laws, and general landscape of mosquito control and mosquito control districts (MCDs) and their differing approaches to mosquito control.
2. Revisit subcommittee understory questions and directives and discuss potential overlap with other subcommittees.
3. Discuss any data gaps identified and determine which the subcommittee considers to be critical.
4. Discuss proposed sources to fill critical gaps and determine which the subcommittee considers to be essential.

Jessica Burgess provided an overview of current policy structure, existing laws, and general landscape of mosquito control in MA. Jessica noted that she has been working in this space for over ten years and served as the General Counsel for the State Reclamation Mosquito Control Board (SRB). Before 2020 there were two things that were reviewed. First, Massachusetts General Law (M.G.L) Chapter 252. Second, were several pieces of special enabling legislation that created most of the Mosquito Control Districts (MCDs). In 2020, there was Chapter 120 of the Act in 2020, which created the Task Force and added a new section of M.G.L. 252. M.G.L 252 was enacted in 1918 and most sections have never been updated to reflect the changes of how county and municipal governments operate. Jessica noted activities that are done under M.G.L. 252 are still subject to other applicable laws and regulations.

Jessica discussed in detail the current structure of mosquito control in MA. Jessica then reviewed some general provisions of M.G.L 252 that were relevant to operations:

- Section 1:
 - allows for drain or flow a meadow, swamp etc. Remove obstructions in rivers, eradicate mosquitoes in any infested area
 - Very broad, doesn't identify nuisance or arbovirus, general provision that talks at a high level that a lot of activity can be conducted to eradicate mosquitoes
- Section 2:
 - sets up SRB, DEP, MDAR, DCR employees
 - Funded through assessments to MCDs, legislative appropriations
- Section 2A:
 - created by C. 120 of the Acts of 2020
 - Authorized the SRB to engage in preventative, management, and eradication methods it deems necessary anywhere in MA
 - Formalized DPH's role in arbovirus risk determinations
 - Required written determination from DPH of an elevated risk for the current or next year
 - SRB can act through any MCD, other state agency, or hire professions as needed
 - Allows for opt outs through two different processes
 - Requirements for certain aerial and wide-area emergency response methods of treatment
- Section 3:

- Authorized SRB to act for public health
- Section 4:
 - SRB to hire individuals and enter land
- Section 4A:
 - Authorizes state agencies and municipalities as landowners to be parties to proceedings within section 1 – 14C, to the same extent as individual proprietors
- Section 5:
 - Property owners can petition SRB for improvements
 - Requires petition to ID funds and pay for the improvements
 - Authorizes SRB to organize district and appoint commissioners as needed to perform and maintain improvements
- Section 5A:
 - SRB can perform work without forming a district
 - IDs funding mechanisms, allows SRB to incur costs, salaries, hire staff, can assess those costs to others as they deem necessary
 - Gives SRB authority to certify budgets and report those numbers to the DOR
 - Allows non-member municipalities to vote to join an MCD, subject to SRB approval
- Section 5B:
 - Authorized boards of health in a municipality not included in an MCD to determine any area infested by mosquitoes, or likely to produce mosquitoes to be a public nuisance
 - BOH may require owner, occupant, or person in charge to abate the nuisance.
- Section 6A:
 - MCDs can hold and obtain liability insurance
- Section 8:
 - Allows state to contribute to costs of improvements made to protect public health
- Section 9-11:
 - Different funding options for MCDs created by the SRB
 - Established when county government was in place
 - Lots of reference to municipal and county governments that don't really mesh with how municipal governments operate today. Constantly trying to see if we can meet the legislative intent
- Section 12:
 - Commissioners to hire individuals, purchase, and own property
- Section 13:
 - Authorizes commissioners to perform work associated with raising and lowering waters
- Section 14:
 - MCDs must submit invoices to SRB for review
- Section 14D:
 - Gives districts the sole authority for personnel decisions
- Section 15 through 23:
 - General provisions not applicable to MCD activities (taking authority, roadways, fees, damages, petitions to municipalities)
- Section 24:
 - Authorizes the establishment of greenhead fly control projects
 - Can exist under MCDs, funded separately, membership can be limited to greenhead fly control operations
 - 252 has a lot of sections, few that are on point to what we need to do now because so many of the sections were about IDing issues and improvements and then creating things to attack those improvements
 - Special enabling legislation, some of it dates back all the way to 1930s (more recent is 1970s)

- SRB did not initially use the sections to create MCDs, legislature did the special enabling legislation
- Almost every area of the Commonwealth has an MCD that could provide services to a municipality if it joined
- Each enabling legislation has been amended several times
- In Chp 252 there's a mechanism to create these districts, but since they've already been created for the Commonwealth, there are not more to be created. If towns want to create a new one, they are pointed to the enabling legislation to see which they are eligible to join
- Enabling legislation addresses funding and commissioners
 - Funding: established general funding mechanism and its through land valuation assessments. Does not give municipality discretion over the amount assessed. Allows for voluntary contributions, establishes trust account.
 - Legislation establishes commissioners, number of commissioners, subject to SRB appointment and removal, IDs any applicable requirements for appointment (like specific areas of expertise), generally 5 commissioners for each project
- Membership: county-based, land area, or municipalities eligible for membership
 - County-based unless otherwise noted
 - IDs method to join and withdraw, any time limits associated with membership
- SRB Role
 - All created as if constituted under the SRB under C. 252 Section 5a.
 - All MCDs subject to SRB oversight and applicable provisions of 252
 - Oversees budgets, expenses, operations, and commissioners

In closing, Jessica noted that Chapter 252 and the enabling legislation gave the SRB general oversight authority. In addition, there were other statutes and regulations that MCDs needed to comply with related to pesticides, fish and wildlife, endangered species, and water quality protection.

Richard Pollack asked if there was a legal definition within 252 for the term nuisance? Jessica noted there was no definitions in 252 and that 252 referenced public health but did not set out to identify nuisance or arbovirus control. It was established for the eradication of mosquitoes and reclaiming lands. The discussion moved towards other legislation or sources that may include a definition of the term nuisance or eradication. Heidi Ricci commented that based on the current outdated legislation there was an opportunity to rethink the current structure as it related to wetland management, the role of DPH and Mass Wildlife, and assisting local communities with education, surveillance, and source reduction.

Jessica Burgess commented that there was no statutory role for DPH or Division of Fisheries and Wildlife, but they are involved in other ways and there was consultation with those Agencies. It was noted that it was good to flag that DPH and Mass Wildlife are not listed in 252 and from a structural perspective that topic may be relevant to other subcommittee groups as well. Jessica Burgess discussed that MCDs established under 252 can have voluntary contributions. For example, East Middlesex and Pioneer Valley Mosquito Control Districts.

Jessica Burgess addressed the cherry sheet deduction process. Heidi Ricci noted until recently, the only way communities could get surveillance was an all or nothing situation. Heidi Ricci referenced that the town of Uxbridge had hired a private company for surveillance and DPH was accepting that data into their systems. Jessica Burgess responded that under the 252 structure, Uxbridge would need to report that data to the SRB. In terms of reporting, all MCDs work with DPH and DPH does all the testing. Although not formally identified in 252, that was another way that DPH was very much involved in the Districts' surveillance process. A question was raised related to the assessment process for municipalities and if the state accounted for land mass that would be considered state owned property. Jessica Burgess noted that this could be brought back to get more detail about how DOR assess land valuation of state-owned property. It was also noted to keep in mind that municipalities were not just paying for MCD services but were also assessed for staff, buildings, and equipment. There was a base cost associated with general operating and then there was payment into the SRB because of the SRB services.

Jessica Burgess commented that this discussion identified components for consideration during recommendation development; to have more flexibility there would need to be a legislative change. Julia Blatt asked about doing away with or updating the legislation so that it is in alignment with the wetlands protection act. Jessica noted that if the subcommittee had identified within the current structure something that doesn't make sense, a recommendation to adjust the current language could be explored further.

Subcommittee members discussed the benefit of rewriting 252 by starting with the purpose of the legislation being centered around science-based mosquito control. The group saw a need for consistency in how mosquito control was handled across MCD's and discussed the need for greater control from a centralized body that could incorporate perspectives from other state agencies into the mosquito control process. Russell Hopping added that defining terminology such as nuisance, creating greater consistency, transparency, and streamlining the opt out process would be beneficial focus areas.

It was noted that the group had two directives: Identifying challenges to municipalities joining MCDs and assessing the need to update the composition of the SRB. Brad Mitchell commented that a lot of this was dependent on how we set up mosquito control. Best practices should be for setting up a system for implementing, creating, and updating best practices, not actually recommending best practices. Julia Blatt commented that she was thinking of the water management act which balanced sets out goals and the regulations that were supposed to support those goals. Jessica noted that she was speaking from her perspective, but EEA's role is to try to help identify the means to accomplish certain goals and objectives. For example, if it was done this way, you are going to be subject to open meeting law. Or, if you wanted to do it this way, we need to make sure that there's regulatory authority.

Heidi Ricci commented that getting some consensus on goals for the program would assist in informing the work for the subcommittee. Heidi Ricci noted we needed a mosquito disease management plan that was open and transparent and was approved following public input. In addition, there needed to be an oversight entity that included DPH, Division of Fisheries and Wildlife, and outside agencies and experts. It was mentioned that the CDC website had a good definition of disease vs. nuisance mosquitoes. Richard Pollack commented in response to a point raised about nuisance vs. disease and noted that MCDs don't try to eliminate all mosquitoes but rather target those mosquitos that pose risk.

Russell Hopping noted the discussions about eliminating 252 and asked what the goal was, and if it might be too radical to think about removing nuisance from the goal of mosquito control. Brad Mitchell argued that we come back to discussion on nuisance control. There was general agreement that we should not rewrite MGL 252, but rather eliminate it and replace it with a framework of what it should and could entail.

Diana Pietri shifted the conversation to talk about the process for filling gaps and recommended the group think about the information that's currently available and what the critical gaps are in that information. In addition, Diana reminded the subcommittee group that other areas of focus will be centered on the discussion of goals, the definition of nuisance, questions related to MGL 252, and what to do with MGL 252 moving forward.

Diana recapped that the next meeting would be on 10/28/21 and that there would be a full Task Force meeting on 10/21/21. Seeing no other comments or questions from the group Stephen Rich took a motion to adjourn. Brad Mitchell made the motion, with Heidi Porter seconding. All ayes. Meeting was adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

MCTF Policy Structure Subcommittee Meeting Minutes 10 28 21

Minutes for the Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century (MCTF) Task Force Meeting

Subcommittee Meeting: Policy Structure

October 28, 2021, 12:00 p.m. via Zoom

Meeting Topics:

- Meeting Opening, Welcome and Roll Call (chair)
- Housekeeping Notes (EEA representatives)
- Meeting Purpose, Agenda (chair and facilitator)
- Discuss strength of information in ERG report and existing data gaps in landscape of data
- Propose potential sources to fill data gaps and determine which sources are credible and essential
- Discuss goals of mosquito control for the Commonwealth
- Discuss definition of nuisance for mosquitoes and mosquito control
- Discuss and finalize subcommittee member action items prior to next meeting
- Wrap Up (Facilitator)
- Closing Remarks and Vote to Adjourn (chair)

Stephen Rich called the meeting to order at 12:03 pm. Heidi Ricci and Derek Brindisi were not available to attend the meeting. All other subcommittee members were present. Subcommittee members included: Stephen Rich (Chair), Julia Blatt, Brad Mitchell, Richard Pollack, and Heidi Porter.

Diana Pietri (ERG Facilitator) asked to run through some housekeeping notes. Diana shared her screen with agenda items listed. The content reviewed by the group looked at data gaps and broached the subject of mosquito control board framework. The agenda noted the need to hear about the strength of the ERG report, available data, and the desire to discuss sources to address data gaps. In addition, the agenda referenced a need to determine mosquito control goals for the state and discuss the definition of nuisance.

Diana asked Steve if there was anything to add and Steve agreed the information discussed was straightforward. Diana raised a discussion point around potential data gaps. The subcommittee has had a few weeks to dig into the report; however, there is an acknowledgement that some subcommittee members have more time to put in than others. The subcommittee group will be talking about goals and the definition of nuisance. The next meeting will be in less than two weeks due to the Veterans Day Holiday. The group will use the next two meetings to discuss goals and moving towards direction of next steps.

Diana then opened the floor to the subcommittee members to get feedback on the ERG report and data gaps. Russell expressed a desire to spend more time with report. Russell did not think there were gaps at this point. Russell mentioned that if we are thinking about replacing M.G.L. 252 then that may set the stage for us to look at it openly and take a step back. Russell did feel that defining nuisance was critical and poses the question of how does the process get remapped once we define nuisance?

Richard commented that the report fell into two main buckets regarding data gaps. First, scientifically there is a lot we don't know, and we have to make assumptions. Second, what we don't know as objectively as we would like, is what do the residents of each municipality want? We do know how many towns call into the mosquito control projects for help. Richard then noted that perhaps we are moving towards a recommendation that M.G.L. 252 is dated and needs to be reevaluated. Richard stated that we need to figure out what to recommend to legislators and what that final product will look like.

Steve thought the ERG report was comprehensive and he enjoyed the historical context. Also, he wanted to see more about how things are done in neighboring states and thought there was great value in how mosquito control is done in other states that have similar risk, for example, in states like NY and CT. Brad agreed with Richard that scientific data gaps are not the purview for this subcommittee. Brad noted that we don't have a lot of indication of what residents want regarding mosquito control. Most people don't know how mosquito control is done. Brad stated that he wants to see how much mosquito projects vary in what they do and how they do it. He feels that there is not a lot of consistency amongst projects in the work they do. Wants to structure mosquito control so it is science-based and sound. Brad posed the question if mosquito control projects are not operating consistently then why is that? Additionally, Brad noted that here needs to be a focus on nuisance. There is still a need for nuisance control – but what defines it?

Julia noted that she read the report a month ago and did not have time to re-review it. Julia took the time to review M.G.L. 252 and agrees that it is out of date. Julia was not convinced that the current way we address mosquito control is the only way to protect public health. Julia stated that she was struck by the number of communities that wanted to opt-out, but were denied, and did not think that was great.

Heidi Porter noted that she agreed with Brad's statement related to a science-based approach and wondered how we pull in the nuisance component because it is so broad and hard to define. Heidi posed the question of how do we quantify the impact to the nuisance question? There was a community reaction to mosquitos this year. The concept of the presence of mosquitos affecting mental health is important to include. Heidi Porter agreed that mosquito control should not be for one-off parties and struggles with the fact that so many communities are not receiving services and thinks it should be up to the community leaders to know how their constituents are feeling. Also, Heidi Porter feels as though there should be a baseline of mosquito control services and people can add services as they wish.

Diana moved the conversation to the proposal of potential sources to fill data gaps and to the determination of which sources are credible and essential, and the need for a framework for science-based mosquito control management – Julia, Russell, and Rich agreed this was a critical gap.

Richard agreed that we need a framework for scientifically based mosquito control and questions how critical the gap is. Many Mosquito Control Districts (MCD's) already use science, and he doesn't think there is a huge critical gap. The MCD's already have a framework and Brad agreed. Brad states that we need to make sure the framework is consistent across all MCD's and that the framework can change over time with the advent of new science or technology. Russell does not see this issue as a data gap. His gap is understanding - what do we mean by scientifically based process? What do we mean by a scientifically based process and how is that different than what is happening now? Russell noted that we need to define the gap to determine what the future recommendations will be. Julia stated that

there is a need of focusing on state mandated directives and assessing the composition of the State Reclamation Board (SRB).

Following up on Richard's point, Steve agreed there is good scientific practice in MCD's. Steve thinks it needs to be more centralized. NY and CT have top quality scientist doing mosquito control in the departments and there is a benefit to having science housed in the same department with mosquito control. Building on what Steve said, Richard noted that research is critical to understand what is going on out there. Specifically, is what we are doing working? The SRB including members of the past were adamant there should not be research – funding should relate to control of mosquitos, and the former SRB position was we could not kill mosquitos with research. There has been a good sea change in the past few years with changeover in the SRB. Richard reiterates that it may make sense to look at the directive: updating the composition of the SRB. Does it make sense to include DPH in a future composition of the SRB? What should the SRB look like in the future? Is that something we want to pursue and take up that challenge? Brad agreed that research should be part of this process. Brad noted without central control and oversight he would have concerns with MCD's doing their own research. In addition, the framework of the SRB needs to be thought out, as there would be concerns with projects doing research independently without oversight.

Seeing no further commentary, Diana recapped the overall conversation. Diana noted, based on what was being discussed, it sounded as though there was a desire to have a science-based framework and to think about how the SRB should be structured. These were discussion topics that fit well into this directive. The subcommittee group agreed with Diana. It is the role of the group to make recommendations as to how the state can ensure this is addressed moving forward.

Diana then suggested that conversation pivot to best policy practices from neighboring states. Diana posed the question: how critical do others feel this is for recommendations? Is this a critical data gap? Brad, Steve, Heidi Porter, Julia, and Russell all agreed that this is a critical topic for moving forward. This is a topic that requires further discussion. Russell stated this is a best practice we are asking for and if we think there is a better process in another state we should look at it, but it feels like this conversation belongs on the best practice subcommittee. Diana noted this may be helpful when we look at policy structures from other states. Rich thought it was critical we know what other states are doing. It ranges from NJ's coordinated program as compared to NY's spottier program (although Suffolk County and Syracuse have good programs because those areas are hotspots). CT has good surveillance but not a lot of mosquito control. Overall, think that MA is better off than most states. How can we set up a policy structure that chooses the best of what we find elsewhere? Brad noted that we should not limit ourselves to neighboring states. No one has a perfect program, but we can take the best from each state. Russell noted the need to look for how we want to structure MA. There is a need for public participation, transparency, policy, and procedural stakeholder input. Two areas of focus that were noted are:

- Communication
- Surveillance

Diana opened the discussion about municipal resident desires and wants. Is this a critical gap? Brad stated that we need to know more about what they want, but they need to know what is happening. This needs to be a nuanced discussion that should be based on sound knowledge. We need to educate

public and then listen to what they want. Julia noted that this was an interesting topic, and we need to figure out who are the stakeholders and what data we need. Perhaps via a survey, but who would a survey go to - boards of health, selectmen? Julia understood the point that most people don't understand what type of mosquito control is happening now.

Rich raised the point regarding cost barriers. One gap that could be calculated is what is that actually per capita cost for mosquito control? The per capita cost could be minimal. Rich did an exercise like this years ago and encouraged the group to look at this. For some areas, when Rich did the calculation, the cost was less than a single bottle of repellent. Need to dig into the cost and understand if it really is cost-prohibitive. Julia said people responding to a survey may benefit from understanding the risk of EEE and maybe understand that in the context of other health hazards as well. Heidi Porter noted cost could be an issue, but once you are a member of a MCD you get what you get. No opportunity for picking from a menu of services.

Diana broached the subject of variations in MCD's in what and how they are doing things. Diana asks the group if this is worth exploring. The majority of the subcommittee feels that this is a critical gap. Brad noted that we don't need to know every difference but if we took top line items (such as salt marsh mosquito control, adulticiding) these are key things we would want to examine as case studies. Rich stated that it is not in the purview of this subcommittee to determine what trap to use, or which insecticide to use. What is deemed best for that locality, or ecological problem that is happening is what should be chosen regarding process for addressing the issue. Rich agreed some group or the SRB should be centralized to help guide that decision making to determine the preferred method to use, but you still need to have some flexibility.

Russell asked a question regarding, how do these districts operate? He is interested in seeing something around consistency in decision making and what services are offered. Russell has experience in working with many different MCD's and they have many different approaches to doing things. Russell agrees, consistency within the MCD's as much as possible would be good. Steve noted that the group should consider which of the things should vary between MCD's and which should not. Steve proposes that there should be a list of things that we think all MCD's should consider, and then additional things districts could do (similar to menu discussion) Brad states that a lot of decision making in MCDs is subjective; we do need variation, but also need to consider whether or not the differences are objective or subjective, are they verified.

Diana turned the subcommittee conversation over to determining additional needs and information, specifically related to the definition of nuisance versus disease vector mosquitos. Rich noted that a lot of this is in the ERG report. There are other regulations that speak to nuisances. This is a central argument. Everyone has their own threshold for pain and irritation. Not sure how to settle that issue. Brad does not feel this is a data gap. It is not all that clear between nuisance and public health. We need to have more conversation and open discussion to determine what our goals are. Brad noted that the open discussion should first determine goals. What is the intention of what triggered the application to address the nuisance? Diana agreed this topic should be an on-going conversation and relevant to other sub committees. Russell noted the data gap and asked if mosquitoes were the only nuisance in MA, we would set up a control for, or are there other animals in MA that this would be

applied to? Russell mentioned there is no parallel program to other animals. How does mosquito control fit into a standard for this type of control?

Rich noted that many other states don't have mosquito control, but they do have vector control. For example, CA's vector program includes ticks, rats, bedbugs. Some MCDs do greenhead fly control. There are some parallels, but again thinking about what's a nuisance; when does it rise from a minor annoyance to something that everyone wants mitigated in some way. Jennifer Forman-Orth mentioned to the group about greenhead fly control and provided a link from the Cape MCD with more details: <https://www.ccmcp.net/greenhead-fly-control>. Brad agreed that Rich noted an important point; when does it go from a nuisance to something larger? Brad noted this needs to be explored. If it is a small group being impacted it would be a nuisance, but when there are a lot of people impacted perhaps that is a level for mitigation.

Diana noted the following three areas as potential data gaps and asked if this was something we should discuss as a subcommittee.

1. General need for definition of public nuisance
2. Menu of mosquito control items/opt outs
3. Efficacy of pesticides for mosquito control/vector control

Brad noted efficacy would fit best within the Pesticides Selection subcommittee. Brad thought this was something that this subcommittee should look at through policy structure and where pesticides can be evaluated and implemented. Steve questioned the efficacy of pesticides for mosquito control or disease control because they are two different topics. Julia noted this as an overarching question for this taskforce. Steve noted that these are different questions. Rich noted that DPH will be presenting on another subcommittee related to the topic of the efficacy of pesticides.

Diana discussed the potential sources to fill the gaps we mentioned, particularly related to best practices from neighboring states, public participation and transparency, and variation between MCDs. Steve noted that he is thinking about it through the lens of DPH's role regarding arbovirus surveillance. There is participation in other states. For example, peer review science coming out of other states, versus DPH in MA which seems like a closed box. Diana reminded the subcommittee members that they will be doing this research, ERG is not exploring other sources. Heidi Porter commented that taking a look at existing arbovirus plans in MA and comparing those with other states would be curious to see the differences. In response, Julia offered staff members to do some research regarding what other states are doing. Rich noted that there is value in research. He suggested focusing on the NJ & CT mosquito control programs. What are the interactions of state departments and their involvement with mosquito control? Also, what is their involvement with other institutions. Steve commented that other states have close ties with academic institutions, and we don't have a similar tie here in MA.

Heidi Porter agreed with the group regarding research on other states and the involvement of other agencies and institution. Heidi Porter expressed a need to review sources for menu-based system of options. We should be able to share the menu of options that we have in our district that every community chooses from. There would be a baseline for administrative costs and then you could choose based on knowledge and feedback of the services you want, and you can also get feedback from town and wetland managers if you need the services or not. Brad noted that review of other states would be worthwhile. Brad commented that there were wide variations in projects that did salt marsh mosquito

control and how they did it – there was a lot of subjectivity. On the topic of adulticiding, the Cape Cod MCD doesn't do adulticiding. Other MCD's have differences in adulticiding, and it seems subjective. Brad added, having a one-page of info of the triggers for adulticiding and that kind of thing from each project could be helpful.

Diana mentioned there is a summary of MCD activities in the ERG report. Diana noted we could point folks to where in the report, and the belief was that the MCD reports are publicly available. Brad noted that the reports don't reflect the why of the decisions, equally as important as the what, but seems like maybe something the SRB could get. Dianna mentioned the if the subcommittee wants someone from the SRB to speak, it could be arranged.

Russell noted that it would be interesting to know how practices have an impact on salt marshes. How does that get picked up if it gets implemented without the research component and how those practices are evaluated long term? Heidi Porter suggested that in addition to salt marshes, we need to look at the rivers and dams and look at the MCD's and if they have larger river systems within their districts – do the MCD's interact with fish and wildlife? Rich noted that several of the MCD's do get involved with water, rivers, culverts, and they have specialist that deal with state and municipal members to ensure they are not trying to create mosquito habitat that they are ultimately trying to eliminate.

Diana commented that we did not have the time to talk about our goals and that the next meeting will focus on the goals of the task force. It was communicated that the next meeting would be on 11/9 and there would be discussion about nuisance in that future meeting and there was an agreement that the subcommittee members would return to data gaps and move into goals of mosquito control for the state. Julia asked Diana to send her the list of people from other states so that her team could reach out for information. Diana agreed to circle back to Julia regarding that ask. Seeing no other questions or comments from the subcommittee, Steve entertained a vote to adjourn the meeting and the motion to adjourn was seconded by Rich and Brad at 2:00 pm.

MCTF Policy Structure Subcommittee Meeting Minutes 11 09 21

Minutes for the Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century (MCTF) Task Force Meeting

Subcommittee Meeting: Policy Structure

November 9, 2021, 12:00 p.m. via Zoom

Meeting Topics:

- Meeting Open, Welcome and Roll Call (chair)
- Housekeeping Notes (EEA representatives)
- Meeting Purpose, Agenda (chair and facilitator)
- Discuss Additional Sources or Information to Fill Data Gaps
- Discuss Goals of Mosquito Control for the Commonwealth
- Begin Discussion on Outlining Recommendations
- Discuss and Finalize Subcommittee Member Action Items Prior to Next Meeting
- Wrap Up (Facilitator)
- Closing Remarks and Vote to Adjourn (chair)

Stephen Rich called the meeting to order at 12:03 pm. The subcommittee members in attendance included Russell Hopping, Brad Mitchell, Richard Pollack, Heidi Ricci, and Heidi Porter. Alisha Bouchard and Jessica Burgess addressed housekeeping items. Diana commented on the full task force meeting related to the DPH presentation. Heidi noted that she submitted a list of questions related to environmental health impacts of pesticides and was also trying to make more connections with experts and felt that this was the biggest gap in the information at this point. Jessica Burgess noted due to scheduling Dr. Brown was the only one that was able to attend the full task force meeting, but more DPH resources and individuals who serve roles in the areas that were referenced would be available in future meetings to fill the goal of addressing data gaps.

Stephen Rich discussed private labs and thought some of the things that were noted about third party labs in the presentation could be revisited. Alisha Bouchard noted that there will be DPH staff at the next full task force meeting where additional questions can be asked. Diana Pietri mentioned overlap arising in other subcommittees that may be relevant to the Policy Structure group. Stephen Rich commented that having meeting minutes of these meetings and additional subcommittee meetings would be helpful. Jessica Burgess commented that once meeting minutes are approved, they can be shared with the subcommittee groups and meeting minutes would be posted to the full task force site.

Diana Pietri moved the conversation to the subcommittee schedule and timing of meeting objectives from November through February (2022). The group discussed extending the time frame for the task force work. Alisha responded that she would check with EEA to see if there was any update on that topic. Members of the subcommittee group also discussed the effects of chemicals on human health and the environment as a necessary component to consider answering directives related to policy.

Brad Mitchell responded that he was not sure that data gaps on human health were pertinent to the charge of the subcommittee. Heidi Ricci noted that the subcommittee did not need to understand all the aspects of the data gaps in detail but when addressing diseases that impact a dozen cases per year and talking about other conditions that affect hundreds of thousands of people across the Commonwealth on an annual basis, more context was needed. Members of the subcommittee discussed the need to be careful when making subjective judgments on

what was important to other people. It was noted that there are gaps in everything and at some point, the subcommittee would need to make recommendations and offer guidance.

Diana Pietri conducted a vote of simple majority to determine if the subcommittee group thought this was a critical gap that needed to be addressed. Diana noted to the group to raise their virtual hands. Two people (Heidi Ricci and Russell Hopping) thought it was a critical data gap. Four people do not think it was a critical data gap (Brad Mitchell, Richard Pollack, Heidi Porter, Stephen Rich). Heidi Ricci commented about voting down information and wanted it noted there were discussions about consensus recommendations and then minority opinions. Brad Mitchell highlighted that this topic should be in a different committee. Diana Pietri commented that she would make sure the facilitator of the pesticide selection subcommittee knew that this came up. Brad noted he was on the Pesticide Selection subcommittee and can bring it back as well.

Diana Pietri provided a recap of the critical data gaps that were identified:

- Best policy structure from neighboring State. Example, was there a better way to structure MA based on the way other States are structuring things
- Public participation, transparency, policy, and procedural stakeholder input
- Variation between MCDs: how, why, and inconsistencies across different MCDs, including funding structure

Russell Hopping noted that it could be useful to outline what science-based mosquito control would look like that's different than what's happening now. Richard Pollack clarified that the MCD's are making decision based on scientific analysis, but the MCDs may not have a complete data set as we like. Heidi commented that some MCD's operate differently than others and thinks some districts apply the science in different ways. Brad Mitchell commented that from his perspective science was used. Brad discussed a few of his concerns and noted that there needed to be scientific consensus in how mosquito control is performed.

Richard Pollack followed on Brad Mitchells comments that there was data that confirmed the location and timing of complaints and using eyes and ears of residents was valuable. Russell noted that it would be helpful to determine what changes need to be made to make it more consistent and scientifically based. Heidi commented that it was a struggle to link roadside spraying with human health outcomes because there was not data on communities that don't belong to districts. Diana asked if the subcommittee wanted to keep discussing this at future meetings to inform recommendations. Heidi Ricci and Russell Hopping said they wanted to keep discussing. Brad Mitchell thought it was important, but no need for debate. Brad added that there needed to be centralized decision making as there were too many groups making decisions.

Diana Pietri asked the group for final thoughts. Heidi Ricci noted that she hoped the group looked at Boulder CO, the CDC/EPA framework, and what other states are doing. Heidi Porter noted that she anticipated that bringing a science-based component would be part of any recommendation the committee made. The group discussed looking at other states mosquito programs to review different elements that could help inform decisions. In addition, it was discussed that the group should review practices of non-neighboring states to identify other options for mosquito control.

Stephen Rich followed up on expectations and noted a lot of these things were about trade-off and that consensus meant compromise. Members of the subcommittee discussed local landowner options and broached some questions related to what taxpayers of the state desired in a mosquito control program. Heidi Ricci discussed opt out related to people wanting surveillance, wetlands management, education, and outreach, but not spraying or local roles in deciding about spraying. Heidi noted a structure for municipalities to get what they want and not what they don't want, a menu-based option. Brad Mitchell commented on the need to distinguish between nuisance and vector control. Alisha Bouchard mentioned that Richard Pollack shared a document from the AMCA about mosquito control and parts of it may be helpful to the group.

Diana Pietri asked if there were any additional data gaps that needed to be addressed. Heidi Ricci noted a check in with someone at EEA to engage with EJ communities. Alisha Bouchard addressed this as something being working on. This was determined to be an area of need but not a critical data gap.

The last critical data gap was the variation between MCDs and the how and why. Heidi Porter responded for the communities that are in an MCD how and why are they in an MCD and how would the structure of an MCD change? Jessica Burgess commented that the recommendation would need to start with legislative change. Broad sweeping change would need to amend enabling legislation, or repeal and do some sort of change to MGL 252 with a more generalized MCD structure. Each MCD through MGL 252 or their own legislation sits within the SRB. Jessica Burgess noted that we can help identify the resources of what that would look like.

Rich Pollack commented that there are two kinds of change on the horizon. First, change in fiscal structure which would require legislative change. Some towns may want only some services. Second, change in practices may not require a legislative change. Generally, the director of the MCD determined what was best for a district. Commissions should be able to make that determination. All things worthy of discussion, maybe services can be provided based on what a community wants. More larvicide, more surveillance, but for the same dollar amount. Subcommittee members discussed recommendations for legislative changes and what could be implemented by the SRB and MDAR. Jessica Burgess clarified that there could be flexibility in services, but there was not flexibility in cost structures without legislative change.

Heidi Ricci noted that it was within the charge of the subcommittee to tackle legislative change and ask if there could be ways for municipalities to participate in DPH surveillance but nothing else. She identified that there are lots of issues with local control and how we're measuring what we're doing and how we're affording it. She also identified that the group should be looking at ways to break down silos across governments. Richard Pollack noted Heidi Ricci's idea of breaking down silos and linking conservation commissions with MCDs. Richard noted that he had tried in the MCD he serves in as Commissioner and not a single conservation commission wanted to engage. If we could encourage this collaboration it would be great, but it has historically been difficult. Richard referred back to the discussion on a menu approach. Richard asked what might happen if there was a spike in the abundance of nuisance mosquitos or if there was a peak in arboviral risk, for towns that want only surveillance. If funds, personnel, and equipment are not available, the services will not be available.

Diana noted that Brad Mitchell had proposed that MCDs or MDAR provide a rationale on how they made their decisions (for example, on use of adulticide). Brad noted that he thought it would be a benefit to having this documented. Diana called for a show of hands to establish a set of questions to distribute to the MCD's for answers. No one stated that they were opposed. Brad Mitchell agreed to draft questions, one on adulticiding and one on salt marsh control. Jessica Burgess flagged for OML purposes that the document cannot be shared until the next subcommittee meeting. Richard Pollock directed those interested to read the MCD annual reports and encouraged all the subcommittee members to come up with questions as to the "why" of MCD practices.

Diana Pietri noted that the ERG report had a chapter on IPM and encouraged the group to review the content. Diana mentioned that the next meeting would be on 11/18 and that meeting would include a discussion from Julia Blatt related to some of the practices from other states. Diana agreed to follow up with Heidi Ricci regarding the compilation of Colorado information to present at the next meeting and Diana would also follow up with Brad Mitchell regarding looking into Florida. Seeing no other questions or comments Stephen Rich entertained a motion to adjourn from Richard Pollack, the motion was seconded by Brad Mitchell. All in favor said aye. The meeting was adjourned at 2:02 p.m.

MCTF Policy Structure Subcommittee Meeting Minutes 11 18 21

Minutes for the Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century (MCTF) Task Force Meeting

Subcommittee Meeting: Policy Structure

November 18, 2021, 1:00 p.m. via Zoom

Meeting Topics:

- Meeting Open, Welcome and Roll Call (chair)
- Housekeeping Notes (EEA representatives)
- Meeting Purpose, Agenda (chair and facilitator)
- Presentation on Best Practices and Mosquito Control Policy Structure from Other States (Julia Blatt)
- Presentation on Florida's Mosquito Control Program (Brad Mitchell)
- Presentation on Colorado's Mosquito Control Program (Heidi Ricci)
- Discussion of Best Practices from Other States Highlighted in Presentations
- Identify Questions for EEA to Ask of MCDs
- Wrap Up and Next Steps (Facilitator)
- Closing Remarks and Vote to Adjourn (chair)

Meeting called to order by Stephen Rich at 1:05 p.m. Subcommittee members in attendance included Heidi Ricci, Brad Mitchell, Julia Blatt, Russell Hopping, Richard Pollack, and Heidi Porter. Alisha Bouchard provided an update on housekeeping items.

9/30 and 10/28 meeting minutes were presented for an approval vote. Richard Pollack noted a correction to the 10/28 meeting minutes. Heidi Ricci also noted that the meeting minutes should clearly reference Heidi Porter and Heidi Ricci as there are two Heidi's on the subcommittee. Alisha Bouchard noted edits to the meeting minutes could be e-mailed to ERG and ERG would make minor edits and post the minutes online.

Stephen Rich took a motion to accept meeting minutes for 9/30 and 10/28. Richard Pollock made a motion to accept meeting minutes with the recommended correction to the 10/28 meeting minutes. Heidi Ricci (aye for 9/30 abstain for 10/28), Brad Mitchell (abstain from both 9/30 and 10/28), Julia Blatt (abstain for 9/30 and aye for 10/28), Russell Hopping (abstain for 9/30 aye for 10/28), Heidi Porter (amendment to the motion to include an initial at the end of any Heidi names, aye to both 9/30 and 10/28), Richard Pollack (aye to both 9/30 and 10/28).

- Presentation on Best Practices and Mosquito Control Policy Structure from Other States (Julia Blatt)

Julia Blatt introduced Sarah Bower from her staff. It was noted that there was a much longer document with all of Sarah's notes which would be shared with the subcommittee as well. Sarah indicated seven research questions that were utilized for NY, NJ, and CT.

1. What state entities are responsible for mosquito control and how do they interact?
 2. What is the structure for management?
 3. How is it funded?
 4. What is the role of the state health department and research institutions/scientists?
 5. How do their surveillance plans differ from ours?
 6. What services do they provide?
 7. How well is it working?
- NY: County level health departments do surveillance and management as well as aerial spraying decision making was done by local health departments
 - Technical and outreach support from the State DOH

- Funded by county and state supported assets. State pays for surveillance control activities and testing
- CT: Local health departments perform control and outreach measures
 - Control was not very robust. State was limited to doing larviciding on state lands only
 - Interagency Mosquito management program (6 agencies) provides surveillance, management, and technical assistance to municipalities
 - Funded through the state's general fund for mosquito control
- NJ: County mosquito control commission (6 agencies) perform control measures such as spraying
 - State does more of the surveillance and monitoring, testing, operations, and budget
 - Funded by the commission annually

Stephen Rich asked if CT and NY had a similar structure to NJ where Rutgers was involved and if there was a sense of academic institutions direct ties to programs. Sarah responded that she didn't get a sense there was a connection with NY but believed that most of the CT surveillance was conducted by their Ag experiment station. Russell Hopping asked if the state department in CT was limited to mosquito control on state lands on the coast? Sarah noted that they haven't had to do larviciding over the past 20 years and if they had to do it, it would only be to state owned parks and coastal areas. Heidi Ricci asked if CT did adulticiding and Sarah stated she thought they did.

Diana transitioned to Brad Mitchell regarding FL. Brad asked to table that discussion to the next meeting but wanted to bring attention to a white paper from FL. Brad thought FL did a good job with their mission statement. It was noted that FL raised an issue that had not been discussed regarding economic development. For example, the Cape district in the past had made statements about the relationship between tourism and their mosquito control, and that might be something interesting to keep in mind for future conversations.

- Presentation on Colorado's Mosquito Control Program (Heidi Ricci)

Heidi noted that CO had a detailed technical memo with several resources and an ecological approach to mosquito management. Heidi Ricci commented that the mosquito population was increasing while other useful insects are decreasing, and it was noted that mosquitos bred readily in artificial habitats. Most predators and other helpful insects and fish needed higher quality habitats. This was a common theme across ecological management. CO did larval dips, trapping, and other monitoring of species in the wetlands. Heidi noted the role of natural predators in a diverse ecosystem suppress pest species like mosquitos and that they tended to be present but in lower numbers, and noted the technical review of scientific literature on BTI and noted toxicity to tadpoles. Heidi Ricci commented that they don't use adulticide in CO due to human health and efficacy concerns. CO was monitoring 500 sites that had thousands of biodiversity records. Higher aquatic biodiversity richness was correlated with lower mosquito larvae. The presence of aquatic life reduced abundance of larval and adult mosquitoes and the presence of adult dragonflies significantly reduced the presence of adult mosquitoes. It was noted that CO did not have EEE, just WNV, and they categorized breeding sites to tailor their responses. CO may use BTI on occasions in catch basin in low quality high breeding sites and they worked to improve habitat in high quality high breeding sites.

Richard Pollack mentioned that many of the MCDs in the state do pursue nonchemical management and environmental improvements. Richard also noted that a few of the key species of mosquitoes don't live in areas where fish and dragonflies are native. Heidi commented that an area of potential study was getting eels into the crypts and headwater areas where they can live. Brad Mitchell noted that introducing fish into a habitat where they are not found may pose an issue. Heidi Ricci clarified that she was not talking about introducing, but rather restoring a native species to an area.

Brad Mitchell noted that Gabrielle Sakolsky had a comment in the chat. The chat commentary recommended that people refer to the CO report and review the original publications referenced to ensure the information cited was taken in the correct context. It was noted that there are hyperlinks to the sources in the CO report. Heidi Ricci

commented that was a good point to make and referenced the American Mosquito Control Association's most recent guidelines. That document states that natural predators are not effective for mosquito control, but the only citation it provides to support that claim is a narrow study on purple martins from 1968. So it is important to go back to the original sources.

Diana shifted the meeting discussion to the questionnaire the subcommittee wanted to send to the MCD's. Diana shared her screen and the set of questions that were put together by Brad Mitchell. The questionnaire was broken out by salt marsh water management and adulticide. Brad noted the questionnaire focused on consistency across MCD's and identification of reasons for inconsistencies. Diana commented that she would be sending the content out to the group for review.

Heidi Ricci thanked Brad for his work and suggested asking if the MCDs work with restoration projects or conservation agencies related to salt marshes as she would be interested to know more. Brad noted that he was going to leave it more general but would add more if that was what the group wanted. It was noted that this questionnaire was to understand the decision-making and striking the balance between MCD decision making and central oversight decision making. The goal was not on effectiveness or efficacy, but rather to understand the process.

Diana noted that the questions would be sent to the MCD's during the week of 11/29. Heidi Ricci commented that she would like to also include the question regarding specific threshold for action and asking open ended questions on follow up measurement of efficacy. Brad agreed it would be useful to compare how the MCDs evaluate efficacy and it was probably appropriate for both marsh management and adulticiding. Stephen Rich noted that this underscored the difference between best practices and policy structure and wanted to make sure that people understood these were just case studies and didn't want people to be defending decisions. Brad noted he tried to do that and if individuals had suggestions about making this stronger or clearer, they should weigh in.

Diana discussed the upcoming meeting schedule. It was determined that there would be a quorum for the 12/23 subcommittee meeting and the suggestion was made to have the meeting at the scheduled date and time. Due to technical difficulties, the Zoom meeting unintentionally closed at 2:01pm for the entire subcommittee group and attendees. Diana Pietri closed out the meeting via e-mail and agreed to follow up with more details regarding information and the sharing of meeting materials.

MCTF Policy Structure Subcommittee Meeting Minutes 12 09 21

Minutes for the Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century (MCTF) Task Force Meeting

Subcommittee Meeting: Policy Structure

December 9, 2021, 12:00 p.m. via Zoom

Meeting Topics:

- Meeting Open, Welcome and Roll Call (Chair)
- Housekeeping Notes (EEA Representatives)
- Vote on Meeting Minutes, Meeting Purpose, Agenda (Chair and Facilitator)
- Presentation on Florida's Mosquito Control Program (Brad Mitchell)
- Final Discussion of Best Practices from Other States
- Review Recommendation Ideas and Process for Recommendation Development
- Discuss and Identify Recommendations
- Wrap Up and Next Steps (Facilitator)
- Closing Remarks and Vote to Adjourn (Chair)

Meeting Open, Welcome & Roll Call, Housekeeping Notes:

The subcommittee meeting was initiated at 12:04 by Stephen Rich. Roll call was conducted and a quorum was established. Meeting members in attendance included Heidi Ricci, Russell Hopping, Richard Pollack, Julia Blatt, and Brad Mitchell. Stephen Rich brought up the topic of a subcommittee meeting co-chair. Diana mentioned that the subcommittee could change meeting times if needed through polling subcommittee members on availability going forward in 2022. These topics would be revisited at the end of the subcommittee meeting.

Presentation on Florida's Mosquito Control Program – Brad Mitchell:

Brad Mitchell discussed the nature of FL mosquito control and noted the State program is municipal or district based and fairly independent. Brad discussed the Florida Coordinating Council on Mosquito Control and noted the group seemed to be centered around policy and creation of guidelines. Brad commented that there were several research centers and believed they were all public. Brad mentioned one of the key points was that the Coordinating Council worked closely with the municipal and district mosquito programs. Brad noted that the Coordinating Council did create a white paper and is on their third edition. The white paper illustrated how mosquito control worked in FL and the intricacies of the other groups that are involved. Brad commented that there was a mission statement, and the subcommittee group may want to look at that mission statement in some detail.

Richard Pollack agreed a clear mandate and statement of purpose in MA was warranted. Richard wanted to point out the last line that was highlighted in the document that was shared on the screen regarding nuisance and vector. Richard noted that any mosquito that approaches a person in Florida is likely a target of mosquito control. Brad noted that tourism was also a factor in play. Heidi Ricci asked if FL had standardized threshold for action, any management of wetlands, and if they had any efficacy or non-target information? Brad noted that the white paper may have some information listed. Richard encouraged the group to look at and review the state of FL mosquito management program on-line. The group discussed topics regarding mosquito control and potential impacts on tourism. Russell Hopping asked if there was a crosswalk of protecting the environment. Brad responded yes that FL looked at non-target impacts. Russell noted that he would be interested to see how the state of FL handled that. Brad again encouraged the group to read the white paper to get additional deep dive information.

Final Discussion of Best Practices from Other States:

Heidi Ricci observed that several of the states had involvement from public health agencies, ecological agencies, and outside influence. Brad pointed out that all those entities are involved with mosquito control in MA and agreed that information needs to be formalized for communication and distribution. Stephen noted the involvement of academic partners as a plus for the FL programs because it brought another dimension of understanding. The group discussed the importance of defining a mission statement to help drive policy and reinforce what is being done related to mosquito control. Jessica Burgess noted that given the age of MGL 252 and what it intended mosquito management to be, that it would be best to think forward on what the group wanted the future of mosquito management to look like in MA. Jessica also mentioned that there is a purpose section in legislative drafting which introduces what the legislation is and what the overall goal is.

Stephen noted there is not a lot of cooperation with academic partners from DPH and he viewed that as a missed opportunity. Brad mentioned the need for a purpose section and starting to identify which academic programs would be helpful to mosquito control in MA. The group discussed the importance of defining a purpose and goal statement. Heidi Ricci noted that it may be difficult to reach consensus and she would not support a goal statement that called for nuisance control statewide. There was added discussion regarding flexibility for municipalities to get the services they want, specific to the protection of public health and there was group consensus that academic institutions across the state could be tapped into as a resource for a mosquito control program.

Review Recommendation Ideas and Process for Recommendation Development:

The recommendations were divided by directive (v) *assessing the need to update the composition of the state reclamation and mosquito control board*; and directive (x) *identifying the challenges, including but not limited to financial barriers, facing municipalities in joining a regional mosquito control project or district*.

Starting with Directive (v) Recommendation 1 was centered on thinking about how a process would work to have revised legislation. Recommendations were made for the legislature to rewrite and framework legislation around science-based mosquito control. Recommendation 2 noted reform to the composition of the SRB and renaming the board to reflect its goals. Recommendation 3 noted a reconstituted SRB led by DPH and other entities involved with representatives from Fish and Wildlife. The next set of recommendations discussed the need for the SRB to have more centralized guidance regarding preferred approaches to mosquito control, such as salt marsh management and adulticiding to guide decision making on the MCD level and creating consistency ensuring the structure of the SRB at a policy level had a mechanism and structure for review of pesticides for efficacy, human, and environmental health impacts. Diana noted that Heidi had sent a recommendation setting a policy framework that allowed for the creation of a mosquito borne disease management plan.

The group conversation then moved to the few recommendations that related to Directive (x). Recommendation 1 discussed a baseline of services across the state that would allow municipalities to have services similar to a menu-based approach. The group also recommended revising the funding structure for mosquito control and MCDs, so it was more uniform across the state. Group conversations continued towards the design of a framework and the need to make DPH responsible for statewide surveillance.

Discuss and Identify Recommendations:

Stephen noted conversations about other state programs and asked if it made sense to have people from other states on our boards for outside guidance. Richard noted that he was not currently aware of out of state participants on boards. Brad mentioned that he was still struggling with the level of independence and oversight with the MCDs and he was not sure of the correct balance. Brad noted that more coordination and consistency amongst the MCD's was needed. Heidi Ricci agreed and noted that a reconstituted board would be responsible for setting the overall approach and would have goals and thresholds for action. Heidi commented that the new board could account for regional differences and have the option of baseline services such as education, surveillance, and

intervention during EEE outbreaks. Brad noted that he in general agreed but commented that we are being too prescriptive. Brad noted that oversight of the MCDs is important, but he would not dismiss administrative services. Brad also noted that oversight of MCDs should be ensuring that taxpayer money going into mosquito control should be used for mosquito control; ensure appropriate use of resources.

Jessica added context on the function and services that MCDs perform. Jessica noted that currently there is language in MGL 252 that addresses administrative oversight. Jessica noted that the MCDs are state entities and the need to be mindful of how the MCDs are set up. For example, the MCDs must follow state procurement and hiring policy. Jessica noted to the group that recommendations should keep in mind that the MCDs still be able to be set up in a way to function and perform all the things that the subcommittee wants the MCDs to do without forgetting that MCD's are state entities and need to perform functions consistent with state process.

The group discussed Mass Wildlife and DPH having statutory roles and jurisdiction in a newly reconstituted SRB. Heidi Ricci asked Jessica if the regional planning agencies are state agencies. Jessica responded that the MCDs sit within the Executive Branch of State government and employees of MCDs are considered state employees. Jessica compared the MCDs as having a similar structure as DCR and DEP with regional offices that provide regionally specific services. MCDs provide regional services at a local level but within a state structure. It was also noted that Regional Transit Authorities (RTA) are created through special legislation. Legislatively they have a lot of specific roles in how they function. Brad commented that if the SRB is reconstituted there should be representation from the Mass Municipal Association (MMA).

Julia noted that it would be useful to do a periodic review of effectiveness or how well the program is meeting its goals of public health and ecological protectiveness. Heidi Ricci commented that her vision would include what Julia stated. Heidi noted that the program would be designed to evaluate efficacy and impacts annually with periodic public input. In addition, there would be annual reporting for the whole program to quantify efficacy and impacts.

There was group agreement that DPH and Fish and Wildlife should be involved on some level, but Brad also commented for a larger oversight board that a Commissioner should be responsible for appointing members. Brad commented that the group should not be too prescriptive for a larger oversight board and it should be up to the Commissioner to make this decision. Diana asked the group if they agreed there was a need for formalized roles for DPH and Fish and Wildlife on a reconstituted board and everyone in the subcommittee group agreed.

Russell commented that the group should think about the first recommendation on the list related to the revision of MGL 252 to assist in defining the purpose of the SRB to put a finer point on the goal of the recommendation. Russell noted the need for clearly defined goals and purpose of mosquito control. Jessica commented on all the enabling legislation as well related to the repeal of MGL 252. Jessica emphasized that the reference to the revision of MGL 252 would also encompass all enabling legislation. Brad commented that there would need to be a detailed meeting on the goal and purpose of mosquito control, as there was not enough time in the current meeting to delve into that topic. Julia commented that she liked the first recommendation as well and noted that it may make sense to go through the information of what should be incorporated into the legislation in relation to all the recommendation content that has been documented. Julia noted that she would like to put in ecologically sensitive as science-based, as it is not just about human health. Heidi Ricci asked a question of Jessica about enabling legislation if they are in the ERG report or had they been given some other way? Jessica noted because of their age you cannot access them but if the subcommittee would like we could get copies. Heidi Ricci thought it was important for the subcommittee to have all the enabling legislation. Jessica commented that she believed she gave them to ERG, but we should be able to provide that information.

Diana noted that she had the document that Heidi Ricci had drafted around framework and would distribute it to the group as a reference. Brad commented on the first recommendation that he thought it made sense, but it was

not going to work the way the recommendation was drafted in the Legislature. Brad noted he would rather ensure that the MCDS are following best practices on wetlands management

Wrap Up and Next Steps (Facilitator):

Diana recapped and noted that it sounded like the subcommittee wanted to come up with a revised framework for MGL 252, what that looks like, and to develop a clear purpose. Diana asked for a virtual show of hands of how many members want to carve out a large chunk of time in an upcoming meeting to have that conversation. Everyone on the subcommittee agreed to that approach. It was noted that it would be best to table that discussion until the first meeting in the new year so all subcommittee members could be in attendance.

Closing Remarks and Vote to Adjourn (Chair):

Diana asked the group if anyone would want to volunteer as a co-chair and Julia Blatt volunteered to be the co-chair. Richard Pollack made a motion, which was seconded by Heidi Ricci to nominate Julia Blatt as the co-chair. Stephen Rich conducted roll call and all subcommittee members in attendance voted aye in agreement to nominate Julia Blatt as the Policy Structure subcommittee co-chair. Seeing no other questions or comments from the group Stephen Rich took a motion to adjourn from Brad Mitchell, seconded by Heidi Ricci. All in favor said aye. The meeting was adjourned at 2:01 pm.

MCTF Policy Structure Subcommittee Meeting Minutes 12 23 21

Minutes for the Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century (MCTF) Task Force Meeting

Subcommittee Meeting: Policy Structure

December 23, 2021, 12:00 p.m. via Zoom

Meeting Topics:

- Meeting Open, Welcome and Roll Call (Chair)
- Housekeeping Notes (EEA Representatives)
- Vote on Meeting Minutes, Meeting Purpose, Agenda (Chair and Facilitator)
- Discussion Regarding MCD Responses to Questions
- Discuss Recommendation Development Process and 2022 Schedule
- Continue Discussing Recommendations
- Begin to Brainstorm Mosquito Control Purpose
- Wrap Up and Next Steps (Facilitator)
- Closing Remarks and Vote to Adjourn (Chair)

Stephen Rich joined the meeting at 12:09 p.m. and conducted roll call. A quorum was established, and meeting attendees included Heidi Ricci, Russell Hoping, Heidi Porter, and Richard Pollack. A brief housekeeping update was provided by Alisha Bouchard.

Diana Pietri referenced an article that Heidi Ricci provided regarding low dose toxicants. A link to the article was placed into the chat for subcommittee members to review. Heidi Ricci provided an overview of the article as an emerging concern in human health. An alternate opinion article was provided in the Q&A chat for subcommittee review. Stephen Rich asked: how do we recommend a process to proceed with a mosquito oversight board to balance these types of concerns? Richard Pollack thanked Heidi Ricci for presenting a thought-provoking article. Richard added that this was not settled science and the article pointed to an association between chemicals and illness, but did not show causation, which can be a difficult thing to do. Richard referred to MCD personnel and wondered to what extent if any MCD personnel had suffered from such exposure and to the best of Richard's knowledge he had not heard of any incidence with MCD personnel.

Heidi Ricci agreed that it was not settled science and discussed that there are people suffering from real illnesses in addition to certain cancers and neurological diseases that are on the rise. This was discussed in the broader context of the need to expand the expertise on a mosquito management board based on science and that there would be a need to have a detailed mosquito management plan for the state.

Russell mentioned another consideration would be to approach this to ensure that adulticiding was only happening when necessary and recommended standards that would limit the application of adulticide. Stephen noted that this underscored the need to have scientists on the board that had nuanced understanding of the latest pieces of information and that more representation from the academic world was a benefit. Richard responded that there was a common presumption that pesticide exposure led to issues with people, but pesticides can also reduce the exposure to illness.

Discussion Regarding MCD Responses to Questions:

Detailed responses from the MCDs focused on salt marsh management and adulticiding related to how decisions were made and if a common standard was followed. Heidi Ricci discussed her two main takeaways and thought the recommendation still went back to a science-based management plan and that there may need to be flexibility built in to address regional needs. Russell noted a slightly different viewpoint regarding coastal management on the North Shore and commented that he saw a degree of variability on when some MCDs decided to take a level of action. Members of the subcommittee discussed the benefit in having a more centralized approach to mosquito control in order to have more consistent guidance and protocols along the way.

Richard noted that the MCD answers were responsive and demonstrated that MCDs are thinking about and considering a broad range of options in trying to select the best solution for their own environments and it seemed that there was a consensus amongst the subcommittee that there was a benefit to some flexibility for MCDs. Richard added that this was a good exercise and put to rest many concerns that the MCDs spray without careful regard to potential impacts.

Heidi Ricci thought it would be helpful for a new structure to provide some standardization for thresholds in action and how efficacy is measured, specifically, for truck-based spraying. Russell noted that he was interested in the opinions of other subcommittee members that were not in attendance today. Heidi Porter discussed thresholds and asked if there was a consensus on what the threshold should be to initiate a response and was there information on what individual communities were setting as guidance for thresholds for response.

Jessica Burgess responded that DPH is significantly involved due to testing. For aerial spraying, the DPH public health hazard designation is used as a standard for response. There are a number of pieces of information that go into when and how a response is initiated. The DPH and Mosquito Advisory Group is heavily involved in the decision-making process. Alisha Bouchard added that DPH has thresholds for high risk, low risk, and critical risk based on the abundance of mosquitoes and if there was virus detection in animals and humans.

Heidi Porter commented on how individual projects were making decisions on thresholds for action. Alisha Bouchard referenced the Northeast MCD and their mosquito management plan with the towns in their district. Richard discussed the need for variability and referenced the adulticiding thresholds that were provided by MCDs in their questionnaire responses. Richard noted that there was thoughtfulness in the process and encouraged the group to review the responses. Heidi Ricci discussed the range of variability that was presented in the MCD responses and referenced a benefit in personal protective measures against mosquito bites. Heidi Ricci mentioned that the group may not reach agreement on some of these questions.

Discuss Recommendation Development Process and 2022 Schedule:

Diana recapped the December through March timeline calendar and noted that there were four subcommittee meetings remaining. New subcommittee meeting days and times were discussed, and Diana highlighted that subcommittee members would be tasked with developing recommendation in between meetings. It was agreed upon that ERG could provide assistance between meetings in drafting recommendations. Diana also provided an overview of the components when drafting proposed recommendations. There was a clarification point made confirming the February 17th meeting date and it was mentioned that overlap in subcommittee recommendations should be addressed during the full task force meetings.

Continue Discussing Recommendations:

Members of the subcommittee shared their thoughts with Diana prior to the meeting, which were aggregated for review. The discussion started with the first recommendation to repeal or revise MGL 252 and enabling legislation for MCDs. Russell stated that MGL 252 is out of date and does not provide clarity or guidance for mosquito control statewide. Heidi Ricci agreed with Russell and added that there was a need for standardization of best practices and tracking systems on effects and efficacy. It was added that the current legislation doesn't include DPH or Mass Wildlife and doesn't have opportunities for public input or tailoring for community-based needs for their desired level of involvement.

Richard Pollack agreed that MGL 252 is out of date and unclear and noted that standardization was good but so was flexibility. Richard added that DPH and Mass Wildlife are present during the decision-making process for aerial spraying event and there were currently opportunities for public input through MCD Commission meetings. Richard saw a need to provide services far and wide and that there were many places in the state that would see value in having information from surveillance, monitoring, and intervention should that be deemed justified. It was emphasized by members of the subcommittee that the recommendation for new Legislation should include clarity related to DPH and Mass Wildlife involvement. Subcommittee members also discussed the involvement of academic institutions such as UMASS, a consistent level of comprehensive coverage, and noted the need to articulate in the new legislation how mosquito control would be funded and implemented.

Heidi Ricci noted that the lower bullets in the recommendation referenced structure and funding and clarified the points on public input as they related to more meaningful public input into the overall plan and added that DPH and Mass Wildlife be included into new Legislation in an official role. Jessica Burgess discussed the procedural aspects of amending language in MGL 252 versus a repeal and replace of the Legislation. It is noted that the subcommittee should think about what they want and then EEA and MDAR can assist in the process. Alisha Bouchard commented regarding the need for a new chapter if the SRB is replaced with a mosquito management board.

Heidi Ricci noted that parts of MGL 252 reference language that had not been used and she hoped we could eliminate and add things to the Legislation. Heidi Ricci also added that if MGL 252 is going to be rewritten she would not want a complete disruption of the MCDs. Jessica discussed that we could assist with that and something that came to mind as a similar example was when the Cannabis Control Commission (CCC) moved from being within DPH to their own state agency. Jessica noted that there was language regarding timeline for implementation and shifting of staff.

Begin to Brainstorm Mosquito Control Purpose:

Diana discussed the second recommendation related to a mission statement and whether this was a separate recommendation for a purpose statement, or could it get rolled into the recommendation related to the repeal and replace of MGL 252. Richard noted that everyone had their own thoughts of what mosquito control was but hoped there could be some agreement with why we are doing mosquito control. Richard wrote a draft to help explain the why of mosquito control and the draft resolution on mosquito management was shared with the group. Richard noted that this was a linear thought process as to what we might agree upon and commonalities of what we might move forward. Diana mentioned that documentation drafts would be shared with the group after the meeting.

The group discussed finding commonalities and agreed on avoiding producing more mosquito habitat. Russell asked if the group didn't have a single goal and purpose of the repeal and replace of MGL 252, would it be more of a job description at the board level? Heidi Ricci didn't view this as a job description and thought it should be an overarching goal of the program. She noted that there are things in Richard's proposal that she agreed with and things she didn't agree with, such as nuisance or annoyance. Heidi Ricci discussed using low impact development techniques that will not create mosquito habitat and mentioned that having some role in education, state support, and storm water regulation would be very beneficial.

Wrap Up and Next Steps:

Diana recapped the discussion related to the draft recommendations and noted that there may be opportunities for recommendation consolidation going forward. Diana went to the Q&A and shared a comment from Gabrielle Sakolsky related to the mission statement that Priscilla Matton drafted. Heidi Ricci noted that she wanted her thoughts on state level funding for education and surveillance and continued funding for the districts captured in the notes.

Closing Remarks and Vote to Adjourn:

Diana discussed homework for the group and topics for upcoming meetings in 2022. The next subcommittee meeting would be held on 1/6. Seeing no other questions or comments, Stephen Rich took a motion to adjourn from Richard Pollack. All subcommittee members voted aye. The meeting was adjourned at 2:00 pm.

MCTF Policy Structure Subcommittee Meeting Minutes 01 06 22

Minutes for the Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century (MCTF) Task Force Meeting

Subcommittee Meeting: Policy Structure

January 6, 2022, 12:00 p.m. via Zoom

Meeting Topics:

- Meeting Open, Welcome and Roll Call (Chair)
- Housekeeping Notes (EEA Representatives)
- Vote on Meeting Minutes, Meeting Purpose, Agenda (Chair and Facilitator)
- Recap and Wrap Up Discussion Regarding MCD Responses to Questions
- Refine Recommendation to Revise and/or Repeal and Replace MGL C. 252
- Review Suggestions for Additional MCD Recommendations
- Wrap Up and Next Steps (Facilitator)
- Closing Remarks and Vote to Adjourn (Chair)

Meeting Open, Welcome, Roll Call, and Housekeeping Notes

The meeting was called to order by Stephen Rich at 12:02. A roll call was conducted and subcommittee members in attendance included Julia Blatt, Russell Hopping, Brad Mitchell, Richard Pollack, and Heidi Ricci. The meeting agenda was shared and discussed with the subcommittee group. Alisha Bouchard provided a standard housekeeping update.

Vote on Meeting Minutes, Meeting Purpose, Agenda (Chair and Facilitator)

A vote was proposed for meeting minutes from the 12/9 subcommittee meeting. Richard Pollack made a motion to accept the minutes as amended with stated corrections, seconded by Brad Mitchell. A roll call was conducted, Julia Blatt (aye), Russell Hopping (aye), Brad Mitchell (aye), Richard Pollack (aye) Heidi Ricci (aye) Stephen Rich (aye). The meeting minutes were accepted with the recommended changes.

Dian Pietri discussed goals and logistics for upcoming subcommittee meetings in January and February. It was noted that the Best Practices subcommittee would also be scheduling additional meetings and there was a school vacation week in February, so subcommittee member availability may be a challenge. Heidi Ricci commented on the timing of the public listening session and noted that ideally it would be good for subcommittee members to have time to review the public comments. Caroline Higley discussed the calendar timeline and ability of the public to enter comments via the portal. It was noted that the intent was to post everything online as soon as edits were made, and documents were prepared for the task force.

Recap and Wrap Up Discussion Regarding MCD Responses to Questions

MCD questions were displayed to allow for commentary for the subcommittee members that were not present at the last meeting where the MCD answers were discussed. Brad Mitchell commented that there may be some bias on the part of MCDs related to what residents want. Brad asked the subcommittee group for their perception on the consistency of MCD practices. Heidi Ricci agreed with Brad's comments and noted that there was a need for some standardization but also acknowledged that there are some regional differences within the state that need to be taken into account. Heidi Ricci discussed the answers in relation to salt marsh management and added education and surveillance being baseline, but there was also a need for input on source control and ecological based management. Heidi noted that it was beneficial to have the MCDs involved in certain ecological projects as they are exempt from the wetlands protection act. Russell Hopping discussed the benefit of centralization to determine clear thresholds, how decisions are made, and how polices are being followed. Richard Pollack noted

that there was a benefit to standardization but asked the group for ideas of what those are and added that flexibility in mosquito control was also a benefit. Richard Pollack encouraged the subcommittee members to reach out to their local MCD Commissions and attend their meetings to understand what went into the decision-making process. Brad Mitchell discussed the Northeast MCDs response on water management and noted that there was a significant difference in process between the Cape MCD and the Northeast MCD. Brad added that the Cape didn't use adulticiding but every other MCD did, and he did not see a lot of consistency or it well explained. Brad noted that some of his perspective may be based on old information and bias.

Stephen Rich discussed the variability that was seen in different MCDs. Stephen noted that he did trust that the MCDs have peoples' best interest in mind and the decisions of how they determine these processes were good. Stephen added that he thought the group should be thinking about policy not practices related to who was going to make the decision on how mosquito control gets done. Heidi Ricci responded and discussed the public interest in natural resources and how they may be impacted by some of these practices. Subcommittee members also discussed the need for a more centralized process to ensure the MCDs are using the most current and effective techniques.

Refine Recommendation to Revise and or Repeal and Replace MGL C. 252

Content was shown to the subcommittee that provided an overview of the rationale and what was discussed for recommendation 1 related to board composition, funding, scientific opinion, and representation from other states. Diana addressed the feasibility portion of the template and what would be handled by MDAR. Richard Pollack, Brad Mitchell, and Russell Hopping commented that they approved of the content but also wanted to ensure there was still an opportunity for conversation to ensure things were still subject to change. Heidi Ricci noted that the key points were synthesized and asked about the process of what gets moved forward. Diana addressed the timeline and process to incorporate thoughts and feedback before finalizing recommendations for final vote. Jessica Burgess commented that the goal was to provide comments and ideas so ERG could refine to the extent that anything was talked about today it could be incorporated into another version.

Heidi Ricci thought the recommendation was great and well written and wanted to ensure it captured wetland management and input for funding related to a new data system to be able to better track and report on operations, results, and the opt out process. Julia Blatt, Brad Mitchell and Stephen Rich also supported moving the recommendation forward. Diana mentioned that some minor changes would be made based on the current discussion and the recommendation would move forward.

The group moved to recommendation 2 and Richard Pollack provided an overview and his thought process on amending the MA stormwater handbook. Heidi Ricci noted that she was in agreement with Richard Pollack and mentioned documentation she had provided and noted that DEP was in the process of updating the handbook and moving in the direction of low impact development. Subcommittee members discussed maintenance as a potential issue in relation to the recommendation. Diana addressed the subcommittee directives with the group and noted that this may best fit on another subcommittee. The group discussed to which subcommittee the recommendation related. Julia Blatt thought this was a great recommendation for whatever subcommittee ended up with it and noted that it may be useful putting this on a fast track otherwise the opportunity may be missed.

Stephen Rich commented that this recommendation was a challenging fit for the Policy Structure subcommittee and was not sure how it fit into the composition of the SRB. Richard Pollack noted the task force preferred that the subcommittee offer our best recommendation and that this recommendation could come through Best Practice or Policy Structure, but it seemed that it was a better fit on Policy Structure. Heidi Ricci referenced the subcommittee charge and noted that storm water management was listed. Heidi Ricci added discussions on maintenance standards and low impact development. Diana mentioned the understory questions and how recommendation could fit within the understory questions. Diana asked for a show of hands to move this recommendation forward and all subcommittee members agreed.

Review Suggestions for Additional MCD Recommendations

The first recommendation topic (recommendation #3) that was reviewed related to revising the funding structure of MCDs to ensure uniformity across MA and to allow for towns to join MCDs at a lower cost. It was discussed that this recommendation created flexibility for towns to join MCDs and potentially supported a menu-based approach to mosquito control services. Stephen Rich discussed his thought process on policy versus practices and noted that the change of MGL 252 was what the group should be discussing. Heidi Ricci thought the recommended draft language needed some modification and discussed how the enabling legislation has limited what the MCDs can do. It was mentioned that the MCDs should be set up under a newly reconstituted board to flesh out the details with a unified system with essential services for communities. Richard Pollack discussed a bi-phased approach that came out of tax dollars that ensured a centralized program that would carry out surveillance for pathogen carrying mosquitos, and if necessary, an appropriate response. Funding would also include sources for research and education. The second component for communities that desire to have more larviciding, adulticiding, and local stormwater management could still be funded off the cherry sheet.

Subcommittee members discussed the best way to approach potential reframing or treatment as a standalone recommendation. Alisha Bouchard mentioned that it may be best to handle as a standalone recommendation for voting purposes. Jessica Burgess provided perspective on the development of a newly reconstituted board and recommended keeping it broad but identifying the areas that a new board would need to address. Diana noted that the full task force was a great place to bring up and address these issues. Julia Blatt commented that when a recommendation is standalone, it carries more weight. Stephen Rich mentioned that one way to create impact is to discuss who should be on the board, as it would have more long-term policy consequences. Jessica Burgess noted that when you repeal and replace MGL 252 there would be a need to create a new oversight board and define how the oversight board conducts mosquito control. Currently, the SRB is the oversight body of MCDs and it would need to be restructured in a way so the MCDs fit in the new oversight body. There would need to be a clear way to demonstrate MCD structure, set up, and reporting still exist in the newly SRB-like structure.

Heidi Ricci noted that it was a point very well taken and what needed to happen was a transitional process where the MCDs could be transitioned into a new organizational framework. There could be an opportunity for expansion and new regions to be created. There was a show of hands for the recommendation to be moved forward to the full task force and all subcommittee members agreed.

The next recommendation (establishing baseline services, recommendation #4 under directive X) was presented to the group and a show of hands was requested to move the recommendation forward to the task force. All subcommittee members agreed with the caveat that the recommendation language be fleshed out a bit more.

The third recommendation (topic 3 under directive X, specific to surveillance) was discussed with the subcommittee and Heidi Ricci mentioned that this has come up under the Best Practices subcommittee. Diana asked if the team was ok removing this outline recommendation from the table for now. Heidi Ricci asked that the group come back to this and noted that this was also a policy issue around a unified surveillance process that was scientific and transparent to the public and was important to the policy conversation.

Wrap Up and Next Steps (Facilitator)

Diana noted that the draft outline recommendations that were discussed and agreed upon would be revised and sent to the task force. There would also be a follow up communication with the subcommittee group to determine dates for rescheduling meetings and distribution of homework items related to draft outline recommendation issues and wording.

Closing Remarks and Vote to Adjourn (Chair)

Stephen Rich made a motion to adjourn the meeting. A motion was made by Richard Pollack and seconded by Julia Blatt. All those in favor said aye. The meeting was adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

MCTF Policy Structure Subcommittee Meeting Minutes 01 21 22

Minutes for the Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century (MCTF) Task Force Meeting

Subcommittee Meeting: Policy Structure

January 21, 2022, 1:00 p.m. via Zoom

Meeting Topics:

- Meeting Open, Welcome and Roll Call (Chair)
- Housekeeping Notes (EEA Representatives)
- Vote on Meeting Minutes, Meeting Purpose, Agenda (Chair and Facilitator)
- Recap and Reflect on Comments and Discussion from full MCTF Meeting
- Discuss Background, Rationale and Substance for Recommendation 1
- Continue Discussion of Recommendation 1
- Wrap Up and Next Steps (Facilitator)
- Closing Remarks and Vote to Adjourn (Chair)

Meeting Open, Welcome, Roll Call, Housekeeping Notes:

Stephen Rich called the meeting to order at 1:03 p.m. Roll call was conducted. Subcommittee members in attendance included Richard Pollack, Russell Hopping, Brad Mitchell, Julia Blatt, and Heidi Ricci. Jessica Burgess provided a housekeeping update.

Meeting Purpose and agenda:

Diana Pietri discussed upcoming meetings and addressed the goal of advancing recommendations ahead of the next task force meeting and public listening session. It was noted that there were two other time slots for meetings in case they were needed on 2/25 and 3/1, which were the proposed dates based on subcommittee responses to the ERG poll.

Recap and Reflect on Comments and Discussion from full MCTF Meeting:

Richard Pollack discussed the need to agree on the goal of mosquito control in the Commonwealth and noted that was a topic that needed to be addressed. Julia Blatt commented on the fact that no one seemed concerned with the recommendation to repeal and replace M.G.L. 252 and she took that as a good sign that there would be support for that recommendation. Heidi Ricci agreed with the comments and noted that it was always the intention that there would be an interim period to ensure the MCDs transition into the new legislation. Stephen Rich discussed the repeal of M.G.L. 252 eliminating the MCDs and liked the idea of a transition being included in the recommendation. Brad Mitchell noted that the group may want to think about what the goal of transition was for the MCDs to ensure people retain jobs, and there was not a gap in mosquito control.

Discuss Background, Rationale and Substance for Recommendation 1:

Stephen Rich commented that the group was not on the same page with what the goal for mosquito control was. Julia Blatt commented that to her it was persuasive that the original legislation was passed in 1918 and it was time to update the legislation, so it was up to date on the science. Brad Mitchell noted that the MCDs have been good about keeping up with the science and agreed the group needed to determine the goal and purpose of mosquito control. Jessica Burgess commented that M.G.L. 252 didn't address the work and best practices of mosquito control today and pointed out that all the things the subcommittee wanted to see in new legislation didn't exist in the current legislation.

Richard Pollack discussed the goal of a mosquito control program, who would be at the table contributing, how it would be funded, and how it would be continued with the latest scientific updates to perform effective mosquito

management without sacrificing human or environmental health. It was noted that eradicating mosquitos was not the goal and was not practical. Heidi Ricci agreed with Richard Pollack and pointed out that the existing law did not cover the operation as currently conducted and gave authority to do things that were not good practices, for example, draining wetlands. Russell Hopping commented on the feasibility section of the recommendation potentially influencing what needed to be included in the background. Jessica Burgess provided an overview of what MDAR/EEA were thinking about in terms of an outline structure for the subcommittee to consider and the goal was to have more feasibility information for the subcommittee by the next meeting.

Subcommittee members discussed defining goals in terms of separating control of mosquitoes and control of human disease. It was added that the health and welfare of domesticated animals and livestock be considered as WNV and EEE could take a toll on those animals. Heidi Ricci noted that this was included in the draft goal statement that she had written. Richard Pollack agreed with the inclusion of the health and welfare of animals and noted that if a mosquito was coming towards a person it was deleterious and encouraged the group not to go down the suggested path based on the dichotomy of opinions within the group.

Diana Pietri asked if the group wanted to move forward with discussing goals. Brad Mitchell suggested a separate meeting for goals since goals would determine how to develop policy with different viewpoints. Richard Pollack noted the draft that he had created and circulated a few weeks ago in the form of a resolution and suggested the group review to see where they agreed and didn't agree. Heidi Ricci commented that she laid out a similar framework and hoped the group could review her version as well to determine where there was agreement. A question was raised in relation to how the task force would vote to determine a majority and minority opinion. Jessica Burgess and Russell Hopping discussed the potential format for recommendations that would be addressed at the task force level and then forwarded to the legislature. Jessica Burgess added that typically newer legislation did contain purpose, goals, and objectives to give parameters on implementation and that this legislation was established to charge the task force with coming up with what made the most sense based on the task force member expertise and background.

Brad Mitchell commented that good legislation should have a purpose, but the legislature would decide what the purpose was for the whole Commonwealth and the real goal was to describe the subcommittees viewpoints and to let the legislature work it out in committees. Julia Blatt suggested the group should work to determine a purpose and goal and added that there were things the group agreed on and somethings the group did not agree on. Heidi Ricci thought it was important to see if there were things the group agreed on for a broad goal. Heidi Ricci also expressed her concerns on majority and minority opinions because it was not fully representative of the feelings across the Commonwealth and suggested laying out disagreements and submitting them to the legislature so they could ultimately decide. Stephen Rich suggested gravitating recommendations towards what the subcommittee wanted to do to make it better than today. For example, who was on the new board to provide a variety of viewpoints and opinions.

Richard Pollack commented on mosquito mitigation and noted that residents were calling for it and they wanted it and that was why we have the MCDs. It was added that many of the requests that come in were not related to just disease threat. Heidi Ricci commented that there were residents that wanted spraying and in other parts of the state and there were residents that did not want spraying. Heidi Ricci added that there were communities that wanted services but didn't want spraying and that was a big part of why reform was needed.

The majority of subcommittee members determined that they wanted to spend the remaining meeting time discussing goals to acknowledge areas of consensus and disagreement. Heidi Ricci suggested reviewing the document she had drafted, and Richard Pollack thought it would be useful to look at Heidi Ricci's document, his document, and any other documents that were available. Stephen Rich recommended that the subcommittee look at both Heidi Ricci's and Richard Pollack's draft goal statements.

Discussion on Draft Goal Statements – (Heidi Ricci and Richard Pollack)

Heidi Ricci provided an overview of her goal statement to the subcommittee members. Several of the points within the draft were discussed and Heidi Ricci noted the lack of public input and transparency into the DPH plan. The draft outlined overall reforms and aligning the program with other state priorities. In addition, there were references to surveillance on a statewide basis, more support for municipal officials to address stormwater management, improved electronic record keeping, and people having the right to avoid chemical trespass if they didn't want chemicals imposed upon them. Heidi Ricci commented that she hoped there were areas of agreement and acknowledged that there would be some areas of disagreement as well.

Richard Pollack provided an overview of his goal statement to the subcommittee members. Richard Pollack commented that there were means to suppress mosquito populations that included environmentally appropriate habitat modifications and addressed the points about not causing concern to people or the environment. Richard Pollack noted that the group may want to review the document and address it at the next meeting. Subcommittee members discussed process related questions related to the level of detail that needed to be incorporated into the goals. Russell Hopping noted that the goal statements were written in different ways and wondered if ERG could look at the two drafts and meld them together to see where the differences were. Richard Pollack recommended that the subcommittee read both draft versions as it may help with deliberation.

Stephen Rich referenced the eighth point in Richard Pollack's draft goal statement and asked if the removal of that point from the draft would cause consternation. Richard Pollack responded that he was representing an MCD and thought it would cause distress to the citizenry to have that point pulled from the draft. The discussion continued related to the level of detail in the goal statement and if the subcommittee could go through and agree to take out items that didn't need to be front and center, so there could be a set of principles for review. Diana Pietri noted that ERG would be able to organize some of the content into tables for easier review. Brad Mitchell commented that he personally felt that adulticides were overused but they also served a purpose and they needed to be reevaluated for use. Heidi Ricci added that the disagreement seemed to be in the efficacy of adulticide use and noted that Mass Audubon had hundreds of thousands of people visiting their properties and they didn't use adulticide and encouraged personal protection; however, she was not sure the subcommittee would be able to resolve those differences.

Diana Pietri recapped the directives of the subcommittee. Brad Mitchell discussed the efficacy of aerial spraying versus truck-based spraying and commented on repellants as a tool and not a replacement. It was noted how adulticides used needed to be reviewed, but there was not a belief the group needed to go deep into the weeds between disease control and non-disease mosquito control. Subcommittee members noted that the goals needed to be discussed. Heidi Ricci commented that she did not disagree that there was some role for adulticides in an IPM framework but noted that non-target impact monitoring was currently not happening. Brad Mitchell noted that there was currently monitoring of pollinators by MDAR and cautioned against absolute statements that there was no monitoring.

Continue Discussion of Recommendation 1:

Brad Mitchell commented on centralized oversight and the value in having the regional MCDs. Heidi Ricci noted public input and accountability into the system to have input and periodic reviews. Jessica Burgess asked Heidi Ricci a question regarding public input and accountability so MDAR could better address the feasibility review for the subcommittee. Heidi Ricci clarified her suggested recommendations related to public input and accountability. Russell Hopping discussed the need to set clear guidelines and boundaries for what was the responsibility and purview of the state, municipalities, and individuals.

Brad Mitchell noted that there was a need to be clear on the entities of the new oversight board and something for the subcommittee to think about was what that structure would look like and who was involved. It was also added that the new board should have the broad ability to create subcommittees as needed. Julia Blatt commented that the board shouldn't include people from other states and the board should look for expertise internally. Jessica Burgess noted that this was looked at as part of the feasibility review and it may not be possible

to have individuals from out of state as board members. Subcommittee members discussed that the board could and should coordinate with other state entities if needed.

Wrap Up, Next Steps, Closing Remarks, and Vote to Adjourn:

Diana Pietri noted that documentation discussed during the subcommittee meeting would be distributed to the group. The next subcommittee meeting would be held in two weeks on 2/4. Seeing no other comments from the group, Stephen Rich entertained a motion to adjourn from Brad Mitchell. Seconded by Richard Pollack. All in favor said aye. The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

MCTF Policy Structure Subcommittee Meeting Minutes 02 04 22

Minutes for the Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century (MCTF) Task Force Meeting

Subcommittee Meeting: Policy Structure

February 04, 2022, 12:00 p.m. via Zoom

Meeting Topics:

- Meeting Open, Welcome, Roll Call, Housekeeping Notes
- Vote on Meeting Minutes (10/14 & 11/9), Meeting Purpose, Agenda
- Discuss Goals of Mosquito Control
- Discuss Recommendation 1 (Revise or Replace MGL 252) Content
- Discuss MCD-Specific Recommendations
- Wrap Up and Next Steps
- Closing Remarks and Vote to Adjourn

Meeting Open, Welcome, Roll Call, Housekeeping Notes:

Stephen Rich called the meeting to order at 12:05 p.m. A quorum was met. Roll call was conducted. Subcommittee members in attendance included Richard Pollack, Russell Hopping, Julia Blatt, and Heidi Ricci. Jessica Burgess provided a housekeeping update.

Vote on Meeting Minutes (10/14 & 11/9), Meeting Purpose, Agenda:

It was noted that five sets of meeting minutes were distributed to the group; however, the subcommittee would only be voting on 10/14 and 11/9 meeting minutes. Stephen Rich made a motion to approve 10/14 and 11/9 meeting minutes. A roll call was conducted. Richard Pollack (aye to both), Russell Hopping (aye to both), Julia Blatt (aye to 10/14 and abstain on 11/9), Heidi Ricci (aye to both), Stephen Rich (aye to both). The agenda was reviewed with group. Diana Pietri discussed meeting strategy and referenced the full task force meeting and public listening session which would be held during the week of 2/7. Russell Hopping noted that he would not be able to attend the subcommittee meeting on 2/17.

Discuss Goals of Mosquito Control:

Diana Pietri presented three questions to the group of things to think about related to the goal of mosquito control for the Commonwealth.

- What is needed in terms of a goal statement that can serve the purpose of our recommendations and allow us to move forward with recommendation development?
- What are your “must haves” in terms of components to include in a goal statement?
- What components of the existing goal statements do you think are appropriate to include in a revised goal statement?

Russell Hopping thought a goal statement needed to set the scope for a statewide control program. Stephen Rich suggested a tone to reflect complex problems that required a balanced approach, and it was important to recognize that there were tradeoffs. Richard Pollack commented that it was necessary to define what subcommittee members agreed on and if it would be limited to mosquitoes carrying virus or broadened, as it was now, to the management of nuisance mosquitoes. Heidi Ricci discussed the scope and purpose of a statewide mosquito management program and noted that it should include an emphasis on a science-based approach but should recognize that science cannot provide all the definite answers, and that the desires of communities needed

to be addressed as well. Julia Blatt commented on the purpose of mosquito control and agreed with the suggestions from Russell Hopping and Heidi Ricci.

The group discussion moved to purpose and scope. Julia Blatt discussed the purpose to protect public health and the environment and did not think that mosquito nuisance control should be part of the goals. In addition, Julia Blatt supported mosquito control choices that did not include pesticides. Heidi Ricci commented on using the best available science and public engagement and would also include the goal of integrating other programs and initiatives. Richard Pollack commented on science-based mosquito management that provided the greatest benefit to people with the least environmental risk. Richard Pollack added that he believed there was a great call for managing mosquitoes that pose a public health threat and agreed that if a community didn't want to pursue certain facets of mosquito control, that it should be left up to them. Stephen Rich noted that he agreed with most of what had been said and added the inclusion of scientists into the decision-making process. Russell Hopping added that the efforts should be guided through a science-based approach and gaps in the approach should be identified and filled.

Diana Pietri discussed public engagement and asked the subcommittee group if they felt that should be included in the goal statement. Richard Pollack commented that public engagement was a means of getting input and that each town already had the opportunity to weigh in. Russell Hopping noted that the local engagement subcommittee was looking at public engagement and discussed IPM in relation to public engagement. Heidi Ricci noted the lack of transparency and public engagement as one of the reasons why the task force was formed. Julia Blatt asked a process question related to topics the subcommittee were divided on. Diana Pietri discussed recommendation process and divergence of opinions. The subcommittee directives were reviewed, and it was noted that goals would be reviewed at the full task force meeting.

Richard Pollack commented that the subcommittee had the opportunity to try to inform the full task force and proposed that the group explore the line-item information to determine where they agreed or didn't agree as that would be helpful to the entire task force. Richard Pollack encouraged the subcommittee members to spend more time on the goal statement and commented that arriving at a goal statement was the first thing the task force should have done from day one. Russell Hopping noted that transparency needed to be built into the goal statement. Heidi Ricci commented on the statute that created the task force and discussed the section that related to what the subcommittee was discussing regarding a goal statement.

The subcommittee group moved to discuss nuisance versus disease control. Heidi Ricci commented that the subcommittee was tasked to propose comprehensive reform and that reform would focus on disease control. Richard Pollack noted that the focus should be on reducing risk from EEE, WNV, and other infections. Subcommittee members discussed disease control focused on arbovirus and a statewide program with nuisance control being handled at a community level. It was noted that nuisance control should not be the responsibility of the state. Stephen Rich noted that the goal was about public health and was not about nuisance and disease and that the focus should be about addressing public health. Stephen Rich added that there were other aspects of public health that were not associated with arbovirus and the creation of a policy statement about the problems that we understand today would not be wise.

Components of the goal statement were added based on the subcommittee conversation under the recommendation that focused on the repeal, replace, or revision of M.G.L. 252 and enabling MCD legislation. Russell Hopping commented that the additions captured the essence for him. Richard Pollack discussed the best available science and encouraged funding and research to address any gaps. Julia Blatt added she would like to see an addition of non-pesticide approaches to mosquito management. Heidi Ricci noted that she could live with the language the way it was presented and was ok with the concept. Stephen Rich discussed coming up with an overarching statement the subcommittee could agree on and proposed an alternative recommendation to the language. Members of the subcommittee continued to discuss the best approach in the development of a goal

statement. Subcommittee members commented that there seemed to be agreement on the drafted points and the recommendation was made that the group move forward with what was documented.

Discuss Recommendation 1 (Revise or Replace MGL 252) Content:

An overview of the background and rationale draft language was provided to the subcommittee group. Richard Pollack discussed the oversight board and mosquito control by private applicators. Jessica Burgess commented that the current board does not have control over private applicators. It was added that private applicators were subject to pesticide laws and there was not additional state oversight for them. Richard Pollack did not think it made sense to hamper state led mosquito control efforts when private applicators could do more without state oversight. Stephen Rich discussed oversight responsibilities in the newly reconstituted board. Jessica Burgess noted that the MCDs currently answer to the SRB and were under SRB oversight. For example, all the district commissioners were appointed, approved, and could be removed by the SRB. Stephen Rich and Jessica Burgess shared information about how the MCDs interact with the SRB and local communities. It was noted that the MCDs answer to their member communities and make decisions on what was needed for mosquito control, but that process was overseen by the SRB.

Subcommittee members discussed added language to emphasize institutions, expertise, and statewide versus local process. There were additional conversations related to the creation of a new oversight board. Jessica Burgess flagged for the subcommittee that an oversight board already existed, and the subcommittee was really looking to restructure the existing board and recommending making those adjustments clear in legislation versus just practice and policy.

The group moved to the second set of bullets in the recommendation on what the restructured board would do and reviewed the language with the group. It was noted that there had been discussion on the appropriate agencies, universities, and municipalities involved in the structure and the process. Heidi Ricci discussed the role of DPH and noted that there needed to be input from the DPH Bureau of Environmental Health and outside experts in human and ecotoxicology. It was added that language was needed on the availability of municipalities to get the services they wanted and needed. Stephen Rich commented on the addition of representatives from the state universities on entomology and public health. Jessica Burgess suggested the creation of language that referenced entities and areas of expertise to ensure the public body seat could be filled. Richard Pollack discussed academic expertise and the specificity of it being a state entity or state university. Jessica Burgess clarified that it was up to what the subcommittee to determine what universities and institutions they wanted on the board and suggested the subcommittee be mindful of what qualifiers they put in the recommendation language. It was recommended that the subcommittee look at chapter 132 B to get a sense of how legislation identified people to sit in certain roles on public bodies.

Stephen Rich responded to Richard Pollack regarding the recommendation on state and private academic institutions and discussed the qualitative difference of having a state employee who was also an academic on the commission. Russell Hopping discussed quality control and dealing with private applicators and thought quality control needed to be fleshed out a little be more to determine what the subcommittee was asking for.

Amend the Massachusetts stormwater handbook (and relevant building land use and stormwater regulations):

Diana Pietri asked the group if the recommendation still fit within the subcommittee. Heidi Ricci commented that she hoped this would remain as a potential recommendation and noted this recommendation addressed an overlooked area and was consistent with the direction that DEP and the EPA was moving towards on stormwater management. Stephen Rich noted that this recommendation seemed more like practice then policy and did not fit the subcommittees mandate. Richard Pollack noted that he thought it was an important topic. Heidi Ricci commented that she would be ok with the recommendation in any form as long as it was included somewhere and noted that this recommendation was something that could have a positive impact. Russell Hopping added that this recommendation was very important, and he was not tied to where it belonged. Julia Blatt agreed and

reiterated that she would not want the recommendation to get lost and suggested that it be included in the recommendations to the legislature. Richard Pollack suggested leaving the recommendation language as it was and to let the full task force decide how they want to handle it.

Discuss MCD-Specific Recommendations:

Diana Pietri noted that the recommendation language had not changed since it was last presented to the task force and asked the group if they were ok with the recommendation language being presented to the task force as something that the subcommittee was still working on. All subcommittee members agreed to the presentation of the recommendation material during the task force meeting.

Wrap Up and Next Steps:

Diana Pietri discussed the information Stephen Rich would be presenting at task force meeting and noted that draft documentation discussed during the meeting would be distributed to the subcommittee members in preparation for the next meeting on 2/17.

Closing Remarks and Vote to Adjourn:

Heidi Ricci asked Caroline Higley about web portal submission of public comments for the public listening session. Caroline Higley clarified the submission process. Heidi Ricci noted that the public may have more general comments that they would like to submit and suggested changes to the comment submission format in the web portal. Richard Pollack asked a question related to who could and could not provide public comment. Jessica Burgess provided clarification on the ability of state employees to participate in the public comment process. Seeing no other questions or comments, Stephen Rich entertained a motion to adjourn from Richard Pollack. Seconded by Julia Blatt. All voted aye. The meeting was adjourned at 2:04 p.m.

MCTF Policy Structure Subcommittee Meeting Minutes 02 25 22

Minutes for the Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century (MCTF) Task Force Meeting

Subcommittee Meeting: Policy Structure

February 25, 2022, 09:00 a.m. via Zoom

Meeting Topics:

- Meeting Open, Welcome and Roll Call (Chair)
- Housekeeping Notes (EEA Representatives)
- Vote on Meeting Minutes, Meeting Purpose, Agenda (Chair and Facilitator)
- Reflect on Public Comment Received
- Discuss Recommendation 1 (Revise or Replace MGL 252) Content
- Discuss MCD-Specific Recommendations
- Wrap Up and Next Steps (Facilitator)
- Closing Remarks and Vote to Adjourn (Chair)

Meeting Open, Welcome, Roll Call, Housekeeping Notes:

Stephen Rich called the meeting to order at 9:02 am. A quorum was met. Roll call was conducted. Subcommittee members in attendance included Richard Pollack, Russell Hopping, Julia Blatt, and Heidi Ricci. Jessica Burgess provided a housekeeping update.

Vote on Meeting Minutes (11/18, 12/23, 1/6):

Stephen Rich made a motion to approve the 11/18 meeting minutes as amended based on Heidi Ricci's suggestions. Heidi Ricci made a motion to approve the amended meeting minutes. Seconded by Julia Blatt. A roll call was conducted. Richard Pollack (aye), Russell Hopping (aye), Julia Blatt (aye), Heidi Ricci (aye), Stephen Rich (aye).

Stephen Rich made a motion to approve the 12/23 meeting minutes. Richard Pollack made a motion. Seconded by Heidi Ricci. A roll call vote was conducted. Julia Blatt (abstain), Russell Hopping (aye), Heidi Ricci (aye), Richard Pollack (aye), Stephen Rich (aye).

Stephen Rich made a motion to approve the 1/6 meeting minutes as amended based on Heidi Ricci's suggestions. Richard Pollack made a motion to approve the amended meeting minutes. Seconded by Heidi Ricci. A roll call was conducted. Richard Pollack (aye), Russell Hopping (aye), Julia Blatt (aye), Heidi Ricci (aye), Stephen Rich (aye).

Meeting Purpose, Agenda

The agenda was presented to the subcommittee members. Diana Pietri discussed the finalization of draft recommendations for the full task force. It was noted that the subcommittee meeting on Tuesday 3/1 would focus on finalizing recommendation text and the second hour would be dedicated on voting to advance recommendations to the full task force. Alisha Bouchard noted that an e-mail was distributed to all task force members on guidance and next steps.

Reflection on Public Comment Received:

Stephen Rich commented that he was surprised by the commentators that cited how pleased they were, and thought this was noteworthy as the group discussed the repeal and replace of M.G.L. 252. Stephen Rich added that there may be a proportion of people that were pleased with how mosquito control was done and there was a need to be mindful of that. Julia Blatt noted that she was surprised by what seemed like a large number of people expressing their opposition to the use of pesticides and noted that sentiment was coming from a lot of different

points of view. Richard Pollack found the comments to be interesting and noted that people that were generally ok with the status quo may not log in with concerns or complaints. Richard Pollack added that he wished the people arguing for change were better informed of the entire process and noted that if they attended MCD commission meetings many of their fears may be allayed. Heidi Ricci commented on the tone of the listening session and noted the concerns of pesticides as a big theme. Heidi Ricci referenced the comments from participants from the town of Ashby and discussed the story that was conveyed about the yard with mint and the loss of bees after aerial spraying. Heidi Ricci commented on the written testimony from Dr. Christine Oliver and noted the statistics that were presented and discussed related to chemical sensitivities.

Heidi Ricci commented on the positive observations about the Cape Cod MCD and other MCDs collaborating on wetland management work and noted the theme that the source reduction work on wetlands was very important. Heidi Ricci added that this seemed like something that everyone could get behind related to the use of the best available science. Russell Hopping noted the desire for less adulticide across the board and commented that many of the people that spoke felt that they were not being listened to as well. Jessica Burgess noted one point of clarification that came up regarding the listening session and noted that the SRB has not pursued for or pushed adulticiding in any capacity. Jessica Burgess added that this was not a practice that the SRB undertakes and the SRB was respectful of each MCD and the needs of the communities that they service.

Discuss Recommendation 1 (Revise or Replace MGL 252) Content:

Jessica Burgess discussed statutory amendments related to repeal and replace and noted the easiest way to accomplish this was to make all the changes in the new regulatory structure and to make the statement clear. Julia Blatt asked for clarification on the new language regarding repeal and amend. Jessica Burgess noted the wordsmithing for when the recommendation went to the legislature regarding repeal, replace, and amend, and noted in both cases the subcommittee was proposing to amend M.G.L. 252. Heidi Ricci commented on an editorial change and Jessica Burgess noted there would be a review process to make sure all the correct citations were implemented to ensure it was concise when coming out of the subcommittee.

Diana Pietri discussed the restructuring of the SRB, guideline language, and background and rationale language within the recommendation. Diana Pietri noted that both Heidi Ricci and Richard Pollack drafted revised recommendation language. Richard Pollack provided a recap on some of the suggestions he was proposing in his revision language and encouraged everyone to take a look at what was provided. Heidi Ricci's revised recommendation language was shared with the group. Heidi Ricci noted her revisions focused on the clarification of items that were not as clear as they could be. For example, to make sure the recommendation was capturing all the entities that would be involved and noted that it was important to mention non-profits, research institutions, landowners, and source reduction and land management as an important part of IPM.

Julia Blatt commented that she would like a chance to review the information and Diana Pietri discussed the timing remaining for review. Richard Pollack commented on Heidi Ricci's revised language and contributions and said he had no problem with it in principle, and noted it was implicit in the concept of IPM. Heidi Ricci suggested taking the time to carefully review the recommendation edits and commented on wetlands management needing to be highlighted in the recommendation because there have been significant advances in the technology, and it would be important in expanding the collaboration between MCDs and other entities. Heidi Ricci added that the beneficial techniques that could be used were not part of the existing GEIR and thought that needed to be highlighted. Stephen Rich commented that the suggestions were too specific for policy and appeared to be more about best practices. Julia Blatt agreed with Heidi Ricci that this was needed because it was intended for legislators and thought this was important education and information for the individuals who would be writing the law.

Heidi Ricci explained why this was a policy issue and discussed projects, such as, Allens Pond on the Southcoast and the regulatory hurdles to complete it. It was added that this needed to be a focus to get all the agencies on the same page. Russell Hopping noted that it was a fine line between policy and best practice, and he thought that this should be part of a policy focus. Diana Pietri called for a poll to include this information in the background and

rationale of the recommendation. Russell Hopping, Julia Blatt, and Heidi Ricci were all in favor. Stephen Rich and Richard Pollack were not in favor. It was decided that the information would be moved into the background/rationale section of the recommendation.

Diana Pietri asked the group if there were any components that were missing from the recommendation. Stephen Rich suggested that UMASS have representation on the newly reconstituted board. Subcommittee members supported the notion as long as it did not completely preclude the opportunity for other academic institutions with a level of expertise to weigh in on issues. Jessica Burgess commented on what should be included for the purpose of what the subcommittee would want in the legislation and noted the exact list of agencies or categories of individuals that make up the oversight body should be bulleted out. Jessica Burgess added that if the subcommittee members were ok with it, that EEA/MDAR could assist with the language.

Julia Blatt suggested adding in another group to represent the environment and noted that she would like to see DER or MassWildlife on the board. Alisha Bouchard and Jessica Burgess discussed the additions of departments and divisions of state agencies and the need to be as specific as possible. Jessica Burgess added that the board would be a public body subject to OML and meeting quorum. Heidi Ricci commented on ensuring that the size of the board was manageable and noted that she would prefer that DPH chair the board and the board be a minimum of five but no more than seven. Jessica Burgess commented that the chair of the board doesn't give that agency a new set of authorities and if it was important to have DPH chair the board it would need to be indicated. Russell Hopping discussed guidance and specificity and noted that Fish and Game should include someone from DER on the board since they were the wetlands experts. Richard Pollack commented that traditionally the SRB had been housed within MDAR and he didn't think that DPH had the expertise or the desire to chair this board.

Russell Hopping commented on narrowing down the DEP representation. Alisha Bouchard mentioned that DEP was on the SRB now and represented the division of wetlands and waterways. Richard Pollack expressed his concern that the newly reconstituted board was going to be overpopulated with individuals that may not be able to contribute in the same way as the current SRB. Stephen Rich discussed the goal of giving the commissioners the authority to designate the appropriate people. Stephen Rich and Richard Pollack discussed the inclusion of additional academic institutions. Richard Pollack and Jessica Burgess discussed wordsmithing changes in the recommendation language.

Heidi Ricci noted that she had a problem with listing UMASS so specifically and would prefer allowing chancellors to pick someone at a high enough level with the right expertise. Richard Pollack noted that he thought it was incumbent upon the group to inform and communicate the minimum requirements. Jessica Burgess discussed how this could be accomplished and communicated in relation to roles and purpose. Heidi Ricci noted that this could be addressed from a general statement and she did not want to be too prescriptive to determine who best to represent the university. Julia Blatt commented on her continued concern with the balance of the group and liked the idea of having expertise related to the impacts on aquatics and pollinators. Julia Blatt added that she would support two representatives from Fish and Game and have them be specified.

Diana Pietri took a poll related to voting on the entirety of the recommendation and asked who would be ok with the board list as it was documented. Heidi Ricci, Julia Blatt, Russell Hopping, and Stephen Rich all wanted to see additional changes to the list. Stephen Rich commented that he was willing to go with Heidi Ricci's recommendation but noted earmarking some and not others would be problematic and suggested leaving it up to the commissioners to determine the individuals with the relevant expertise.

Discuss MCD-Specific Recommendations:

The recommendations were presented to the subcommittee members.

- *Establish baseline mosquito control services and allow people/member towns to add services as they wish/as needed*

- *Revise the structure, function, and funding of the MCDs to ensure a comprehensive and cohesive framework for mosquito control across Massachusetts and to potentially allow for towns to join MCDs at lower costs*

Diana Pietri presented the suggested edits that were drafted by Richard Pollack. Heidi Ricci commented that there was an overlap with the local engagement subcommittee and noted that their recommendation was a split vote and there was not local municipal representation on the subcommittee. Heidi Ricci mentioned that she would support merging into one recommendation and thought it was important to advance this idea. Russell Hopping noted that he was fine with the concept of merging the recommendations. Julia Blatt suggested removing adulticiding from the recommendation language. Richard Pollack noted that he was against removing adulticiding and that it was part of the IPM process. Jessica Burgess commented on the state services provided through the MCDs, with the exception of aerial spraying which was done via the SRB in a public health hazard situation and asked if the subcommittee was suggesting adulticide not be used. Julia Blatt responded yes. Stephen Rich noted that adulticide should stay as a viable option. Heidi Ricci noted that it needed to be in there as part of the overall framework as a last resort. Russell Hopping noted he agreed that adulticide should remain in the recommendation.

Richard Pollack discussed the rationale on efforts pursued by the MCDs and the state. Heidi Ricci noted the parallel recommendation on the local engagement subcommittee that was addressing the directive on local options and giving the communities the services that they wanted. Alisha Bouchard mentioned the subcommittee group discussing the funding components and added commentary on basic services being funded by the Commonwealth and additional services that could be funded through a direct bill for any of the towns that wanted those services. Alisha Bouchard added that another topic for the subcommittee to think about was the administrative, operational, and capital improvement costs for MCDs. Heidi Ricci noted this had come up in another subcommittee and added that a lot of details needed to be worked out but from a policy level standpoint supported moving it forward since this is what municipalities had been asking for. It was also noted that there was a lot of additional money on source reduction/wetlands management and there could be money available other than state funding.

Wrap Up and Next Steps:

Diana Pietri noted that the ERG team would merge the two recommendations together and would send out the revised version in addition to the revised recommendation versions that were drafted by Heidi Ricci and Richard Pollack. Richard Pollack discussed feedback shared from Cambridge regarding stormwater structures that were intended to drain. Heidi Ricci shared her wetlands recommendation on an enhanced and coordinated approach to updating policy and best practices on wetland management within the structure of IPM. Heidi Ricci added that there were large pots of money available from both federal and state programs and from a policy standpoint suggested that the MCDs explore collaborative efforts to include these scientific innovations.

Closing Remarks and Vote to Adjourn:

Diana Pietri noted that the subcommittee would be meeting on Tuesday 3/1 from 2:00 – 4:00 pm. It was indicated that Stephen Rich would not be there for the first hour and Julia Blatt would step in as co-chair. Diana Pietri encouraged the subcommittee members to review the recommendation language so that discussions could be finalized, and final voting could occur. Heidi Ricci also mentioned that she had a scheduling conflict for the first half of the meeting. Hearing no other comments from the group Stephen Rich entertained a motion to adjourn. A motion was made by Richard Pollack. Seconded by Julia Blatt. All in favor said aye. The meeting was adjourned at 11:02a.m.

MCTF Policy Structure Subcommittee Meeting Minutes 03 01 22

Minutes for the Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century (MCTF) Task Force Meeting

Subcommittee Meeting: Policy Structure

March 1, 2022, 2:00 p.m. via Zoom

Meeting Topics:

- Meeting Open, Welcome and Roll Call (Chair)
- Housekeeping Notes (EEA Representatives)
- Vote on Meeting Minutes, Meeting Purpose, Agenda (Chair and Facilitator)
- Final Discussion of Recommendation 1
- Final Discussion of Recommendation 3
- Final Discussion of Recommendation 2
- Final Discussion of Recommendation 4
- Recommendation Voting
- Wrap Up (Facilitator)
- Closing Remarks and Vote to Adjourn (Chair)

Meeting Open, Welcome, Roll Call, Housekeeping Notes:

Julia Blatt called the meeting to order in Stephen Rich's absence at 2:04 p.m. A quorum was met. A roll call was conducted. Subcommittee members in attendance included Richard Pollack, Russell Hopping, Brad Mitchell, Heidi Porter, Julia Blatt, Stephen Rich (arrived at 2:27 p.m.), and Heidi Ricci (arrived at 2:17 p.m.). Jessica Burgess provided a housekeeping update.

Meeting Purpose, Agenda:

The agenda was shared with the subcommittee group and it was noted that this was the thirteenth and final meeting of the subcommittee. It was noted that subcommittee members would be working on, finalizing, and voting on recommendations. Diana Pietri commented on the poll that was distributed by ERG to task force members and asked the subcommittee group to respond to the poll since it would help structure the full task force meetings. Diana Pietri noted that all recommendations that the subcommittee developed would be passed along to the task force with the full vote tally and it was likely that the recommendations that were majority supported would get the most discussion. Jessica Burgess commented that an email was distributed to the task force members last week that addressed the details for March task force meetings.

Recommendation Discussion:

Final Discussion of Recommendation 1 – Repeal and replace M.G.L. c.252 and enabling MCD legislation or amend M.G.L. c. 252 and repeal MCD enabling legislation: The updated recommendation language was shared with the group. Diana Pietri asked the group if there were any final changes that were needed before the recommendation advanced to the task force. Heidi Porter commented on the definition, clarity, and purpose related to nuisance versus disease bearing mosquito and asked how the language incorporated nuisance mosquitoes. Diana Pietri noted that the decision was made to have a high level and broader statement that was not making the nuisance distinction. Brad Mitchell noted that he was comfortable with the recommendation. Heidi Ricci noted that she did not think there was anything further to add. Russell Hopping had no additions or questions. Julia Blatt noted that she thought the language was good. Richard Pollack mentioned that he was hoping the comments would be reviewed that were drafted by him and Heidi Ricci. Diana Pietri noted that the group may not have had time to process the comments. Richard Pollack's comments were shared with the group and it was noted that these were Richard Pollack's thoughts, and they may not be supported by other subcommittee members.

Heidi Ricci mentioned that some of the comments in the document were clarifications, and she did not have a problem with most of the content. Heidi Ricci also noted that she was ok not further discussing her changes because they were getting addressed through a recommendation on another subcommittee. Brad Mitchell discussed the nuances of the recommendation language and Julia Blatt noted that she preferred the term mosquito management versus mosquito control. Stephen Rich commented that he liked the language related to risks and benefits and suggested including it in the goal statement. Based on the subcommittee discussion, additional wordsmithing changes were made to the recommendation language. Jessica Burgess and Taryn LaScola discussed the term control and commercial in relation to private mosquito companies. Jessica Burgess added clarification on the phrasing that was used and noted from a legal perspective phrasing could be addressed later. Brad Mitchell discussed the three levels of mosquito management; commercial, state, private homeowner, and commented that the subcommittee should be clear on who they were.

Final Discussion of Recommendation 3 - Revise the structure, function, and funding of MCDs to ensure a comprehensive and cohesive framework for mosquito control across Massachusetts that establishes baseline mosquito control services for all towns/municipalities in the commonwealth, allows towns to join MCDs at lower costs, and allows people/member towns to add services as they wish/as needed: It was noted that this was a merged recommendation that discussed the framework of basic statewide services with additional services funded by municipalities. Richard Pollack suggested that the framework section needed to be clear that the state funded portion of services would be for disease surveillance and it would not be for monitoring of mosquitoes. Brad Mitchell discussed his concerns with towns coming in and out of an MCD and noted there was a need to acknowledge a time frame to allow for MCDs to plan. Brad Mitchell also noted that he thought the subcommittee was missing out on an opportunity to address a level of nuisance control. Subcommittee members discussed basic state funded services and Richard Pollack suggested the MCDs have at least a three-year membership from towns.

Heidi Ricci agreed with requiring a community to have a minimum number of years to opt-in to an MCD and noted her main concern was that communities have the ability to opt-in. Richard Pollack noted a point of clarification in the text that DPH have traps in regionally appropriate areas rather than in each community. Brad Mitchell inquired if the cherry sheet process was going to be part of this recommendation. Jessica Burgess discussed the cherry sheet deduction process and thought it made sense to look at the current valuation calculation through DOR and flag that for the legislature to consider.

Brad Mitchell discussed a mechanism to deal with pathogen carrying mosquito and suggested that the newly created SRB should be able to determine what the appropriate response would be. Richard Pollack discussed a need to be clear related to centralized services and a manner to communicate to MCDs if there was a need to roll their trucks into communities that were not part of an MCD. Heidi Ricci suggested focusing more on education and human health. Brad Mitchell mentioned that the legislation would be there for some time and to consider the fact that there could be new mosquito diseases that would need to be addressed in the future. Julia Blatt commented that this looked like it was setting up the same decision-making structure and suggested the removal of some recommendation language because it was too controversial.

Richard Pollack discussed the need for the task force to recognize that the recommendation would require an influx of funding and that DPH would be carrying the burden of surveillance. Subcommittee members discussed wordsmithing changes and clarification on basic state funded services versus additional services. Heidi Ricci suggested keeping the language broad to address new diseases. The subcommittee group agreed that the proposed language changes in the recommendation could work. Brad Mitchell and Russell Hopping discussed spraying triggered for group events versus spraying being triggered because of an individual request to spray. Brad Mitchell commented on the risk benefit and noted that it was perhaps best suited under a separate bullet for the legislature to consider. Russell Hopping added that there was a nuisance spraying recommendation that was voted on during the best practices subcommittee meeting and suggested that it be something that could be brought up during the full task force meeting.

Final Discussion of Recommendation 2 - Amend the Massachusetts Stormwater Handbook (and relevant building codes): The group reviewed the recommendation language and discussed wordsmithing changes. Russell Hopping suggested adding in language related to climate change considerations. Heidi Ricci commented on the main focus related to how communities were doing stormwater management. Richard Pollack noted that he was ok with the language and suggested adding it into the background and rationale section of the recommendation. There were no additional comments from the subcommittee members.

Final Discussion of Recommendation 4 – Improving Consistency in the Implementation of Integrated Pest Management: It was noted that this recommendation had been forwarded through the best practices subcommittee. Heidi Ricci discussed the recommendation and noted that it was calling for better coordination of agencies. Heidi Ricci added that she really felt that this should be its own separate recommendation so it could get its own attention. It was confirmed that the subcommittee would not be voting on this recommendation because it had been advanced to the task force through another subcommittee with a majority vote.

Recommendation Voting:

Recommendation 1 – Repeal and replace M.G.L. c.252 and enabling MCD legislation or amend M.G.L. c. 252 and repeal MCD enabling legislation: Stephen Rich entertained a motion to vote on the recommendation. Julia Blatt made a motion. Seconded by Richard Pollack. A roll call was conducted. Julia Blatt (aye), Russell Hopping (aye), Brad Mitchell (aye), Richard Pollack (aye), Heidi Ricci (aye), Heidi Porter (aye), Stephen Rich (aye). The motion passed unanimously. Heidi Ricci also wanted to note her concern in relation to Derek Brindisi's absence from the task force and the task force finalizing recommendation without municipal representation.

Recommendation 3 - Revise the structure, function, and funding of MCDs to ensure a comprehensive and cohesive framework for mosquito control across Massachusetts that establishes baseline mosquito control services for all towns/municipalities in the commonwealth, allows towns to join MCDs at lower costs, and allows people/member towns to add services as they wish/as needed: Stephen Rich entertained a motion to vote on the recommendation. Richard Pollack made a motion. Seconded by Heidi Ricci. A roll call vote was conducted. Julia Blatt (aye), Russell Hopping (aye), Brad Mitchell (no), Richard Pollack (aye), Heidi Ricci (aye), Heidi Porter (aye), Stephen Rich (aye). The was motion passed. Brad Mitchell noted that he agreed with the majority of the recommendation, but it was incumbent on mosquito policy to ensure that there was maximized benefit of applications and this precluded spraying based on individual requests.

Recommendation 2 - Amend the Massachusetts Stormwater Handbook (and relevant building codes): A motion was entertained by Stephen Rich to vote on the recommendation. Richard Pollack made a motion. Seconded by Brad Mitchell. A roll call vote was conducted. Julia Blatt (abstain), Russell Hopping (aye), Brad Mitchell (aye), Richard Pollack (aye), Heidi Ricci (aye), Heidi Porter (aye), Stephen Rich (aye). The motion was passed. Julia Blatt commented that in general she liked the idea but was not sure of the additional language suggesting the treating of standing water that was greater than three days old. Julia Blatt noted she preferred the better management of standing water versus using pesticides.

Recommendation 4 - Improving Consistency in the Implementation of Integrated Pest Management: It was determined that there would not be a vote on the recommendation since a version of this recommendation was passed with a majority vote through the best practices subcommittee.

Wrap Up, Closing Remarks, and Vote to Adjourn:

Diana Pietri noted that she would be assisting with the facilitation process for the three final task force meetings. Brad Mitchell and Julia Blatt thanked Diana Pietri for her assistance and facilitation throughout the subcommittee process. Heidi Ricci commented on Derek Brindisi's absence and noted that having his voice missing from the task force was really concerning to her. Heidi Ricci noted that she had recommended getting someone else from Uxbridge to replace Derek Brindisi and that there were several recommendations in the local engagement

subcommittee where a municipal voice was missing, and it could have been a different vote had that municipal representation been there. Jessica Burgess clarified that there was not an opportunity for Derek Brindisi to have a designee and there was municipal representation on the task force although it was not from a non-MCD community. Heidi Ricci added that she hoped that Derek Brindisi would be able to participate in the final task force process. Stephen Rich entertained a motion to adjourn the meeting. Brad Mitchell made a motion. Seconded by Heidi Porter. All in favor said aye. The meeting was adjourned at 3:47 p.m.

**Best Practices Subcommittee
Meeting Minutes**

MCTF Best Practices Subcommittee Meeting Minutes 10 04 21

Minutes for the Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century (MCTF) Task Force Meeting

Subcommittee Meeting: Best Practices

October 04, 2021, 12:00 p.m. via Zoom

Meeting Topics:

- Open Meeting, Roll Call, Welcome, and Meeting Purpose (chair)
- Introductions (facilitator)
- Review and Clarification of Subcommittee Guidance
- Subcommittee Charge and Purpose (*guidance, p. 1*)
 - Conduct of Subcommittee Meetings (*guidance, p. 2*)
 - Schedule (*guidance, p. 2*)
 - Protocols for Drafting Recommendations and Voting (*guidance, p. 3*)
 - Supporting Materials (*guidance, pp. 3-17*)
 - Subcommittee Members and Supporting Personnel
 - Roles of Subcommittee Participants
 - Rules and Expectations for Subcommittee Members
 - Background Materials and MCTF Report Sections Relevant to Subcommittees' Charges
 - Subcommittee Directives and Understory Questions
 - Overlapping Scope in Directives Assigned to Different Subcommittees
 - Example recommendations from the Cranberry Task Force
 - Open Meeting Law Guide
- Clarify the Process for Recommendations Development: Stage 1—Review and Discussion of Information
- Begin the Process of Developing Recommendations
- Closing Remarks (facilitator and chair)

Cheryl Keenan (Facilitator) welcomed everyone to the first meeting of the best practices subcommittee Mosquito Control Task Force (MCTF). This meeting was held as a Zoom webinar. Jennifer Forman Orth (EEA staff lead) noted that any task force members that were attending but not on this subcommittee would be there are attendees, and that any questions from attendees should be asked using the Q&A function. It was reiterated that questions would be addressed at the discretion of the chair.

Richard Robinson (subcommittee chair) welcomed everybody to the meeting, introduced himself, and had the other members of the subcommittee introduce themselves:

- Richard Robinson is a certified organic farmer in Sherborn, Massachusetts. A member of the board of the Northeast Organic Farming Association of Massachusetts. In his other job, he is a science writer.
- Kathy Baskin is Assistant Commissioner of the Bureau of Water Resources at Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection.

- Priscilla Matton is Superintendent of the Bristol County Mosquito Control Project and in attendance to represent organized mosquito control in the Commonwealth.
- Anita Deeley is a commercial beekeeper and the owner, founder, beekeeper at Beverly Bees.
- Russell Hopping is the Lead Coastal Ecologist/Ecology Program Director for the Trustees of Reservation.
- Richard Pollack is trained as a Public Health Entomologist who has researched, thought about, and studied in the laboratory in the field of mosquitoes and mosquito-borne diseases for more than four decades.
- Helen Poynton is a UMass Boston Professor of Molecular Ecotoxicology and does a lot of work at the aquatics level and hopes this group can find best practices.
- Heidi Ricci is the Director of Policy and Advocacy at Mass Audubon and has been working in mosquito control for several years. Mass Audubon manages over 40,000 acres of land statewide, including Drumlin Farm Wildlife Sanctuary. In addition, Mass Audubon has a couple of farm operations and sells over a half-million dollars of organically grown produce each year. Although they are not a certified organic farm, they do follow organic practices.
- Kim LeBeau (arrived halfway through the meeting) is the senior program manager for water quality for MA Water Resources Authority, which provides water and wastewater services to over 3 million people in 53 communities as a public water system. Has experience dealing with source and drinking water regulatory & nonregulatory issues.

Jennifer Forman Orth, an Environmental Biologist at the Mass. Dept. of Agricultural Resources (MDAR), and was the EEA facilitator for this subcommittee, there to help things run smoothly and ensure that the MA Open Meeting Law is being adhered to. Cheryl Keenan is with ERG (Eastern Research Group, Inc.) Mosquito Control Task Force and is the facilitator of this subcommittee, focused on making sure everybody is on the same page of what the topic says going forward, covering the ground rules for the subcommittee, and guiding members through the process for the first stage of meeting development. Richard Robinson mentioned the desire for everyone participating to see each other and to use their hand-raising button on Zoom if they wish to speak. The group is mostly going to go through broad-based framework on IPM (Integrated Pest Management). It is communicated that a quorum is required for any meeting going forward, so it is important that everybody attend. The Task Force report is a primary source of information for the subcommittee.

The conversation starts with a discussion of the schedule of events that emphasizes the outlining and drafting of recommendations. It's a broad schedule, with the expectation that the final recommendation will be completed in just about 9 meetings.

There was a review and clarification of subcommittee guidance. Richard Robinson noted that two of the three directives are quite broad and will likely require a lot of discussion. Richard Robinson suggested that starting with the third one about organic agriculture could be a good way to get the group familiarized with the process, noting that having a focused schedule to get through everything is important. Heidi Ricci mentioned that she felt like discussing the broad framework of IPM was a necessary precursor to getting into the weeds of the third directive. All requested to revisit this discussion at the end of the meeting. Helen Poynton wanted to confirm that all attendance-related matters should be communicated with Cheryl Keenan. Heidi Ricci noted that Caroline had sent out an email with the ERG facilitators' emails.

The conversation then moved into Understory Questions. Richard Robinson had written his own set of understory questions in response to the three directives and wanted to encourage others to do the same. He was wondering whether these questions could be sent to Cheryl Keenan and sent out with the agenda for the next meeting. This raised a question of adherence to MA Open Meeting Law, as discussed extensively below when Jessica Burgess of MDAR was able to join. Richard Robinson was concerned that subcommittee members not being able to disseminate their own thoughts in-between meetings would slow the whole process down and referenced his prior experience on another committee he was involved with in the past.

Heidi Ricci and Helen Poynton both brought up that having access to the comments on ERG's report as soon as possible would be helpful. Kathy Baskin proposed setting up short fifteen-minute meetings to receive information so that subcommittee members might be able to process and be prepared for the longer meetings. Heidi Ricci had a specific comment on the first understory question for the IPM directive. Although the IPM directive was broad, Heidi Ricci felt that the understory questions were overly narrow (e.g. focusing on only MCDs' ability to carry out IPM) and might constrain the discussion. Heidi Ricci also felt like clarifying the overall goal in the beginning of the process was important, as being on the same page across all subcommittees was important.

Overlapping scope was brought up as part of the meeting conversation. Richard Robinson and Priscilla Matton brought up the issue of how some members on this subcommittee were also on other subcommittees. While there might be some benefits (e.g. being able to bring in relevant details from the other subcommittees and vice versa), perhaps this could also be a problem. Richard Robinson noted this might only be a problem if overlapping members represented a quorum on one of the subcommittees.

This was discussed further discussed via a Q&A portion of the conversation. Jennifer Forman Orth questioned whether it was necessary to have video on in Zoom to legally participate in meetings and voting. This was related to a comment Richard Robinson brought up earlier; he asked people to have video on if possible, both in case this was legally necessary and to encourage better conversational flow. Jessica Burgess noted if subcommittees members were audible, that was fine, since voting is done by roll calls. Jennifer Forman Orth asked about Richard Robinson's proposal to have subcommittees members submit questions to Cheryl and whether these questions could be disseminated to all subcommittee members before the next meeting. Jessica Burgess explained that no member of a public body can engage in deliberations outside of public meetings; the most that can be done is scheduling or sharing agenda items. If information is shared in a public meeting, that is fine. But if information is aggregated outside of meetings, it can't be automatically shared; it will need to be sent to ERG and Caroline to evaluate whether it constitutes "deliberative material", in which case it cannot be shared outside of the meeting.

Jessica Burgess also addressed Richard Robinson's proposal, specifically saying that unfortunately it probably would constitute a violation of MA Open Meeting Laws. Sending questions counts as deliberation because it is essentially bringing up ideas for other subcommittees members to consider, even if there is no response by those members. Jessica Burgess acknowledged this was a strict interpretation, but that the Open Meeting Law became stricter a couple of years ago due to concerns that were raised. Jessica Burgess noted that she doesn't want to make the process more cumbersome, but if the process isn't airtight, someone could challenge it, and everyone would have to start from square one again.

Heidi Ricci stated that she valued transparency but believed that other public bodies were able to collect materials and post them with agenda notices to make publicly available. Along those lines, she expressed a concern that the guidance document didn't seem to be publicly available yet, nor the public comments. Jessica Burgess noted they would work to make everything publicly available. Jennifer Forman Orth said that nothing was being intentionally withheld, and that EEA was likely just swamped and unable to get to posting the materials yet.

Richard Robinson said the remainder of this discussion could be taken offline. To reiterate, Jessica Burgess said the existing guidance was to not share anything with other members of the subcommittees /MCTF and to send everything to ERG/Caroline. Jessica Burgess agreed to investigate nuances. Jennifer Forman Orth asked about the issue of crossover of subjects between different subcommittees in their discussions. Is there anything that members of multiple subcommittees need to be wary of in their discussions? Jessica Burgess said she would investigate it. Jennifer Forman Orth asked about the issue of individuals sitting on multiple subcommittees and whether this constituted a violation of the open meeting law. Jessica Burgess noted she would investigate that but her initial thought was that it should be fine if the members did not constitute a quorum. However, Priscilla Matton noted that she, Heidi Ricci, and Russell Hopping were all members of the local engagement subcommittee and comprised a majority (3/5).

The meeting group discussed next steps and Cheryl Keenan asked whether anyone had any objections to doing some "homework" before the next meeting. Helen Poynton strongly urged the release of other MCTF members' comments on the ERG report ASAP so that the subcommittee could identify critical data gaps. Jennifer Forman Orth noted she had put the question out there as to its status. Heidi Ricci reiterated this, asking for access to all comments on the report because there may be some important technical comments beyond what MCTF members shared. Heidi Ricci reiterated her desire for everyone to arrive at a firm and shared understanding of the overall goal, especially regarding IPM. Heidi Ricci cited Appendix B as having some good materials to look at (additional documents reviewed), calling out a Xerces Society document on ecological mosquito control and a file from Boulder Colorado. She also recommended a joint statement from CDC & EPA on mosquito control, a short and readable document. Heidi Ricci noted that each member of the MCTF brings their own expertise that could help supplement the report, although she didn't know how this might come into play during deliberations.

Russell Hopping asked whether there was any concrete way in which the subcommittee members are meant to be evaluating the overall strength of the information in the report. Cheryl Keenan stated that it was qualitative, and the main aim was to identify critical data gaps. Cheryl Keenan asked whether anyone had objections to taking the homework on. No one spoke up, so Cheryl Keenan assumed that everyone agreed. Richard Robinson had a comment about how he was a little worried that the next meetings would get bogged down in procedural discussions and that the subcommittee might have to rush through the actual decision-making. He asked for thoughts, but no one had any. Cheryl Keenan then posed the question of which directive to focus on first, reminding everyone that Heidi Ricci had implied she wanted to focus on the first directive while Richard Robinson had said the third.

Russell Hopping noted he felt like there was quite a steep learning curve with the process and felt like starting with the third one, the most defined of all the questions, could be a good idea. Heidi Ricci said that she was happy to go with the third one if that was the consensus, but firmly wanted it to be in the context of IPM. Cheryl Keenan reminded everyone that this didn't have to be a directive-by-directive process.

Richard Pollack and Helen Poynton expressed a desire to first look at all the directives more generally because they are related. More concrete recommendations could come later; Richard Pollock said they could go from the top, Helen Poynton said they could go from organic farming. Richard Robinson, Russell Hopping, Anita Deeley and Priscilla Matton vocalized their support for this approach. Priscilla Matton said that then maybe they could start with organic farming for the specific recommendations. Richard Robinson noted he liked the idea of identifying gaps across all three directives from the outset. Richard Robinson reiterated his desire for people to come up with their own understory questions to help frame the discussion. He also suggested that people focus on identifying specific data gaps for the directives and figure out how to fill those gaps within the constraints of the time available. He noted that he wanted to get more information about nuisance spraying by private contractors to help evaluate IPM needs because the ERG report didn't touch on this much. He thought that someone at some point might've mentioned the data was available, it just wasn't included. He hoped Cheryl Keenan and ERG could note this.

Cheryl Keenan recapped the discussion by saying that next meeting, the subcommittee would not necessarily focus on one specific directive; it would have a general review/discussion. Richard Pollock and Heidi Ricci wanted to see Richard Robinson's understory questions. Jessica Burgess noted that Richard Robinson could say it verbally in the meeting and follow up with written confirmation (also it would be in meeting minutes); he could also share his screen. Screen shot that was shared is below:

Additional understory questions for the best practices subcommittee

(i) facilitating the use of integrated pest management, including surveillance, public education, enhanced habitat for mosquito predators and storm water management;

- What training/monitoring/incentive structures are in place, or should be in place, for MCDs to improve their IPM activities?
- What resources do MCDs need that they currently lack to improve their IPM activities?
- What priority weights on the range of IPM activities should be offered to guide MCD IPM practices? (eg, should public education be the top priority?)
- Are MCDs the only practitioners of IPM we should be addressing?

(vi) developing procedures to protect human and ecological health and minimize non target impacts of mosquito pesticides, including, but not limited to, effects on persons with respiratory or immune system illnesses, drinking water supplies, pollinators and aquatic life;

- What types of procedures, and carried out by whom, should be contemplated outside of the IPM guidance above?
- Is it possible to develop an algorithm/decision tree for determining when to do aerial spraying, and would this be the minimum we would need to achieve the goals of this best practice recommendation?
- Do decision-makers need/have access to infections data below the county level?
- How should nuisance spraying requests from individuals be handled?



(iv) protecting organic agriculture from pesticide use;

- What procedures are already in place to protect a certified farm from spray? How should these be modified?
- Should any farm be able to take advantage of these protections? Why or why not?
- Is it possible to develop a second tier or protections for non-certified farms?
- Should there be a buffer zone around a farm that is also protected from spray, as any farm in MA is only a part of a local ecosystem?

Cheryl Keenan and Richard Robinson will develop the agenda for the next meeting. Richard Robinson asked for specific agenda items to be sent to Cheryl Keenan within the next three days. The next meeting will include soliciting overall thoughts/viewpoints based on the subcommittee's review of the report, perhaps framed by revisited understory questions, and will be held on 10/13 from 12pm-2pm. Richard Robinson motioned to adjourn the meeting, which was seconded from Richard Pollock. The subcommittee supported the motion. The meeting was adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

MCTF Best Practices Subcommittee Meeting Minutes 10 13 21

Minutes for the Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century (MCTF) Task Force Meeting

Subcommittee Meeting: Best Practices

October 13, 2021, 12:00 p.m. via Zoom

Best Practices Subcommittee Members in attendance: Richard Robinson, Heidi Ricci, Helen Poynton, Priscilla Matton, Kathleen Baskin, Kimberly LeBeau, Richard Pollack, Russell Hopping. Subcommittee meeting is at quorum.

The subcommittee meeting was called to order and a role call was conducted with all subcommittee members in attendance other than Anita Deeley. Cheryl Kennan provided follow-up on procedural questions from the previous meeting.

- Review of Understory Questions
 - ERG consolidated understory questions into one file.
 - Cheryl Keenan asked how the group wanted to proceed regarding the understory questions regarding refining the questions themselves or to start discussing the content.
 - Richard Pollack asked to share some additions to the understory questions.
 - Heidi Ricci noted that her submitted comments were more about identifying gaps and potential sources for filling gaps versus formulating questions.
 - Priscilla Matton discussed mosquito control done by private applicator and noted that might be good to clarify the scope of the task force as established by the legislation. Priscilla Matton's impression was that the main task was to focus on State and Local organized mosquito control.
 - Cheryl Keenan mentioned that this could be a discussion to have offline about whether there was anything that was out of scope for the Best Practices subcommittee.
 - Russ Hopping expressed some concern that three meetings would be enough for reviewing and discussing all information. Cheryl Keenan noted that their approach could be to get everyone's big picture views and figure out common ground, before moving into identifying critical gaps.
 - Richard Robinson encouraged everyone to pose any additional understory questions now. He also thought it was good to get on the same page about the scope; he felt like the intention of the legislation was to make sure the committee wouldn't ignore any relevant features and was in favor of keeping a broader scope.
 - Richard Pollack presented some additional understory questions:
 - What predators are known to practically diminish the abundance of the main enzootic and epidemic vectors of WNV and EEE – or of any kind of mosquito - in the Commonwealth?
 - What non-target species, or even target species, had suffered a sustained population decline because of any pesticide applied by an MCD for mosquito management in the Commonwealth?
 - What objective evidence supports the contention that mosquito larvicides or adulticides, as applied by a Massachusetts MCD, have caused direct and measurable harm to a person?
 - To what extent have MCD activities caused agricultural products to be rendered harmful or unhealthful to consumers?
 - What kinds and amounts of pesticides are applied against mosquitoes by commercial applicators? Why do those entities not need to identify and enumerate mosquitoes or to comply with many of the restrictions imposed on MCDs?
 - To what extent and for what reasons would MCDs apply pesticides directly to bodies of drinking water?
 - Heidi Ricci wanted to pose another question: where is the list of threatened/endangered species in Massachusetts where adulticide use might be highly toxic to those organisms? What are the current procedures, if any, with regards to these species? Having this list would be helpful for monitoring purposes.

- Priscilla Matton brought up Chapter 333 CMR 13.3 – exclusions and wondered what specifically in there the subcommittee might want to address.
- Subcommittee members discussed their big picture thoughts as it related to mosquito control. Members of the subcommittee shared thoughts on nuisance spraying versus public health spraying, concerns about non-target impacts, pesticides that are applied by private residents/private applicators, benefit of public education, the decision-making process for how to spray, the benefit of looking at other regions and states to gather information on non-chemical mosquito control, and large landowner interests.
 - Heidi Ricci noted that she felt that identifying the overall goal of the program was an important starting point. and pointed to CDC's and EPA's recommendations for a science based IPM approach. Heidi Ricci wondered whether public education and personal protective measures were more important for protection. In addition, there was conversation about municipalities wanting resources for education and surveillance and determining how they would get help if there was a hot spot of cases.
 - Kimberly LeBeau commented that her concerns were mostly directed towards directive six and she spoke from the perspective of large surface water body systems and PFAS. She could see the value in developing a QA/QC program for pesticides used within state beyond just the registration of pesticides for use. She thought that the actual chemical supply shipped to MCDs could be vetted through testing labs and concerns about degradation of chemicals in storage could be flagged. Kim also thought that information could be given to water system managers in a more proactive way. For example, by teaching them how to sample for the pesticides before spraying events occur.
 - Priscilla Matton noted that she would be happy to provide her perspective as part of an MCD on how to define nuisance versus disease-carrying mosquitoes, noting that it was very complex. She mentioned that on 10/19, Taryn LaScola would be giving information on how pesticides are registered and approved for use in MA as well as the PFAS testing that has already been done. She pointed to the Department of Fish and Wildlife as being experts when it came to protecting nontarget species and cited the Department of Environmental Protection as the ones having the resources for testing and monitoring in the environment.
 - Kathleen Baskin mentioned that she would be happy to provide the perspective of DEP on sampling and how they engage with public water systems in response to the previous two comments.
 - Richard Pollack cited his experience with this topic for many decades and noted that he felt a bit frustrated about the way the subcommittee seemed to be approaching the first two directives. In his experience as a Commissioner, there was a phenomenal amount of effort put into IPM, such as, education, stormwater management, chemical and other non-chemical efforts for mosquito control. He noted that MCDs do share information and look to other regions, consult journals, and go to conferences for the latest news. He felt that the distinction between nuisance and disease mosquitoes might not be easily resolvable. He would challenge everyone to think about their threshold for tolerating disease and death resulting from WNV and EEE. He rejected the suggestion that there was no data on the efficacy of spraying and disease prevention; he acknowledged the data isn't great but that these weren't "spray and pray" operations. Richard Pollack mentioned that the reason why the location of cases couldn't be released more easily was due to confidentiality issues. He also rejected the claim that natural habitats don't support mosquitoes, pointing to cedar swamps and cattail stands as examples of habitats that are major mosquito breeding grounds.
- Cheryl Keenan noted that ERG could look through comments on the report and add them to the critical gap spreadsheet. For the next meeting, the subcommittee was tasked with reviewing the comments that had been made available on the report and to continue to identify critical gaps. The focus would be on filling the most critical gaps that are necessary to move forward with recommendations.
 - Heidi Ricci noted that in her submission she thought she was identifying only the most critical of gaps. Even in cases where the issue was a lack of data, she would want there to be a discussion. She noted that one concern she hadn't raised was about vulnerable individuals, such as, infants, children,

pregnant women. The report talked about recommendations for these individuals to reduce their own exposure, but she wasn't sure how many people these recommendations were reaching. She wondered if relying on these measures was sufficient.

- Russ Hopping suggested having people answer the understory questions and aggregating the results.
- Richard Pollack noted that he was open to finding common ground and wanted Richard Robinson to help educate him on the measurable impacts of MCD pesticide applications to organic agriculture in MA.

- Comment submitted via the Zoom Q&A from LJ Rigsby:

- Should all public awareness material, - messaging, factsheets, flyers, infographics be managed centrally at EOHHS-level and disseminated thru org chart and available to all municipalities and public. MCDs offer member municipalities support resources for public awareness and prevention. Northeast for example, via a "Municipal Toolbox," gated and accessible only to members. Is it legal for MCDs to restrict access to these "public health" documents? Does each MCD create its own public awareness materials?

From MCD:

- Educating the public about mosquitoes and mosquito-borne illness is an important aspect of integrated mosquito control. Districts produce educational outreach materials, give presentations to the public, and bring outreach materials to public events, to teach people about the "personal protection" required to prevent mosquito-borne illness. Several Districts also offer comprehensive programs to their member communities that are geared towards K-12

MCTF Best Practices Subcommittee Meeting Minutes 10 25 21

Minutes for the Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century (MCTF) Task Force Meeting

Subcommittee Meeting: Best Practices

October 25, 2021, 12:00 p.m. via Zoom

Richard Robinson (Chair) called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m. and conducted a roll call. A quorum was established. Subcommittee members in attendance included Richard Pollack, Priscilla Matton, Helen Poynton, Kimberly LeBeau, Kathleen Baskin, and Russell Hopping. Richard Robinson provided a brief recap of the full task force meeting. Cheryl Keenan (ERG Facilitator) addressed procedural notes with subcommittee members.

- Presentation on What Could/Should MCDs Do Better – Priscilla Matton

Priscilla Matton noted that she felt that MCDs were always striving to do their best regarding Integrated Pest Management (IPM). Bristol County MCD used all the available tools in their toolbox given the constraints of time and funding. Priscilla commented that while people expressed the greatest amount of concern about adulticiding, that comprised a tiny fraction of what the MCD does. The MCD does water management all year round, larval control when appropriate, source reduction all year round, surveillance, education, maintaining equipment, etc.

Priscilla noted that she felt that the Commonwealth generally did a good job with surveillance, a cornerstone of any IPM program. Private companies do not conduct much surveillance, if any, and only respond to resident requests. A significant amount of MCD time and energy was spent conducting targeted surveillance. Priscilla noted that there were fifty-three (53) different mosquito species found in Massachusetts and showed a slide with the top 21 species considered vectors of disease.

Priscilla then showed slides with surveillance data from the past fifteen years in Bristol County. Of the mosquito samples collected, 96% of the species were potential vectors for EEE and 97% for WNV. Adulticiding by truck took place from June through September. Priscilla noted that the MCD handled surveillance proactively versus reactively. Priscilla noted that in terms of room for improvement, surveillance can only ever capture snapshots in time and cannot serve as a perfect predictor. Another facet for consideration was DPH's ability to provide testing services. With the effects of climate change, warming temperatures mean longer seasons, which means that funding will need to go further for mosquito control.

Priscilla mentioned that Bristol County MCD does education and outreach. The MCDs have open and continuous conversations with member cities and towns (e.g., Boards of Health, Conservation Commissions, Road and Bridge Divisions, School Departments, Councils on Aging). Bristol MCD was trying to expand their ability to target mosquito larvae. Mosquitoes implicated in EEE are particularly difficult to control in larval form and not all active ingredients work equally well against all species. Bristol County MCD was also looking into pesticide resistance, the spread of *Aedes albopictus* (Asian tiger mosquito, a recent invasive species), and water management techniques, particularly for reducing standing water in salt marshes.

Potential improvements included having access to new tools (e.g., drones, which are potentially less expensive than aircraft and less invasive) and technical support from state agencies. Priscilla emphasized that their mandate was to control mosquitoes, and other state agencies can help fill in the gaps related to protecting human health and nontarget organisms.

- Discussion About MCD Best Practices

Richard Pollack mentioned that he had heard complaints that MCDs engaged in "spray and pray" operations and wanted Priscilla to help educate him on what drives applications of pesticides. Priscilla noted that there were a variety of measures that drove truck-based spraying. When a resident complains, the complaint gets put on a map

and the MCD evaluates the overall picture to make their decision. Bristol MCD tended not to spray large areas unless there seemed to be a cluster of either resident requests or positive mosquito samples. It was noted that it was important to be on a no spray list if you wished to have your property excluded from spraying. With EEE, the habitat for the mosquitoes that drive the virus cycle was usually far off the road, so the MCD tried to address areas with bridge vectors like cattail marshes and floodwater areas.

Helen Poynton noted that she had looked into the efficacy of vehicle-based spraying. The Reddy 2006 study in MA did not find benefit from spraying but many papers and review articles seem to report mixed results. Helen wanted to clarify whether Priscilla's slides showed efficacy data, since it didn't look like there were decreases in mosquito populations after spraying.

Priscilla clarified that the slides did not exactly show efficacy, and that there was no control area so they could not tell whether what they were seeing was different from what would have happened without spraying. In some cases, they saw decreases at traps after spraying, but the trap data was only a snapshot. The MCD checked traps on a weekly basis, and pyrethroids don't last that long, so there wouldn't necessarily be a big decrease from week to week.

Richard Pollack explained that mosquitoes are coming off the wetlands constantly, and even if there was a reduction immediately after spraying, there would still be new, younger mosquitoes appearing afterwards. Helen and Priscilla discussed how funding for research worked in the MCD's. Priscilla noted that research in Bristol County MCD had been funded through their own budget and on occasion in conjunction with other entities such as Save the Bay. Richard Pollack noted that up until a few years ago, the SRB didn't allow the MCDs to do their own research.

Helen inquired about the budgeting process related to outreach and education. Priscilla noted that the Commission helped the MCDs in budgeting. She pointed out that capturing costs of outreach and education wasn't easy; whereas it was easy to look at the price tag of pesticides. Richard Pollack noted that there are monthly meetings that are open for the public. The superintendent for the Project proposed a budget (that included outreach, equipment, etc.) and after being debated, it gets sent to the state for final certification. Richard Pollack noted that although sometimes education works, he felt that in many cases education was not very successful. For example, he was involved with the 2006 Reddy study that Helen cited as it was performed at Harvard School of Public Health (HSPH).

Kim LeBeau asked about what the staffing of a successful MCD would look like, and how much interaction Bristol County MCD had with private applicators. Priscilla mentioned that some towns pay more, and some pay less to the MCD. At a minimum, the staff needed to have an entomologist to conduct surveillance. Bristol County MCD had twenty member towns and five applicators. When adulticiding happened, the MCD was in a town once per week for less than three hours of application at a time. Larviciding tended to be more costly and there had to be more people available to do the applications. For safety, the MCD would send people out in pairs for water management.

Priscilla noted that the MCD barely deals with private applicators. Private applicators are required to log how much they use with the state at the end of each year, but they don't have to provide information on where the pesticides were applied or any other information. Taryn LaScola (EEA Staff) submitted in the chat: "Private companies are required to keep records on every application they make. The record includes site, amount used, product, applicator etc. All licensed individuals are required to send in an annual use report to MDAR which is what Priscilla was referring to."

Russell Hopping asked about how high of a priority salt marshes were for controlling potential disease vectors. Priscilla commented that there were two species of salt marsh mosquitoes capable of transmitting EEE. Because of the tides in salt marshes, there can be massive influxes at one time. Bristol County MCD pays more attention when there are cedar swamps and salt marshes in a similar area. Russell posed a question of whether assessing MCDs by

their budget was the right way of gauging how a district was spending its resources on mosquito control. Priscilla agreed that looking at the budget probably wasn't the best way of figuring this out as there are certain things that are easy to track, like water management jobs and the manual work there, but others, like educational outreach are harder. Alisha Bouchard (EEA Staff) mentioned that MCDs receive funding through DOR, essentially via trust accounts for operating expenses and capital investments. Because of this, it was hard to itemize expenditures.

Kim LeBeau asked whether there were opportunities for MCDs to come together to learn from each other. Priscilla provided examples such as the Northeastern Mosquito Control Association annual meeting, site visits by water management districts, and monthly meetings of MCD superintendents. Richard Robinson suggested that the subcommittee start to clarify some of the takeaways from the discussion related to education and current mosquito control funding structures.

Richard Pollack brought up that some of the most relevant mosquitoes for transmission risk cannot currently be adequately controlled by larviciding. He argued that MCDs don't have the desire to apply products just for the sake of doing so. Richard Robinson asked what would happen if we didn't do any adulticiding? Richard Pollack commented that many people have asked this, and no one knows. Some groups have calculated that without certain aerial adulticiding interventions, there could have been "X" number of additional cases or deaths.

Helen Poynton brought up the outbreak of EEE in the 1930s, when modern insecticides were not available. Priscilla Matton mentioned that this year there were record numbers of mosquitoes, but not that much EEE. She mentioned that the distinction between spraying for nuisance mosquitoes and disease-carrying mosquitoes might be relevant. Richard Pollack noted that another task force member, Sam Telford, had noted that virtually every nuisance mosquito can be a potential vector.

Richard Pollack noted that the hypothetical scenario in which there was no MCD spraying could result in increased use of private applicators and individuals taking it upon themselves to buy their own chemicals and use them. He mentioned that the status quo with MCD spraying could be the lesser of two evils. Richard Robinson agreed and noted that the possibility of individuals taking action frightened him. Russell Hopping returned to the idea of education, wondering how to improve messaging and to reach more people. He noted that the Local Engagement subcommittee was probably covering this, but Richard Robinson said that this could also play a role in this subcommittee.

Kim LeBeau suggested building upon successes, noting that it seemed like some MCDs were more experienced than others. She noted that in addition to education, the state could help with consistent messaging. Priscilla Matton noted that in 2019, that was the biggest outbreak year the state had ever seen and there was a lot of messaging that year. The two big questions were (1) how to get people who don't normally care to care, and (2) how to make sure people who don't care are still being protected. For example, some people might assume someone else was dealing with the mosquitoes and not take any personal protective measures. Priscilla acknowledged that DPH pushed the personal protection messaging and said that Bristol County MCD made sure to end every call with a reminder for that as well.

- Presentation on Certified Organic Farms – Richard Robinson

Richard Robinson noted that because of the success of the organic movement, organic farming started developing a bigger market share. The word "organic" was used to attract consumers. Not all farmers liked this, and the federal government eventually stepped in. Being labeled "organic" meant adhering to a strict set of definitions, but that still left out quite a lot of farms. There are a number of thriving small farms that use organic practices but on land that the farmers don't own (and therefore cannot get certified). Some farmers also do not want to pay the certification fees. Richard Robinson noted it costs around \$800/year to stay certified, but he gets reimbursed for part of this by the state. Some farms don't like how the certification feels like a marketing ploy.

In Richard Robinson's personal experience, he heard about spraying and was alarmed. After making some calls, he did see that the plane clearly avoided his farm. Richard Robinson also noted that he has seen pollinators on his farm even though he doesn't manage them himself and was worried about spray effects on them and the ecosystem at large. If a farmer's crops are sprayed, that meant that they cannot sell that year's crops as organic. Richard Robinson hoped that the subcommittees charge could be to consider all those who consider themselves organic farmers, not just certified ones. He wondered why the task force would not consider excluding all farms. He also noted that many organic farms are in central Massachusetts, away from most of the mosquito activity.

- Discussion About Organic Farming

Richard Robinson asked how people felt about the question of protecting certified vs. non-certified organic farmers. Priscilla Matton noted that the pesticides Bristol County MCD uses for adulticiding have been tested on crops as part of the EPA registration process and wondered whether that meant that non-organic farms aren't as much of a concern. Given that getting exclusion requests for certified organic farmers was already a burdensome process and setting up aerial spraying was also extremely difficult, adding more farms to the list created even more of a challenge. Priscilla Matton also asked whether all farmers would be willing to provide their exact locations to the government to be properly excluded from spraying.

Richard Robinson felt that it was the farmer's responsibility to make sure their farm was protected by supplying the necessary information. He acknowledged that there was probably a way to make the opt-out process more efficient, perhaps through renewals. He wondered whether small farms could even be meaningfully excluded from spraying. He agreed that there was some rationale for using the certified vs. non-certified delineation; the certified organic label carries financial implications. Whether it's fair or not, it was a market reality that organic farmers can sell produce for more than someone who was not certified.

Helen Poynton asked about whether there was any verification for produce marketed as organic. Richard Robinson explained that although no one in practice checked, someone could check and if fraud were discovered they could go out of business. He also said that he didn't feel like any certifying agencies would go out of their way to inspect in direct response to aerial spraying. Helen Poynton noted that the residues from aerial spraying were likely too small to effectively measure in most cases. Richard Robinson clarified that as a certified organic farmer, if he was sprayed, he could not sell his produce as organic for the upcoming year.

- Next Steps

Richard Pollack asked whether a request could be made for Dr. Catherine Brown of DPH to give a short overview of their summary of efficacy in terms of reducing abundance and viral risk. The subcommittee agreed they would like to hear Dr. Brown and allotted 10-15 minutes at the next meeting. Alisha Bouchard mentioned that Caroline Higley was collecting questions for DPH to avoid duplication and Dr. Brown's input might come at the next subcommittee meeting or full task force meeting. Seeing no other questions or comments, Richard Robinson entertained a motion to adjourn from Richard Pollack, seconded from Priscilla Matton. All in favor said aye. The meeting was adjourned at 2:00 pm.

MCTF Best Practices Subcommittee Meeting Minutes 11 08 21

Minutes for the Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century (MCTF) Task Force Meeting

Subcommittee Meeting: Best Practices

November 8, 2021, 12:00 p.m. via Zoom

Meeting Topics:

- Open Meeting, Roll Call, Welcome, and Meeting Purpose (chair)
- Review the agenda (facilitator)
- Subcommittee discussion on selected topic (background)
 - What are the effects of mosquito control practices on arboviral-borne diseases, non-target species, and human health?
 - Share background/expertise on the topic (Richard Pollack)
 - Share background/expertise on the topic (Heidi Ricci)
- Subcommittee discussion on the effects of mosquito control practices (group discussion)
- Review information sources proposed for sharing with the Subcommittee
- Wrap Up (facilitator and chair)
- Closing Remarks and Vote to Adjourn (chair)

The subcommittee meeting was called to order at 12:03 p.m. by Chair Richard Robinson. Members in attendance included Anita Deeley, Russell Hopping, Kim LeBeau, Priscilla Matton, Richard Pollack, Heidi Ricci, and Kathy Baskin. EEA staff lead Jennifer Forman Orth provided a housekeeping update. Cheryl Keenan, ERG Facilitator, noted at 12:30 p.m. the subcommittee meeting would be paused, and it would be opened as a full task force meeting to allow for a DPH presentation.

- What are the effects of mosquito control practices on arboviral-borne diseases, non-target species, and human health? (Richard Pollack)

Richard Pollack recommended reviewing the ERG report, section 4, as well as the 2021 AMCA report which discussed nuisance and vector control as well as nontarget considerations. Jenn Forman Orth posted the link to the manual in the chat:

https://cdn.ymaws.com/www.mosquito.org/resource/resmgr/docs/publications/hr_november_2021_amca_bmp_ma.pdf

Richard Pollack opened his presentation with a comment regarding larvicide and adulticide products meant to kill or prevent the development of mosquitos. Richard Pollack asked what have we learned? The effects tend to be transient. Mosquito population recover, that was expected and that that was an ok thing. Spraying can have direct effects. Indirect effects can impact prey, predators, or parasites. What about predators? There was no specific predator of mosquitos. Richard Pollack noted that non-target effects can occur directly (via toxicity and growth inhibition) and indirectly (via affecting the abundance of prey and predators). However, many diverse parasites are reliant upon mosquitoes. For example, vector-borne pathogens that carry EEE, WNV, and mosquito-specific infections.

Richard Pollack commented that as far as he was aware no non-target organism had been completely eradicated or suffered a sustained population decline as a result of mosquito larviciding/adulticiding, especially when larviciding/adulticiding was conducted in the way that MA does it. Richard Pollack also noted that these pesticides are not persistent. Example, BTI's and crystal toxins dissolve in alkaline conditions. Vertebrates should not be affected by these products if they are applied correctly. Richard Pollack noted that it would be good to see objective data on whether larger insects are affected. Richard Pollack provided some final food for thought. Just because a substance can kill does not mean it was going to do that in the same manner in the field. Substances might affect non-target organisms in the lab, but lab results do not equal field results. Peer-reviewed studies on larvicides and adulticides seemed to indicate that effects on both target and non-target organisms are transient and populations tended to rebound.

- What are the effects of mosquito control practices on arboviral-borne diseases, non-target species, and human health? (Heidi Ricci)

Heidi Ricci emphasized that lack of data did not mean there weren't any impacts. She agreed that conducting field studies was difficult but noted that many chemicals used in mosquito control are known to be extremely toxic to many organisms. Heidi Ricci commented that when we spray broad-spectrum pesticides, there will inevitably be other effects. Heidi Ricci also noted that honeybees aren't the only relevant bees; there are hundreds of native species of bees as well. Heidi Ricci shared the EPA/CDC joint statement on mosquito control: "The underlying philosophy was that the greatest impact of control will occur when mosquito populations are concentrated, immobile, and accessible. The emphasis was on habitat management and controlling the immature stages". The statement also mentions using Fish & Game and other natural resource specialists.

Heidi Ricci commented that she was hoping to have a lot of conversation about source reduction and other ecologically based methods for managing mosquito populations. For example, upgrading culverts and using eels. Heidi Ricci hoped that the subcommittee could come up with ideas for quantifiable steps for actions moving forward. Heidi Ricci also noted human health impacts and circulated a document by the Utah Physicians for a Healthy Environment and was working on getting some medical experts to provide additional input.

A motion was made to transition to the full task force meeting for the DPH presentation. A motion was made by Kathy Baskin and seconded by Richard Pollack. All subcommittee members voted aye. Cheryl turned the meeting over to Caroline Higley (EEA Staff Lead) for the full task force meeting.

Upon return at approximately 1:19 p.m. from the Full Task Force meeting, Richard Robinson conducted roll call. Subcommittee members in attendance included Anita Deeley, Russell Hopping, Kim LeBeau, Priscilla Matton, Richard Pollack, Heidi Ricci, and Kathy Baskin.

Upon return, the subcommittee group discussed aspects of IPM. Heidi Ricci expressed interest in thinking about other aspects of IPM such as, managing development in the context of stormwater and catch basins. In addition to introducing mosquito predators like eels to breeding grounds to do more source management, as well as education. Many of the source management strategies could have co-benefits. Richard Pollack responded that the goal of mosquito control was not to eradicate mosquitoes, but rather to reduce the amplitude of the peak risk. Richard Pollack mentioned that his opinions on nontarget effects were based on forty years of his experience conducting studies himself and reading the literature. Members of the subcommittee discussed the available research and literature in relation to balancing different factors of risk to non-target organisms and human health impacts. Richard Robinson proposed a hypothetical to the group: What if we said no more adulticiding? What might happen?

Priscilla Matton noted that her county gets between 10,000-15,000 spray requests in three months and assumed that many of those submitting requests would potentially pay for private mosquito control. Richard Robinson agreed that this was likely to happen and was a scary outcome letting homeowners or private applicators spray in less regulated ways. Priscilla Matton wondered whether getting rid of ground-based adulticiding, which might mean more aerial spraying and more private spraying, was an acceptable outcome.

Heidi Ricci emphasized that the MA efficacy data seemed to demonstrate inconclusive results in recent years. Priscilla Matton clarified that some of the sprays in 2019 didn't have available efficacy data for Central MA. She noted that she personally had some issues with how DPH does efficacy calculations, mostly because DPH oversees data from such a large area. Priscilla Matton also felt like she'd seen a decrease in opt-outs in her county. Richard Pollack said from his perspective as Norfolk County MCD Commissioner, was that residents of member towns supported the MCD's actions. Heidi Ricci mentioned that the Sierra Club provided an analysis of opt-out data which showed a decrease in opt-outs, although the decrease might not be on the same order or magnitude as spray requests.

Heidi Ricci, Priscilla Matton, Richard Robinson, and Richard Pollack debated the relationship between spraying and disease. Richard Pollack noted he felt like there were snippets of evidence regarding aerial spraying and human health, and that reducing the abundance of mosquitoes mathematically reduced risk. He agreed that there was limited data but not absolutely zero data. Heidi Ricci acknowledged that there might be evidence showing that aerial spraying could reduce EEE incidence, but she felt there was not enough data on nontarget impacts.

Richard Pollack cited an expert on honeybees as saying there wasn't strong evidence that bees had suffered, but Heidi Ricci stated that comments had been submitted indicating that there might've been harm. Heidi Ricci noted that bees exposed to pesticides are more vulnerable to other threats like mites and diseases, and that honeybees don't make up the complete picture. Anita Deeley commented that she had personally seen impacts on bees, especially with truck-spraying. It was noted that bees are resilient, but they do encounter many chemicals and it's unclear how these chemicals impact them. Anita Deeley also acknowledged that it would be great if native pollinators could be monitored.

Russell Hopping seconded the idea that while there was data on the effects of pesticides on honeybees, the focus was sometimes shifted away from other species and honeybees aren't a perfect proxy for other pollinators, for example, smaller species that are active at night. Kathy Baskins expressed the need to take a step back and that the focus should be on minimizing impacts rather than endless debate of whether there are impacts. Kathy Baskin thought that the goal should be to minimize both the impacts we know about and the impacts that we don't know about. Richard Pollock wanted to make it clear that he didn't want his comments to be construed as implying that he didn't think there were any nontarget impacts. He agreed that we should refocus on the mandate of what can we do better. Richard Robinson agreed and hoped that the group could start thinking concretely about recommendations.

Heidi Ricci noted best practices should be considered in the context of the entire IPM framework. There should be planning and surveillance to understand what's going on and adulticiding (per the CDC/EPA framework) as a last resort. Heidi Ricci emphasized that public engagement and having options available for communities was important, although there may be challenges using private companies for surveillance, some municipalities would like to have surveillance, education, and source reduction without having to buy into being part of an MCD because they don't want spraying of pesticides, such as, Uxbridge. Priscilla Matton noted what municipalities do

outside of MCDs might not be something that the MCTF can guarantee although she was all for recommendations such as, DPWs not using cattail mixes.

Questions were submitted via the Q&A chat function which were read and addressed by subcommittee members. Cheryl Kennan noted that there was information to share with the group and listed resources that Heidi Ricci identified that may be helpful to the subcommittee group. Cheryl Keenan shared her screen so Heidi Ricci could walk through the presented resources. Cheryl Keenan also referenced the AMCA guidance and noted that this was something the subcommittee might want to kick off the next meeting with. Richard Robinson recommended for the next meeting that the group review the understory questions that people proposed earlier. Seeing no other comments from the group, Richard Robinson entertained a motion to adjourn the meeting from Richard Pollack, seconded from Priscilla Matton. All in favor said aye. The meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

MCTF Best Practices Subcommittee Meeting Minutes 11 22 21

Minutes for the Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century (MCTF) Task Force Meeting

Subcommittee Meeting: Best Practices

November 22, 2021, 12:00 p.m. via Zoom

Meeting Topics:

- Open Meeting, Roll Call, Welcome, and Meeting Purpose (chair)
- Review the agenda and share info from other subcommittees (facilitator)
- Non-target impacts of insecticides on aquatic life (Helen Poynton)
- Brainstorm recommendation outlines suggested by subcommittee members (chair)
- Discuss Next Steps (facilitator)
- Closing Remarks and Vote to Adjourn (chair)

Roll call was conducted by Richard Robinson and a meeting quorum was established. Members in attendance included Russell Hopping, Heidi Ricci, Kim LeBeau, Priscilla Matton, Richard Pollack, Helen Poynton, and Kathy Baskin. Cheryl Keenan reviewed the agenda and referenced the drafting of questions for the MCD's, related to salt marsh management and adulticiding, which was open to all subcommittees.

- Non-target impacts of insecticides on aquatic life (Helen Poynton)

It was noted the research group looked at a number of different things including the impacts of pyrethroids on organisms, aquatic insects, and larvae. A study from last spring showed the shifts in use and toxicity of pesticides, which showed a decrease in toxicity, but an increase in toxicity in aquatic invertebrates. Fish were being impacted and recent work showed some pyrethroids could cause endocrine disruption in fish in low concentrations. It was noted that one thing that was heard was that lab studies were not predicting what was heard in the field. Helen noted that there were a lot of factors that could make lab tests less sensitive than the field.

When both lab studies and field work were taken into consideration it ended up that the lab studies did a good job of predicting field toxicity. Through the discussions it was noted that populations rebounded quickly and that was an important piece of biodiversity. Helen mentioned the National Science Foundation (NSF) considered three different factors in their assessment of biodiversity. Helen commented that she sent summary notes about a month ago regarding the field studies that were done to look at the impacts of mosquito control effects. Two studies were done in CA and one was done in MA.

Helen put together a few studies that were done in MA and layered what was known about pyrethroids. The content slide that Helen presented showed pyrethroids in all areas in red. It was noted that the slide depicted the state before the large spray event in 2019. Helen's group had been looking at resistant *Hyalomma* and it was mentioned that their results would be out in a year or two. Helen noted there was no detection after 48 hours, so it was short lived in the water. Helen talked about the residential use of insecticides and noted that urban areas had seen a huge increase in toxicity levels and the belief was that it was due to residential use of insecticides. Helen noted that some other figures showed resistant *Hyalomma* that were in areas that were not part of spray events and again the belief was this was due to the use of residential insecticides. Helen summarized her presentation by noting that Pyrethroids were already present and they were already capable of adverse effects in MA waterways. Spraying events could lead to toxic concentrations but they seemed to leave the area quickly, probably bonding to sediments. PBO was more water soluble than the pyrethroids and had the potential to synergize with the pyrethroids that were already present. Helen noted that the source of pyrethroids found was not from the MCD's but rather from residential/commercial use.

Helen asked a question of the committee: How can the State reduce the need for spraying or minimize the harm caused by spraying without increasing homeowner/commercial use? Helen commented that based on the number of individuals in Bristol County that requested mosquito spraying on their properties, if it was not the state doing it, then it would be a private mosquito control company doing it, which was less likely to use informed evidence about mosquitos in their spraying. Helen noted that this was a very important thing to consider.

Richard Pollack asked since we were seeing an improvement in analytical capability, should we be considering a threshold amount? Helen responded yes and commented that the map she showed was at a detection level that was high enough to show detection in Hyalella. Richard Pollack commented that the state does not do widespread adulticiding that frequently and it was his understanding that the more frequent you expose your target/non target then the more pressure you added to create a genetic bottleneck. The question was posed: do the MCDs spray enough to cause this issue?

Helen Poynton commented that Richard Pollack made good points and noted that you see this on the day after a spray event and then next day it was back to pre-spray levels. Hyalella were more likely to become resistant because of their habitat. Helen noted that she wished she knew more about pollinators, but it was outside of her area.

Heidi Ricci asked about PBO synergists and the measurements that were taken and about multiple and repeated exposures. Heidi Ricci acknowledged private owner and commercial application concerns with how pesticides were used. Heidi Ricci asked for Helen's thoughts as a scientist on reducing the load and burden of pesticides in the environment. Helen noted that she wished we had more information on truck-based spraying and would define that as a data gap. Heidi Ricci noted that there could be some data on the amount that MCDs spray annually. Richard Pollack responded that some projects do have data and have a GIS system to show when and where pesticides were applied.

Heidi Ricci asked Helen if she could talk about the role of large areas of refugia in the landscape and how populations and genetic issues Helen mentioned were affected. Helen noted it would be a great help for the flying insects that can easily fly around. For aquatic insects and crustaceans that cannot move around as easily it was not as helpful for them in their ecosystem as it was more isolated.

Kathy Baskin asked a clarifying question on the scatter plot Helen presented on the toxicity units versus mortality. Helen provided an overview explanation of the calculation related to toxic unit and how it related to concentration. Kathy noted that it was interesting to see the data. Kathy mentioned that there could be a recommendation for MA DEP follow up monitoring. Kathy discussed how DEP made decisions on where, when, and what to monitor for. DEP would want to know how those concentrations compare to a lethal dose. Kathy also referenced Helen's aerial spraying slide and noted that slide suggested more personal homeowner spraying.

Helen noted that it was not the charge of this committee to review residential use of all types of products. Richard Robinson interjected that it was well within our purview to say we have been charged with talking about application at the state level, but if there was another significant problem which also needs addressing it was well within our scope to recommend other areas of concern. Priscilla Matton thanked Helen for her presentation and commented on the last slide with the map and thought the use of pyrethroids was not driven by homeowner mosquito control, but rather homeowner defense to control ants and grubs. Helen commented that what Priscilla stated may have something to do with it. Priscilla noted that DEP does have representatives on the SRB and does make the decisions that risk was high enough to spray and where and when to spray. Priscilla mentioned that it would be easier using DEP data for where they could preplan. Priscilla mentioned that using the data to focus in on hot spot areas would be beneficial to align everything, to prevent rush at the end.

Heidi Ricci noted that Priscilla's suggestion was good, and Heidi saw a benefit in more advanced planning. Heidi mentioned that she heard about people scrambling to cover hives, move animals, and cover gardens and not having enough notice. Heidi also discussed the 2019 aerial spraying and noted that the DPH data showed that the

last three sprays had no significant reduction in target mosquito vector. Richard Pollack clarified that weather played an important factor. If it was too cold, windy, other factors may conspire to make the efficacy less than desired. Heidi Ricci asked Richard Robinson if she could show the DPH slide so the group could see what she was referencing. Richard Robinson agreed, and Heidi Ricci showed the slide of the aerial sprays to the group and added that it cost \$2.261M. Alisha Bouchard noted that those were September dates that Heidi Ricci was referencing and there were weather and temperature issues that did impact the sprays. Alisha added that as a best practice going forward, we would not be looking at September for those types of spray operations.

- Brainstorm recommendation outlines suggested by subcommittee members

Kim LeBeau identified a problem with communication. There was a need for more clear and active communication to public water systems. Also, there was a need for development of a QC and QA testing program which incorporated testing for all chemicals used for aerial spraying events and MCD applications.

Richard Pollack recommended that each MCD employee an entomologist to identify mosquitos and have access to a wetland biologist to oversee habitat modification efforts. He encouraged MCD's to focus adulticiding applications on neighborhoods based on objective data and aggregation of complaints. Individual property-based applications should be limited to municipal owned sites and in response to or anticipation of a defined threshold of mosquito activity. Also, would recommend and encourage SRB and MCD to formally define and adopt goals, establish thresholds for action, and set realistic expectations for the management of mosquitos and mosquito-borne diseases that considers the risks and benefits of action and inaction.

Heidi Ricci commented regarding IPM and having standards that include monitoring, protocols, thresholds for the various factions, standards for public outreach, and education. Heidi Ricci commented that she would like to see surveillance become available to every community, regardless of if they take part in routine spraying. Heidi recommended adding more standard procedures for protecting vulnerable populations and beneficial non-target organisms, even when spraying was warranted. Heidi commented on organic agriculture, making the opt out process more streamlined, particularly annual renewal and signage, thresholds for action when there was state intervention, and the possibility for allowing landowners to be excluded even if they were not certified organic.

Richard Robinson shared his screen and displayed his documented recommendations

- Recommended that the DPH be principally responsible for statewide education on mosquito management
- MCD's may continue to include education in their activities but would not be required to and would do so in coordination with DPH
- DPH would coordinate with MDAR, Fish and Wildlife, and other entities to present a comprehensive education campaign about source reduction and personal protection as the cornerstone of disease reduction
- In consultation with MCDs consider ways to reduce or restrict the number of individual requests for nuisance control
- Recommended offering the current opt-out option to all commercial farms
- Recommended codifying the current protected status for certified farms in legislation not just in department policy
- Recommended that aerial applications of adulticides be prohibited
- Recommended the declaration of a public health emergency regarding EEE and WNV be based on published, research based, quantifiable criteria established by a board set up to advise the DPH in this regard.
- Recommend to fund MDAR to collate and analyze pesticide application records from private applicators to understand the situation and develop possible recommendations for limiting use
- Consider recommending in part or in whole, the Hinds Bill

Russell Hopping noted the need to make a greater distinction between public health risk and nuisance control. Helen Poynton noted adding procedures to protect aquatic life and to expand the recommendation to test to areas on lakes and streams receiving run off from pesticide application.

Kathy Baskin added coordinating education efforts to ensure that DPH information is distributed to the public to minimize exposure to EEE. Therefore, we could minimize the need to spray in general. Kathy noted that she liked the idea of MCDs doing some of the monitoring after spraying. There were not many other labs in the Commonwealth that do this work. Kathy asked, how do we make sure capacity was there to do the analysis we recommend, because currently capacity was limited. Kathy Baskin added that a private applicator database would fill a huge gap for the importance of what we were dealing with and there must be funding available for MDAR to do that. There must be urgency and prioritization to get this done. Alisha commented that whatever the recommendation was, it would also make sense to provide funding and a deadline to ensure IT can meet the needs and so we can push the project up the priority list. Russell Hopping commented that as a licensed pesticide applicator it would be great to be able to submit this data online.

Priscilla Matton had a few questions related to the rationale of the recommendations that were made. Priscilla asked Kim LeBeau if there was a map that already existed on MA GIS that we could look at, as that would save time to reference GIS data and any application that took place in those areas. Kim responded that DEP would have a listing of all the public water systems and surface water supplies and perhaps it could be integrated together with MCD maps. Priscilla noted a benefit to having that data but asked how that communication would work. Kim noted that would require further discussion.

Richard Robinson noted that any recommendations made would have to have a level of discussion and planning. Our job was to figure out what was best, practical, and politically feasible. Priscilla noted that she was concerned that we were looking at a reactive approach to mosquito control and that DPH has taken more of a proactive approach. Priscilla noted that if disease was progressing there could be a good reason to spray. Priscilla cautioned against less IPM and more reaction.

Heidi Ricci commented that in protecting human health there needs to be more understanding of vulnerable populations. Heidi Ricci noted that there were thousands of people across the state that were at risk and if spraying was conducted where they lived, they would not be able to live there anymore. Richard Pollack noted that he heard what Heidi Ricci said about vulnerable populations but to keep in mind that people bitten by mosquitos were also part of a vulnerable population.

It was noted that the recommendations list would be organized and distributed to the group as soon as possible and that the group was working on all three directives simultaneously and the question was asked if the group should continue down that path. Richard Robinson noted to stay on the same path. Hearing no other comments, Richard Robinson entertained a motion to adjourn the meeting from Richard Pollack, seconded from Priscilla Matton. All in favor said aye. The meeting was adjourned at 1:56 p.m.

MCTF Best Practices Subcommittee Meeting Minutes 12 06 21

Minutes for the Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century (MCTF) Task Force Meeting

Subcommittee Meeting: Best Practices

December 6, 2021, 12:00 p.m. via Zoom

Meeting topics:

- Open Meeting, Roll Call, and Welcome (chair)
- Review the agenda and schedule (facilitator)
- Discuss the list of recommendation ideas from Meeting #5 (chair and facilitator)
- Discuss Next Steps (facilitator)
- Closing Remarks and Adjourn (chair)

The meeting started at 12:02. Richard Robinson conducted roll call and a quorum was established. Subcommittee members in attendance included Richard Pollack, Helen Poynton, Kim LeBeau, Priscilla Matton, Russell Hopping, and Kathy Baskin. Cheryl Keenan shared her screen to show the group the meeting agenda and addressed the content for the session. It is noted that today's session represents the sixth meeting. The full task force meeting will be held on 12/14 and Richard Robinson will be reporting out on progress. Cheryl noted that the next two meetings on 12/20 and 1/3 fall within holiday vacation schedules and to notify Cheryl in advance if members cannot attend to ensure we have a quorum. Richard Robinson entertained a motion to approve the meeting minutes from the first subcommittee meeting on 10/4. Priscilla Matton made a motion which was seconded by Richard Pollack. Roll call was conducted: Richard Robinson (aye), Richard Pollack (aye), Helen Poynton (aye), Kim LeBeau (aye), Priscilla Matton (aye), Russell Hopping (aye), and Kathy Baskin (aye).

Richard Robinson asked what the schedule was for bringing forward approved recommendations to the full task force. Cheryl noted that it was up to the subcommittee on how they wanted to handle moving recommendations to the final draft stage for the full task force. Richard Robinson commented that the group was really at the brainstorming stage and needed to get to the recommendation components. It is noted that the subcommittee group will need to define the elements of background, recommendation, and rationale. Richard Robinson noted that the group will need to be in a position to make full recommendations within the next few meetings as there could be revision and edits that need to be made. Alisha Bouchard noted that legislation put through an extension through the ARPA bill for the task force to 3/31. Alisha also noted that we are still determining when the listening session will be.

Richard Robinson asked committee members if there were questions or thoughts on process at this point. Cheryl noted that if anyone has ideas to bring that up at any time as there are a lot of moving pieces right now. Richard Robinson recommended looking at the whole sheet of documented ideas and recommendations. Cheryl shared the documented content and noted that the content represented the notes she was taking in real-time during the last meeting. Cheryl added in notes in yellow highlighting as an attempt to start grouping things to hone in on. Listed by three directives. Filling in information on what problems that need to be fixed would be helpful. Richard Robinson noted on his comments, he is open to feedback from the group.

Richard Pollack recommended the group go through Cheryl notes line by line to address issues. The group agreed with that approach. The conversation started with the notes about waters systems from Kim LeBeau. Kim noted there was some discussion on how this would roll out. Kim's main point address how the public knows about mosquito control activities. Kim posed the question: was information clearly communicated when there was an aerial based spraying event? Kim noted that she would like to see more active communication regarding aerial based spraying events. Another question posed was: how do we get information out more proactively? Also noted

was the need to know more information about private applicators. Kim also noted that only a having a few days' notice before a spraying event makes it very difficult to alter operations. For example, minimizing demand and shutting down pumps. With more notice, those actions could be deployed.

Richard Robinson echoed that a bit more information could be used to take important actions to protect the water supply. Richard Robinson asked if Kim was also concerned with truck-based spraying. Kim commented that this was information that we don't know much about. Kim noted that she works with DEP to sample before, during, and after a spraying event. Richard Pollack asked to what extent does adulticiding pose a significant risk to the public water system? Richard Pollack noted that he hasn't seen a level of exposure that would have provided a measurable risk. Richard Pollack asked if shutting down pumps addresses the problem. Richard Pollack added that installation of an electronics system to notify water systems when a spraying is going to occur may be beneficial technology. Kim responded that there are minimal sampling events to look at the data long term to determine if there is a larger issue and commented that she thought that more information was needed in assessing efficacy and risk of aerial spraying events.

Russell Hopping noted that he was struggling with why this documentation was under IPM and mentioned that it may be better structured under a different area within the documentation. Russell also noted that there was a piece of this that overlapped with the local engagement subcommittee. Alisha mentioned that one tool for the water suppliers is to utilize the exclusion request platform. Priscilla Matton noted that most water sources do not have an address and it would be more GPS plot location. Priscilla thought that it would be better to use DEP data in MA GIS to isolate what falls within the 300-foot spray zone. Richard Robinson asked Priscilla to expound on that statement. Priscilla noted that isolating public water bodies would be hard but using DEP data may make it more beneficial. Priscilla commented that it would be useful if DEP could make this information available to MCDs to assist in the process. Priscilla provided a similar collaborative example and noted the MCD's have a memorandum of understanding (MOU) with Fisheries and Wildlife and it may be beneficial to have something similar with DEP to know where water sources are.

Richard Robinson asked the group if there was any additional conversation or questions before moving on. Richard Pollack noted that it would be useful to the MCDs to have entomologists and wetland biologists on staff and commented with the larger projects this is already done. Not sure how it is done with the smaller projects. Alisha noted that the Pioneer Valley MCD is a newly established MCD and has one contract employee who is managing the area with limited-service offerings and no adulticiding. Richard Pollack commented that even with surveillance the MCDs need to understand what type of mosquitos they are addressing. It is noted that Berkshire MCD does not have a full-time entomologist, they have a seasonal entomologist. Priscilla commented that Berkshire has a smaller budget when compared to other larger MCDs. Alisha noted that Priscilla's point about budgets was a good one and commented that if the subcommittee knows there is lack of resources and funding then that should be factored in as part of potential future recommendations.

Richard Robinson noted that he would have thought each MCD would know and understand at a species level of what mosquitos they are trying to control. Richard Pollack noted that is the case with the larger project but was unsure with the scale of the smaller projects. Priscilla commented to the group that all the MCDs they were aware of provide the support and standardization of adulticiding and water management and they are doing it with the available data we have. Richard Pollack noted that private applicators are "spray and pray" operations. In contrast, the MCDs are held to a higher standard and they collect good data. How do we better ensure that those MCDs that do not have those resources can get those resources?

Richard Robinson moved to recommendation number three on the draft recommendation list. Richard Pollack noted his recommendation was an attempt to address his perspective that MCDs should avoid adulticiding individual properties. There should be a regional approach, not just spraying to a particular property. Priscilla agreed with aggregating calls in a certain area; however, Priscilla noted there would need to be a larger education plan to ensure people were aware of the spraying. Richard Robinson noted that the recommendations here may

have an impact on MCD spraying activity. They may impact MCD budgets and may have an impact on private spraying as well. Priscilla asked if the group thought excess spraying would be reduced if nuisance requests were aggregated. Richard Pollack noted that spraying individual properties in isolation will appease the owners of the property but may not be the best plan in managing mosquitos in a neighborhood. Helen Poynton noted that she agrees with the idea that individual property spray isn't going to be as effective if you are trying to protect the community from disease outbreak.

Richard Robinson moved to recommendation number 4. Richard Pollack noted that some members of the public and legislators are confused on mosquito management practice and there may be an opportunity for the MCDs and SRB to define goals of the program to educate people. Richard Robinson noted that as a fine idea and would like to see it happen with clear state level explanations and set of ideas. However, education may not get through to people until there is a public health emergency. Richard Pollack agreed and noted that 10-12 years ago he helped write FAQs and answers for the state. The original questions and answers did address some of these issues and questions, but this document does not exist online anymore. Russell commented that this is an example that there is no centralization of policy or set of standards. For Russell, defining the problem will help assist in determining how IPM thresholds are triggered.

Richard Robinson moved to recommendation number 6. The recommendation address specifics on when and why actions are taken. Richard Robinson noted where we have chronic problems, then it may require a second look of what can be done outside of adulticiding, including land management, habitat change, and water management. Priscilla noted that this is what the MCDs do based on what the data is telling them. Russell responded to Priscilla by noting that the need to use adulticiding should then be reduced over time. Priscilla responded that the MCDs do look to control the problem long term, especially through water management. Richard Pollack noted that non-chemical management is the preferred method but commented that adulticiding is a requested service and that we should not just restrict this to areas known to be vectors. It is noted without individual requests there may be an increase in private pesticide application. Helen commented that you don't want to be reactive you want to remain proactive, and noted that this recommendation may lead to a more of a reactive approach. Richard Robinson noted there is a balance, and this exercise is about figuring out where that balance exists.

Richard Robinson moved to recommendation number 7. Richard Robinson noted the idea was that local communities would have more of a benefit to having different types of service offerings. Priscilla noted that the MCD cost includes the whole IPM plan. There could be municipalities that pay the full amount and only opt get surveillance if that is what they wanted. Adulticiding is part of an IPM plan, but a tiered level approach is not the way the program is set up. Alisha commented that if there was a statewide surveillance program that could be recommended as a separate line item in the budget. Richard Robinson asked about the offering of services. Is this beyond consideration for MCD's? Priscilla noted that if we are looking at IPM, then yes it would be outside of that purview. Priscilla commented that water management is expensive and some towns in Bristol County don't take advantage of water management, but they still pay the full cost of being part of the MCD. Richard Robinson asked if there are any other state offerings/programs to towns that have a fee for service structure. Alisha commented that she was not familiar if other state programs were set up in that fashion.

Russell asked if the group thought surveillance is best done through a statewide program, then is there value in thinking about how water management is funded to incentivize corrective action, so that MCDs don't have to do as much adulticiding? Alisha flagged that a capital investment program might be something for the group to think about, related to a recommendation on funding the MCD's. Alisha noted that the state staff may be able to assist with a decision tree of what would be required to implement. Helen commented on the wording within the recommendation. Helen noted that we have holes in our data and if we want to fix it, then surveillance should be a statewide program. The state should conduct statewide surveillance regardless of if the town is participating in an MCD. Richard Robinson agreed with that recommendation.

Richard Robinson moved to recommendation number 8. Richard Robinson commented that he thought the state should take the lead on all forms of education and that the message be consistent across the state. The state could bring its message to the masses. Richard Pollack agreed with Richard Robinson's comments and noted the benefit of a centralized entity to handle education but argued that DPH does not have the right expertise when it comes to mosquito management. Richard Pollack noted that DPH should be at the table, but MDAR should be the centralized authority. Richard Pollack struck DPH and noted the "state" be principally responsible for statewide education on mosquito management. Russell noted if we don't specify a specific state body to handle education it may get punted. Russell noted to be as specific as possible of the state entities involved in the recommendation.

Richard Robinson skipped over recommendation 9 and went to recommendation 10. Richard Robinson noted that he understood his recommendation was controversial, but he hadn't seen anything that suggests the efficacy of aerial application. Richard Pollack responded that there is benefit to aerial application and there is more benefit than risk. Richard Pollack commented that if there are opportunities to reduce the need to rely on aerial intervention and wherever that is possible it should be explored and used. Richard Pollack noted that it is very complex when determining when it is appropriate to spray. Richard Pollack noted that there is a level of complexity such as weather and season and it would be great if we could plug numbers into a spreadsheet to come up with an answer, but that doesn't exist.

Russell commented that until we have standards, and it gets centralized, we will need to deal with these tough issues before making a recommendation. Russell noted that it would be nice to have some measures, and discuss how to determine success within our recommendations. Richard Pollack asked Russell how he was defining success – reduction of transmission, or reduction in pesticides used. Russell commented that it could be a combination of the two. Priscilla commented that there is available information now and good metrics in the state surveillance and response plan that provide thresholds. Priscilla also noted that spraying is a very difficult decision and there are years where MCD's say no to spraying. Richard Robinson noted that the metrics of success would use a metric reduction of pesticides used and reduction of human disease and he doesn't think reduction of pesticides is a secondary consideration. Richard Robinson recommended plane-based spraying be prohibited.

Richard Robinson and moved to recommendation number 11. Russell noted the need to clearly articulate why mosquito control is happening. What are the standards of why it is being done? Richard Pollack commented that nuisance is generally considered to be a public health issue and if there really was a distinction. Russell thought the group could make the recommendation to define what nuisance means. Richard Robinson noted that the group should try to be as specific and broad as possible on how they recommend structuring mosquito control. Alisha followed up on Russell's questions on thresholds for aerial spray, to note the data comes from DPH.

The conversation moved to recommendations about protecting human health. Recommendation number 1 was reviewed, and Kim LeBeau noted a need for a QA/QC testing program that incorporates testing for all chemicals used for aerial spraying events and MCD application. Richard Robinson asked if this was a significant cost item and Kim noted that it could be, there are significant costs involved, but you should affirm that the chemical delivered is meeting the specifications during widespread application. It is noted that there could be overlap here with the policy structure subcommittee. Kim commented that this gets to the QA/QC program to clarify what gets tested and how to determine what you test to ensure the purity of the pesticide that is being applied.

Richard Robinson moved to recommendation number 3 and noted the potentially vast nature of the relative amounts of chemicals are being sprayed privately versus publicly. Richard Robinson suggested spending some time focusing on individual nuisance control and understanding what the private applicators are doing as well. Richard Pollack noted that private applicators will not want to report any of their applications due to confidential business information (CBI). Richard Robinson commented that he found that concerning. Richard Pollack spoke about CBI and the proprietary nature of private applicators. Kim asked if private applicators were giving us data by town. Richard Robinson noted that the answer appears to be unknown. Russell noted that he is a private applicator and information requested is basic, including type of pesticide used and the amount. Alisha noted if this

topic was tabled for the next meeting, that Taryn could speak to it. Richard Robinson commented that if the subcommittee agreed, he would like to have Taryn give more information. There was no objection. Richard Pollack noted that there was also no data related to private citizens that buy pesticides from the hardware store and apply those pesticides.

Richard Robinson noted it would be good to get more information from MDAR and Taryn. Cheryl noted that documented notes would be circulated around to the group. Richard Robinson asked if there were any assignments for subcommittee member, and what does the group want to focus on from here. Russell had mentioned defining the overall goal of the program. Cheryl noted that may be a foundational piece for the group to focus on. Richard Robinson thought it would be valuable to go through the listing of recommendations. Alisha noted that Taryn can be available to speak to the group during the 12/20 subcommittee meeting. Cheryl noted that she would put Taryn on the agenda. Richard Pollack recommended subcommittee members draft a few sentences of what each thought mosquito control should be. Richard Robinson agreed, and Cheryl stated that this recommendation was a good place to start. Seeing no other comments or questions Richard Robinson took a motion to adjourn. Richard Pollack made a motion to adjourn, seconded by Helen Poynton. All in favor said aye. The meeting was adjourned at 1:58 p.m.

MCTF Best Practices Subcommittee Meeting Minutes 12 20 21

Minutes for the Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century (MCTF) Task Force Meeting

Subcommittee Meeting: Best Practices

December 20, 2021, 12:00 p.m. via Zoom

Meeting Topics:

- Open Meeting, Roll Call, and Welcome (chair)
- Review the agenda and process check-in (facilitator)
- Review the homework: goals drafted by the Subcommittee (facilitator)
- Draft recommendations for the IPM Directive
- Discuss Next Steps (facilitator)
- Closing Remarks and Adjourn

Roll call was conducted at 12:01 pm and a quorum was established. Subcommittee members in attendance included Richard Robinson (chair), Russell Hopping, Richard Pollack, Helen Poynton, Priscilla Matton, Kim LeBeau, and Heidi Ricci. Cheryl Keenan reviewed the agenda and proposed moving the 1/3 meeting to 1/5. In addition, the group was reminded that the second meeting in January was scheduled for 1/19 due to the MLK Day holiday. The change was agreed upon by all subcommittee members in attendance.

Follow up Items

Cheryl Keenan expressed the need to get recommendations drafted due to the 3/31 task force deadline. Cheryl mentioned that ERG could assist in developing straw recommendations based on subcommittee discussions. An alternate recommended approach would be to ask for volunteers to draft text to move recommendations forward. Richard Robinson commented that he was comfortable with either approach.

The next follow up item related to Heidi Ricci's comments on low dose pesticide information. Heidi Ricci located a 2021 article related to human health concerns, which was provided to the group in the chat. Heidi provided an overview of the articles content. Cheryl noted that the subcommittee meeting was focused on IPM and that there have been a lot of ideas generated that the subcommittee needed to start working through.

Review the homework: goals drafted by the Subcommittee

Cheryl mentioned that setting the goals of mosquito control was up to the full task force, and it would not be decided by the subcommittee. Everyone's ideas could be documented and sent along to the full task force for consideration. Three documented goal recommendations were drafted and sent to Cheryl prior to the meeting. Cheryl shared the documentation that was drafted by Priscilla Matton, Helen Poynton, and Richard Pollack. The draft goal statements covered topics related to mosquito control using the best techniques in IPM to address a particular problem. Creating a balanced approach to protect human health, the environment, and mental health through education and awareness of mosquito control practices. In addition, there was examination of 60 to 70 domestic and international mosquito control mission statements which generated a goal recommendation to provide more benefit than risk to people and the environment.

Other Comments or Additions

Heidi commented that the goal of a mosquito control program should be to protect the public from mosquito borne disease in the most environmental way possible, as a true IPM program would focus on source reduction and land management. It was noted that there should be more focus on helping municipalities on best practices for land development, so they do not create mosquito habitat. Heidi clarified that she was not saying to not use pesticides but needed something more rigorous to trigger action for pesticides and efficacy of pesticide use.

Richard Robinson added that mosquito control by the state falls on a broader goal of fostering public health and that the best mosquito control program may be education because other actions have risks that are larger than the

benefit that it can provide. Kathy Baskin and Russell Hopping agreed with the draft goal recommendations that were presented. Kathy noted minimizing impacts to the economy, environment, and public health were important, in addition to keeping the public engaged and part of the process. Kathy would also incorporate research projects to help minimize mosquito breeding and increase efficacy of treatment applications that are applied.

Richard Pollack added that he agreed with the research commentary. Richard mentioned that any mosquito that was attracted to a person and bothers or bites the person was a public health problem. It was a quality-of-life issue which was a public health issue. All mosquitos that annoy people are deleterious and have the capacity of causing harm. The vast majority of people that call for mosquito control are calling for assistance because they are being bothered by mosquitos in addition to protecting people against acquiring an infection. Russell and Heidi discussed the need of the overall goal to look at modernizing mosquito control through technology, science, better wetland management, and through personal protective measures. It was noted that there was a lot that people could do to avoid mosquito bites without having to use pesticides.

Priscilla Matton commented on what the state does versus what the MCDs do. Priscilla clarified that MCD funding comes from cities and towns and discussed current service and funding components. Richard Robinson asked Priscilla about the implication for making mosquito control state-managed. Priscilla commented on the DOR formula and the need to figure out a different funding mechanism if mosquito control moved to a state-based program. Alisha Bouchard noted that it would be a line item in the state budget and that it could be set up like DOT with regional offices across the state. Heidi Ricci recommended a hybrid model of statewide education and surveillance and communities handling other aspects of mosquito management and opting into MCDs if they wanted additional services.

Draft recommendations for the IPM Directive

Richard Robinson noted the need to find where the subcommittee agreed and disagreed and to move these recommendations out of discussion and into the court of the committee. Russell commented that he was not ready to say yay or nay and he recommended fleshing it out into more specific recommendation to try to figure out and drill down to what the subcommittee was trying to address. Heidi Ricci agreed with Russell that more framework was needed.

The first recommendation displayed was on surveillance. Heidi noted that the DPH arbovirus surveillance plan had never been subjected to public input or public comment. Also, because of the current structure it was only advisory and there was nothing statutory of what the MCDs are doing on a day-to-day basis that ties them to the plan. Heidi discussed the need for surveillance at a local level as it may provide a different perspective than state level surveillance. Priscilla thought this would be a good recommendation but based on Heidi's comments it may still need some work. Priscilla mentioned that if surveillance became a statewide program with DPH, that it should not come at the expense of the MCDs paying DPH more money for testing and sampling. Heidi noted that she could support a statewide program of testing through DPH but with flexibility for the municipalities. Russell agreed with a state funded surveillance program, and as part of IPM, towns could start with doing an assessment on their town to address source reduction first.

Richard Robinson noted that towns may benefit from the services an MCD can offer, even if a town was not a member of an MCD. For example, receiving the benefit of surveillance and source reduction. Priscilla and Alisha discussed if surveillance was being done by DPH in every town or just non MCD member towns. Alisha was going to follow up on this topic. Richard Pollack added that historically DPH maintained a few dozen traps in certain sites and noted a benefit of looking at surveillance based on regional ecology and need. Richard Robinson noted his opinion that this was a statewide concern and that it be applied equitably.

Priscilla noted that if statewide surveillance was done it would only be adult surveillance and, in some cases, there may be an issue based on what we want for surveillance. For example, timing and mosquito species. Richard Robinson didn't think that we could be as granular as everyone preferred, but was comfortable noting that the state should conduct statewide surveillance to make the point that this was a responsibility that belongs above MCDs to protect public health. Russell added that the primary focus of surveillance should be on the mosquito

species that was most problematic to public health. As a follow up, Alisha confirmed with DPH that surveillance was done in communities with a focus on EEE, habitat, and evidence of previous activity.

Cheryl noted the next recommendation or series of recommendations focused on variability in IPM implementation across the state. Priscilla preferred to change the language and noted MCDs are responsive and are always using objective criteria. MCDs may not respond without additional data, such as other requests nearby, data from surveillance, habitat, temperature. Priscilla commented that there was a balance. Richard Pollack agreed with everything that Priscilla said and noted that it was an incorrect notion that MCDs just spray when requested. Richard noted that there was a lot that went into the decision-making process. Richard Pollack suggested that we want to have variability and that MCDs should be able to decide what is the right tool to use. There are highly trained people in the MCDs and drawing together their experiences and data to make decisions would be a benefit.

Subcommittee members discussed the need for a framework for MCDs. There were conversations related to the rewording of the recommendation and Richard Robinson noted that he would be happy to recraft the wording on the recommendation. Priscilla mentioned the Generic Environmental Impact Report (GEIR). Many of the parts of IPM may be clearly defined there. Subcommittee members discussed what might help the public feel more comfortable about MCDs taking a unified approach on IPM. Richard Pollack mentioned with a change in the Legislation there may be an opportunity to define what IPM is. Jessica noted that there was currently a definition of IPM in Chapter 132B and provided the link via chat.

Helen Poynton mentioned a guidebook on best practices versus a framework. Russell agreed with Helen's commentary and noted that this may be the starting point. Having a plan for what IPM means for mosquito control, such as a guidebook, could go a long way to articulate to the public what mosquito management entails and what the MCDs do. Jessica cautioned against creating a conflicting definition of IPM since one already existed under Chapter 132B. Priscilla commented that she thought the GEIR allowed for public comment and people could make suggestions to the document. This may address some concerns related to public input into the process. Jessica noted that there are laws on the books that may addresses some of this and often this can be a combination of best practices and legal requirements. Russell noted that the group may want to address the concern of variability in IPM by making the recommendation of updating the language in the GEIR.

Discuss Next Steps

Cheryl asked subcommittee members if there was anything people wanted to volunteer for or have ERG do to assist in moving progress forward. Priscilla agreed to work with ERG on the GEIR. Cheryl asked subcommittee members what they felt would be most helpful to move recommendations forwards. Priscilla noted that she could look at the GEIR to determine if it addressed the questions/goals and complies with the multitude of legislative and regulatory definitions. All subcommittee members in attendance agreed with that approach. Richard Robinson asked ERG to take the surveillance discussion and work it into a straw recommendation as something that the group could review and vote on in the next meeting.

Closing Remarks and Adjourn

Seeing no other questions or comments from the group Richard Robinson took a motion to adjourn from Priscilla Matton, seconded by Kim LeBeau. All in favor said aye. The meeting was adjourned at 1:57 p.m.

MCTF Best Practices Subcommittee Meeting Minutes 01 05 22

Minutes for the Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century (MCTF) Task Force Meeting

Subcommittee Meeting: Best Practices

January 05, 2022, 12:00 p.m. via Zoom

Meeting Topics:

- Open Meeting, Roll Call, and Welcome
- Goals discussed at the last meeting – share one additional submission
- Review schedule
- Consider the remaining recommendation outlines
- Review the three draft recommendations sent with the Agenda
- Closing Remarks and Adjourn

Open Meeting, Roll Call, Welcome:

The subcommittee meeting was called to order at 12:03 p.m. Roll call was conducted by Richard Robinson. The following subcommittee members were in attendance: Kathy Baskin, Russell Hopping, Priscilla Matton, Richard Pollack, Helen Poynton, and Heidi Ricci. Cheryl Keenan provided an overview of the agenda, logistical items, and discussed the recommendation outlines that would be discussed during the subcommittee meeting to determine if there was consensus amongst the group to move recommendations forward to the task force. It was noted that whatever recommendations moved forward would be made available for public comment. Heidi Ricci had a question regarding the draft goal statements. Cheryl Keenan noted that draft goal statements would be shared with the subcommittee and would be going to the task force for consideration.

Goals Discussed at the last meeting – share one additional submission:

Richard Robinson noted his points focused on the larger goal of promoting health, the environment, and ensuring that citizens were free of harm from chemicals. Richard Robinson added that it was quite possible to reduce arbovirus risk through research, monitoring, education, and personal protection.

Heidi Ricci agreed with Richard Robinson's sentiments and discussed her goal and recommendation on mosquito management in relation to a proposed framework of what we know and what we don't know. Heidi noted that the focus was on public education with an emphasis on source reduction and eliminating the creation of new mosquito habitat through stormwater management in addition to using surveillance of where mosquitos are occurring and where are they coming from. Heidi Ricci acknowledged that mosquitos that breed in cattail marshes and crypts are problematic but did not think broad landscape spraying was doing anything to reduce risk. Heidi Ricci mentioned that the best the subcommittee could do was to establish a framework based on the best available science and that some aspects may not be addressed due to time and resource constraints.

Review schedule:

There was discussion about adding an additional subcommittee meeting. The group discussed available dates and Richard Robinson suggested creating a doodle poll to determine a meeting date and time. Kathy Baskin recommended adding time on to existing meetings as a potential accommodation. Some subcommittee members discussed the importance of determining the listening session day and time. Alisha Bouchard noted that an e-mail was sent to the subcommittee soliciting feedback on listening session dates from 2/9 through 2/11.

Consider the remaining recommendation outlines:

The draft recommendation listing that was shared with the subcommittee fell under **Directive VI: Developing procedures to protect human and ecological health and minimize non-target impacts of mosquito pesticides, including, but not limited to, effects on persons with respiratory or immune illnesses, drinking water supplies, pollinators, and aquatic life.**

Richard Robinson suggested discussing Directive IV, the protection of organic agriculture, first. Richard Robinson provided an overview of these draft recommendations and mentioned that some of what was drafted could be handled under the purview of the local engagement subcommittee. Richard Robinson discussed the landowner verbiage within the grouping of recommendations and Heidi Ricci clarified the intention of the recommendation related to non-commercial farming, for example, community gardens and noted that for routine items, they are covered by the local landowner opt out. However, for state response it would not be covered if the opt out was overridden. Heidi noted that the question came down to if we should be doing aerial spraying and that it did not need to be addressed here but wanted it flagged in the bigger picture framework in the new planning process for clearer thresholds for how decisions are made.

Russell Hopping asked a question related to the certification process for organic farms and Richard Robinson provided a response based on the information he was aware of. Alisha Bouchard and Jennifer Forman-Orth provided an overview of the organic farm mapping process for spraying exclusions. Heidi Ricci mentioned that that Mass Audubon has a major farming operation that is not certified organic but uses certified organic farming practices and she hoped that this could be looked at as well. Jessica Burgess added to what Jennifer Forman-Orth discussed regarding certified organic farms and noted that there was currently no definition in MA for commercial farming and mentioned as an agency we do not determine what commercial farming means.

Richard Robinson noted Jessica's point about what is a commercial farm and discussed the additional questions related to organic farming. Heidi Ricci noted that Mass Audubon and the Trustees may not fit under the commercial farming designation due to their nonprofit status. Priscilla Matton commented that she did not get a lot of requests for farm exclusions in Bristol County and her 120 requests are residents and not farms. Richard Robinson noted that he was talking about a small number of farms that would be interested in exclusions and would like to offer a greater degree of protection for farms that are not certified but are concerned. Additional discussion by subcommittee members related to a lack of awareness as a contributing factor to the number of opt-out requests.

The group recapped the review of the outline recommendation language to determine what would move forward to the task force for consideration. It was determined by the group that the first recommendation would not move forward. The second recommendation would move forward but with added notes and discussion. Priscilla Matton recommended to not move the second outline recommendation forward since it could result in less efficacy and the difficulty of determining how it is defined. Richard Pollack suggested caution on how we are defining things and on the restriction of pollinator habitat as it would make it difficult to apply pesticide anywhere in the state.

Heidi Ricci suggested a way to move the outline recommendation forward was by stating that there was not consensus on how to move it forward. Kathy Baskin asked if there was any information on aerial spraying of cranberry bogs. Jessica Burgess added that there were studies and sampling done years ago and believed that the post spray sampling did not indicate any issues related to the products that were used over cranberry bogs. Jennifer Forman-Orth added the sampling protocol and results were included in the ERG report as well. Kathy Baskin noted her concern regarding the complete exemption of lands that may be breeding grounds for mosquitos.

Cheryl Keenan asked for a show of hands from the subcommittee members for consideration of moving the outline recommendation forward, Kathy Baskin, Richard Robinson, Heidi Ricci, Helen Poynton, and Russell Hopping raised their hand in approval of moving the recommendation forward. Kathy Baskin and Russell Hopping asked how this would be presented and if there would be tiers of recommendation based on what was still under discussion. It was noted that there were multiple categories, and more discussion was still needed.

Richard Robinson recommended that the first three recommendations related to water supply drafted by Kim LeBeau under Directive VI be moved forward to the task force for consideration. Kathy Baskin added that the second recommendation would be difficult to implement due to lab capacity in the state and recommended having targeted chemicals to bring this in line with something that could be implemented. Richard Pollack agreed with Kathy and noted that it would be practical if there were specific chemicals of concern in formulated products identified. Richard Pollack added that when the aerial adulticiding process takes place products are shipped in from out of state and may be on the ground for a day or so before they are applied. Heidi Ricci noted that this needed to be looked at more broadly but added that it could be narrowed to PFAS and PFOS.

Russell Hopping recommended making water supply areas exempt from spraying and Kathy Baskin noted that they are exempt with a 500-foot buffer. The group discussed waiting for Kim LeBeau for further discussion and to allow for conversation related to the recommendations. Kathy Baskin, Helen Poynton, Priscilla Matton, Russell Hopping, Heidi Ricci, and Richard Robinson agreed to wait for Kim LeBeau. Heidi Ricci also noted that she would like the recommendation language expanded to include other bodies of water as well.

Cheryl Keenan moved to the next recommendation regarding reducing nuisance control requests, which was under the IPM Directive. Kathy Baskin recommended wordsmithing the language in the recommendation. Heidi Ricci agreed and noted that there may be an opportunity for consolidation of the recommendation. The group moved to the next recommendation related to developing an on-line reporting system. Richard Pollack suggested tabling this recommendation until further discussion. Members of the subcommittee discussed this recommendation based on the benefit the Commonwealth would receive and that this was a problem worth funding. Priscilla Matton asked about the subcommittee charge and if there was authority over private applicators. Richard Robinson suggested that it was within the subcommittees purview to make this recommendation to the Legislature.

Heidi Ricci added that there was a need for online reporting and that it would also be a benefit to private applicators as well to digitize information. Russell Hopping agreed that as a private applicator an online system for reporting would be incredibly useful. Helen Poynton also included her agreement as an ecotoxicologist this recommendation would be very important. Richard Robinson, Richard Pollack, Russell Hopping, Priscilla Matton, Helen Poynton, and Kathy Baskin agreed an on-line system was worthwhile to move forward.

Kathy Baskin noted the vulnerable population recommendation was important to move forward with some added language. Subcommittee members discussed in detail and agreed the recommendation could move forward but additional discussion was still required. Kathy Baskin added that it seemed the recommendation was covering two topics and members of the subcommittee agreed with separating the recommendation into two parts. Heidi Ricci noted that she was still waiting for data from DPH on her vulnerable population questions. Richard Robinson recommended deleting one recommendation related to the Hinds Bill.

Review the three draft recommendations sent with the Agenda:

The three draft recommendations that were related to **Directive I: Facilitating the use of integrated pest management** were displayed for subcommittee member comments. Richard Robinson suggested that if there were substantive problems, the group should discuss. Heidi Ricci asked if the subcommittee would be sharing what was worked on regarding goals. Cheryl noted that it is not in the scope of the subcommittee to write up the goal. Heidi Ricci discussed a need to address a broad outline of concepts, such as, education, source reduction, and surveillance related to where mosquitos were coming from not whether they had disease. Heidi Ricci shared her concern regarding what could and couldn't be shared related to draft documentation. Jessica Burgess provided an overview of OML related to what could and could not be provided.

Richard Robinson asked Cheryl Keenan if she was looking for guidance on the three recommendations that ERG drafted. Cheryl asked if there was any general agreement to move these three recommendations forward. Richard Robinson suggested the group do three polls to send forward to the task force. For the first

recommendation, Richard Robinson noted that he was for it and asked if anyone was against it. No one was against it, but Heidi Ricci mentioned that there were comments that she added that she hoped could be included. Russell Hopping noted that he was fine sending any of these forward as long as the group could continue to discuss and work through the content. Subcommittee members discussed the sharing of comments and agreed to move forward the first recommendation.

Richard Robinson read the next recommendation and noted that he was agreeable to sending it forward to the task force for discussion. All subcommittee members agreed with the understanding that draft recommendation content was still open for discussion. Richard Pollack noted he was ok sending all three draft recommendations to the task force with the caveat that they are still under discussion. Priscilla Matton noted that she was concerned with the word control in one of the recommendations and discussed her viewpoint. Helen Poynton mentioned that she was ok with moving all three draft recommendations forward. Heidi Ricci noted that if the last recommendation was just about pesticide, she was not comfortable with it moving forward and mentioned the need to discuss IPM. Richard Robinson read the third draft recommendation and asked the group if they wanted to move it forward. No one on the subcommittee was opposed to moving it forward as long as there was an opportunity for additional discussion and changes.

Closing Remarks and Adjourn:

Cheryl Keenan asked for subcommittee volunteers to wordsmith the three draft recommendations that were reviewed. Heidi Ricci, Priscilla Matton, Richard Robinson volunteered. Jessica Burgess provided an OML overview related to case-by-case review of work conducted by subcommittee members who are taking on the editing of documents that had been discussed at the meeting. Cheryl Keenan also mentioned that ERG could draft it based on the information and comments that had already been provided and distributed to the group. Richard Robinson noted that if there was a risk the work of volunteers would not be seen, then it made sense for ERG to do the editing. In closing the meeting, Russell Hopping's edits of the draft recommendation were shared with the group so they could be taken into consideration. It was noted that ERG would get the revised recommendations, with caveats, to the full task force. Seeing no other comments from the group, Richard Robinson took a motion to adjourn from Richard Pollack. The motion was seconded by Priscilla Matton. All in favor said aye. The meeting was adjourned at 2:14 pm.

MCTF Best Practices Subcommittee Meeting Minutes 01 19 22

Minutes for the Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century (MCTF) Task Force Meeting

Subcommittee Meeting: Best Practices

January 19, 2022, 12:00 p.m. via Zoom

Meeting Topics:

- Open Meeting, Roll Call, and Welcome (chair)
- Review agenda and schedule (facilitator)
- Review the three draft revised recommendations
- Discuss the remaining IPM recommendation outlines
- Closing Remarks and Adjourn (chair)

Open meeting, roll call, and welcome:

Richard Robinson called the meeting to order at 12:02 PM and roll call was conducted. Subcommittee members in attendance included Kim LeBeau, Anita Deeley, Russell Hopping, Richard Pollack, Priscilla Matton, Helen Poynton, Kathy Baskin, and Heidi Ricci. Jennifer Forman-Orth provided a housekeeping update.

Review agenda and schedule:

Cheryl Keenan shared her screen and provided an overview of the meeting agenda and discussed the meeting schedule and the addition of a subcommittee meeting on Tuesday Feb 8th from 9-11 a.m. Heidi Ricci inquired about the listening session on February 10th and when notifications would be distributed to task force members. Heidi Ricci also referenced a legislative briefing for the upcoming week that may be of interest to the task force members.

Review the three draft revised recommendations:

Cheryl Keenan discussed the recommendation on standardizing IPM and the overview of the draft recommendation layout. Cheryl Keenan opened it up to the subcommittee members to get input on the revised version to determine if it was ready to be sent to the task force and made available for the public listening session.

Richard Robinson added that he was happy with the way draft looked. Russell Hopping asked about revision timeline, measurement, and discussed the third bullet that addressed flexibility and surveillance. Cheryl Keenan noted that there were a few different recommendations on revision timeline, and it was open for discussion. Richard Pollack discussed that having guidance on protocols made sense, but hard and fast protocols may not make sense and suggested that the plan be updated on an as needed basis. Richard Pollack added that MDAR and the MCDs implement the response plan as boots on the ground and recommended clarifying each entity's role and addressing any new associated costs.

Priscilla Matton asked if the response plan was replacing the GEIR and clarified that the SRB was a three-person board. Priscilla Matton recommended modifying the draft language to include overseen by the SRB or directed by the SRB versus written by the SRB and discussed flexibility as more than just what the surveillance data was suggesting and referenced an example from the Cape Cod MCD. Priscilla Matton also recommended response plan review every five years, or as needed.

Heidi Ricci mentioned that the Policy Structure subcommittee was discussing reconstituting the SRB and that the framework would address some of these questions. Heidi Ricci added that the recommendation language should include science-based and noted that the problem that was trying to be addressed was the statutory requirements for things that are based in science with public input. Heidi Ricci suggested that the new plan be reviewed or

updated every year or every other year and include public input. Heidi Ricci also mentioned that the MEPA regulations were currently under review and noted that however this was done there should be opportunity for public input and agreed with balancing flexibility with consistency.

Kim LeBeau added her recommended additions to the draft language and noted that she envisioned that DEP would be involved and that was why she was adding that in the plan to ensure data was reviewed after aerial spraying event. Kim LeBeau added that the review for the plan should take place every three years. Priscilla Matton discussed the state review process and timing. Richard Robison noted that there were no critical flaws in the draft language and suggested that the recommendation be moved forward. Cheryl Keenan asked for consensus from the subcommittee members on the changes that were made, and all subcommittee members agreed to move the recommendation forward.

The subcommittee members moved to the state-wide surveillance recommendation. It was noted that there were two versions of the recommendation. One version focused on surveillance being conducted by multiple agencies and the other recommendation focused on a single agency conducting surveillance. Subcommittee members discussed the versions of the recommendation and it was noted that there was a need to distinguish between mosquito trapping and testing and statewide surveillance for disease. Richard Robinson noted that the focus should be on statewide surveillance.

Richard Pollack commented that the group was straying into the policy arena versus best practices and clarified that the MCDs are a state entity and there was a need to be clear on which part of the state we were talking about. Richard Pollack discussed the surveillance that was done by DPH and the MCDs were intertwined programs that were well involved. It was noted that DPH does not have the capacity to do mosquito monitoring throughout the state. Richard Pollack commented on the draft language and he did not see how it improved upon what we have today. Russell Hopping thought the group was discussing a single state entity providing baseline services and he preferred version one and liked the first two sentences in version two of the recommendation. Helen Poynton agreed with Russell Hopping's suggestion and thought it would be more consistent to keep it within one agency.

Cheryl Keenan asked if the recommendation was ready to move forward. Richard Pollack did not think the recommendation was ready the way it was written. Richard Robinson discussed the fundamental question on statewide surveillance and what fit into best practices. Kim LeBeau agreed with Richard Pollack and commented that the MCDs do a lot of work related to sampling and trapping and the term surveillance was being used broadly. Kim LeBeau agreed with enhanced monitoring but noted that it should be done with the operational knowledge and resources that the MCDs have. As a next step, Cheryl Keenan suggested that each person revise and wordsmith the draft language based on the suggestions discussed. Subcommittee members agreed.

The group moved to the last recommendation, limiting ground based adulticiding applications, and discussed the content that was added into the draft recommendation. Heidi Ricci discussed thresholds and efficacy as an important issue for spraying. Russell Hopping added thoughts on language in relation to threshold factors based on surveillance. Richard Robinson and Richard Pollack suggested some wordsmithing changes. Richard Pollack commented on what was the best low impact way to remove a problem and suggested to the group to think carefully, as the intent was to intervene in an efficacious and environmentally appropriate manner.

Russell Hopping commented that he thought the subcommittee was trying to determine with greater clarity when to use adulticide and added that the aggregation of complaints was no longer relevant if surveillance was utilized to determine where disease existed. Russell Hopping discussed thresholds and specific standards and noted if a threshold was reached of disease bearing mosquitos then there should be some type of action. Cheryl Keenan asked the group if the recommendation could move forward or should the language be revised. Heidi Ricci discussed disease bearing mosquitos and the presence of population and suggested that the subcommittee should discuss this in the context of an overall goal and framework. Richard Pollack suggested that this be tabled and noted that the subcommittee had spent hours discussing and had not moved. Richard Pollack commented on the

notion expressed by some members of the subcommittee that nuisance could be separate from vector was a real problem and he was still hearing statements that there was a clear-cut difference. Also, Richard Pollack noted that the aggregation of complaints was correlated to trap data. Cheryl Keenan commented that we can get comments back on the recommendation language but at some point, the group would need to decide to move forward with the potential for a minority opinion.

Richard Robinson noted that he developed more appreciation of the many efforts that keep mosquitos from becoming a larger public health threat and he did not mind tabling this recommendation. Richard Robinson commented that the group was hung on the fundamental difference in values and it may not be worked out in language. Helen Poynton added that her preference would be having this folded into the standardization of IPM and discussed moving forward with two recommendations. Heidi Ricci added that it came down to efficacy and the data was just not there. Cheryl Keenan suggested drafting two separate recommendations with what was the draft recommendation and what was the minority opinion. Richard Robinson volunteered to take on drafting responsibilities.

Discuss the remaining IPM recommendation outlines:

The subcommittee group moved to the recommendation on the prohibition of aerial application of adulticides, and it was clarified that the focus was on aerial adulticiding. Richard Robinson shared his screen with the group and started his presentation by discussing arbovirus disease and effects on humans that are not impacted by arbovirus. Richard Robinson addressed data from the ERG report and noted the ERG report model. Richard Robinson commented that it was one data point, and the model did not support that aerial adulticiding reduced risk. It was noted that health and environmental effects could not be discounted if the subcommittee was trying to promote the health and wellbeing of people. Richard Robinson referenced the impact of the 2019 aerial sprays and used an analogy related to melanoma and personal protection. Richard Robinson closed by recommending personal protection and additional source reduction.

Richard Pollack discussed the interpretation of the referenced data. Richard Pollack noted that he has been looking at this type of data for many decades and he saw very little environmental harm. In terms of efficacy, Richard Pollack noted that it was known that adulticides kill mosquitos, sometimes more than half, and it was disingenuous to say there was no efficacy. Richard Pollack discussed the cost associated with saving lives and was trying to find common ground the subcommittee could agree on.

Heidi Ricci appreciated the sharing of both perspectives and commented on the ERG report stating that EEA had no data on efficacy. Heidi Ricci referenced the 2019 DPH data on three aerial applications and discussed the lack of effectiveness and cost. Heidi Ricci commented on arbovirus disease incidence and referenced EJ communities suffering the most from pesticides and the cost to non-target species. Heidi Ricci noted that there were a lot of human health concerns. Heidi Ricci discussed the EPA process and encouraged the group to use caution related to pesticides as she felt that there was not any evidence that pesticide application was effective, and she had serious concerns on the impacts.

Priscilla Matton added that it was a tool in the toolbox and was not a prescription for every year, situation, and environment, but she could not get behind the word prohibit. Richard Robinson discussed the cost-benefit of lives saved and the environmental costs that may be offset and noted as a reasonable proxy that reducing the number of disease-carrying mosquito would reduce risk. Richard Pollack noted that he has heard comments about vulnerable populations and wanted to see good objective data that aerial spraying had contributed to the frequency of health-related issues.

Closing Remarks and Adjourn:

Cheryl Keenan noted that additional recommendations would be discussed at the next subcommittee meeting. Cheryl Keenan recapped the next steps for the subcommittee group on revised recommendation language and clarified there were more recommendations for review under other directives. Richard Robinson suggested sending out all the recommendations to the subcommittee members. Seeing no other comments, Richard Robinson entertained a motion to adjourn from Priscilla Matton. Seconded by Richard Pollack. All in favor said aye. The meeting was adjourned at 2:00 pm.

MCTF Best Practices Subcommittee Meeting Minutes 01 31 22

Minutes for the Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century (MCTF) Task Force Meeting

Subcommittee Meeting: Best Practices

January 31, 2022, 12:00 p.m. via Zoom

Meeting Topics:

- Open Meeting, Roll Call, and Welcome
- Review agenda and schedule
- Review the draft revised recommendations
- Discuss the recommendation outlines for our second directive
- Closing Remarks and Adjourn

Open Meeting, Roll Call, and Welcome:

Richard Robinson called the meeting to order at 12:01 p.m. and roll call was conducted. Subcommittee members in attendance included Kim LeBeau, Anita Deeley, Russell Hopping, Richard Pollack, Priscilla Matton, Helen Poynton, Kathy Baskin, and Heidi Ricci. Jennifer Forman-Orth provided a housekeeping update.

Review agenda and schedule:

The meeting schedule and an overview of the agenda was provided to the subcommittee group. It was noted that all draft recommendation ideas would need to be sent out in the standard format to ensure the public has access to the full range of ideas the subcommittee was proposing. Any recommendations that the subcommittee determined would not move forward would be removed before the next task force meeting. It was noted that there were some comments about funding posing an issue for some of the recommendation and it was clarified that the need for funding and resources would be noted but it should not be considered a deal breaker for the recommendation. Cheryl Keenan added that there would need to be discussions on the third directive as well.

Review the draft revised recommendations:

IPM developing a new statewide mosquito management plan – Priscilla Matton shared her comments on the recommendation language related to timing and lack of human health data on exposure to a mosquito control pesticide application and was concerned on how to fulfil the requirements. Heidi Ricci agreed that there were currently no mechanisms in place but the goal for recommendation would be to address a framework, would use the best measures available, and would continue to evaluate and improve. Subcommittee members suggested edits, and additions to the draft recommendation language which were updated in real time. Heidi Ricci commented on not being constrained by the systems currently in place and suggested that there could be new sources, pilot programs, and collaborations with universities and non-profit organizations. Kim LeBeau discussed the timeline for updating plan. Richard Robinson commented on the timeline for updating the plan and thought three years was a good compromise to specify what the subcommittee expected. Russell Hopping seconded Richard Robinson's thoughts on the timeline.

Subcommittee members added their thoughts on edits to the recommendation language related to research. Richard Pollack commented that research should be included but should not be prescriptive of what type of research and suggested letting the regulatory body decide what the research should focus on. Heidi Ricci agreed and commented that a broader recommendation that provided flexibility on what type of research would be a good idea. Subcommittee members discussed available funding in the benefit of mosquito control, the environment, wetland restoration, and salt marsh management. It was noted that there were many opportunities

that could be pursued. The subcommittee took a straw poll and there were no objections moving the draft recommendation to the task force.

Ground based spraying – Richard Robinson presented the revised recommendation language topics which included adulticiding, elevated disease risks, aggregation of complaints, and spraying restricted to municipal bodies and municipal sites. Priscilla Matton discussed her concern with hiring someone to process complaints if no action was going to be taken in response to the complaints, and also discussed concern over the messaging conveyed to members within her community that requested spraying. Heidi Ricci noted that complaint data was valuable and could be used for things like identifying mosquito activity and where mosquitos were coming from. Heidi Ricci added that it would be difficult to come to consensus on this and referenced the definition of IPM in state law 132B. Heidi Ricci commented that to her, an IPM program would only use adulticiding when other methods were not going to be effective.

Russell Hopping discussed developing clear and concise thresholds to be included in the mosquito plan and to highlight the issues for whoever would be developing the plan. Kathy Baskin added to the discussion in relation to the aggregation of complaints and how it would be interpreted to establish threshold and defining municipal properties as it may inadvertently leave some property distinctions out. Richard Pollack offered some suggested recommendation language and expressed concern on the aggregation of complaint language and asked if it would apply to private applicators as well. Richard Pollack added that if thresholds were to be established, they should be set up by MCDs with the wishes of the communities that they service.

Richard Robinson clarified the concerns related to the recommendation language and noted he would not want private applicators spraying pesticides to municipal sites. It was noted that the subcommittee differed on this point and some were comfortable with the use of adulticide to property owners and some were not. A straw poll was recommended to determine if any of the language would satisfy the majority of the subcommittee members. Heidi Ricci added that the overall mosquito management plan should apply to private applicators and in terms of reaching consensus, the original recommendation was written broadly and could present options for public review about different options being debated even if there wasn't group consensus. Priscilla Matton noted her frustration related to residential complaints and commented that the recommendation was limiting what towns may want. Priscilla Matton mentioned that there were thresholds in the GEIR and if there were concerns with the thresholds in the GEIR they could be looked at, but it was not fair to impact residents that wanted spraying.

Richard Robinson recommended the subcommittee group conduct a straw poll to determine if points within the recommendation were worth advancing. Russell Hopping and Heidi Ricci discussed a need to be clear on the language of what the group was voting on. Richard Robinson discussed the complaint language related to elevated disease risk. The group moved to take a poll on revised recommendation text. Richard Robinson, Anita Deeley, and Heidi Ricci supported the revised recommendation text. The subcommittee members continued to clarify language related to complaints and elevated disease risk. Richard Pollack noted that that the language seemed to suggest that there would be no spraying for nuisance. Cheryl Keenan discussed the focus of the recommendation language related to subcommittee members wanting a different process or to leave it as the status quo and suggested moving it forward to the task force as something the group was still working on. Kathy Baskin commented on creating a pathway in the process for public input to attempt to get feedback and direction. Heidi Ricci addressed the need to be clear on what the points were that the subcommittee was asking the public to comment on and provide input.

Surveillance – The suggested comments focused on the agency responsible for surveillance with oversight and coordination on statewide efforts. Subcommittee members reviewed the revised recommendation language to determine a consensus. Priscilla Matton noted her concern related to the MCDs as their funding comes from cities and towns and added that pulling from the resources as an existing MCD from towns that were paying for service would be problematic. Jessica Burgess flagged for consideration that there was MCD coverage everywhere other than Nantucket. There was an MCD that covers every other area of the Commonwealth and not every town was a

member of an MCD, but every town had the ability to join an MCD. Subcommittee members agreed to move the revised recommendation language forward.

Online reporting – The revised recommendation language noted a system where private applicators could update their information. A question was raised about where applications were happening. Richard Robinson commented that the goal was to understand what was happening on the private applicator side. It was noted that there was a need to have data on the date and location of a spray event and a question was raised on CBI related to the collection of date and location of spraying events. Heidi Ricci agreed that dates and general location were important to the public and the state. Helen Poynton added that there was a need to include funding in the language since a system would be expensive to develop and implement. Helen Poynton also commented on who would have access to this data, as it would be a benefit to MCDs and would be great for academic researchers as well. Russell Hopping cautioned on asking for too much information on location as it would be a major burden for applicators and suggested keeping it at the town or county level. Kim LeBeau agreed that location information was needed and commented on real time data entry versus the need for annual reporting.

Richard Pollack noted that he did not see the utility in understanding how much pesticide was being used in a town or county and didn't see the MCDs having much value in knowing how much pesticide was being used by private applicators. Cheryl Keenan commented on the specifics of what could go to the task force. Helen Poynton noted that the state of CA collects this type of data and it was extremely helpful in understanding where to go for potential ecological effects. Cheryl Keenan clarified the additional discussion points that would be added into the recommendation language. The subcommittee group agreed to move this recommendation forward to the task force.

The aerial application of adulticides should be prohibited – Helen Poynton discussed the DPH response to the questions that were raised on the aerial application of pesticides and suggested putting forth a recommendation that there should be a potential reimbursement for people that have multiple chemical sensitivities. Helen Poynton also commented on the ecological responses and noted that there was not a lot of data but the data that does exist shows minimal ecological impact and supported getting more data on this matter. Helen Poynton noted she could not support the recommendation since there could be a reliance on private and truck-based spraying, which would be harmful. Also, one of the data gaps was on when there was a need for multiple spraying events. Cheryl Kennan noted that Helen Poynton's comments on aerial spraying could be well addressed in the recommendation related to determining procedures for protecting vulnerable populations and non-target species even when pesticide application is warranted.

Richard Pollack noted that he would not support the prohibition of aerial application and discussed his opinions on the DPH responses that were received. Heidi Ricci commented on the many diseases that were increasing due to chemical exposures and discussed populations that were impacted by chemical sensitivities. Heidi Ricci also pointed out that there was no data showing that aerial spraying reduced disease risk and noted that it could impact people taking personal protection. Heidi Ricci commented that she would not say never again but did think it deserved further attention in some recommendation going forward that the plan have strict parameters for its use. Cheryl Keenan suggested a poll to determine if this should be moved forward for the subcommittee to consider. Heidi Ricci, Richard Robinson, Anita Deeley, Russell Hopping, and Helen Poynton were in favor of keeping this on the list as a potential draft recommendation.

Each MCD should employ an entomologist to identify mosquitos and a wetland biologist to oversee habitat modification efforts & State agencies should be principally responsible for statewide education on mosquito management – Subcommittee members agreed to move forward both recommendations to the task force

Discuss the recommendation outlines for our second directive:

The subcommittee reviewed the recommendation language under the second directive. Helen Poynton commented that she did not think one of the recommendations was adequately represented in the

recommendation under the IPM directive. Cheryl Keenan and Helen Poynton discussed updated language under the IPM directive. Anita Deeley added that MDAR should continue to do monitoring and testing of honeybees after truck based and aerial spraying. Anita Deeley agreed to e-mail recommendation language to Cheryl Keenan to be included under the IPM recommendation.

Closing Remarks and Adjourn:

Cheryl Keenan discussed the organic agriculture directive and recommendations and proposed that ERG go through the comments to consolidate the content so it could go back to Richard Robinson for drafting with subcommittee input. Richard Robinson acknowledged the question that was in the chat related to real time pesticide application tracking and provided a clarification answer. Seeing no other questions or comments from the group, Richard Robinson entertained a motion to adjourn from Richard Pollack. Seconded by Priscilla Matton. All subcommittee members voted aye. The meeting was adjourned at 2:03 p.m.

MCTF Best Practices Subcommittee Meeting Minutes 02 08 22

Minutes for the Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century (MCTF) Task Force Meeting

Subcommittee Meeting: Best Practices

February 08, 2022, 09:00 a.m. via Zoom

Meeting Topics:

- Open Meeting, Roll Call, and Welcome
- Review agenda and schedule
- Establish Goals
- Review the draft revised recommendations
- Closing Remarks and Adjourn

Open Meeting, Roll Call, and Welcome:

Richard Robinson called the meeting to order at 09:01 a.m. and roll call was conducted. Subcommittee members in attendance included Kim LeBeau, Anita Deeley, Russell Hopping, Richard Pollack, Priscilla Matton, Helen Poynton, Kathy Baskin, and Heidi Ricci. Jennifer Forman-Orth provided a housekeeping update.

Review agenda and schedule:

Cheryl Keenan shared the agenda and schedule with the subcommittee group. Subcommittee members took a poll to determine if they were in favor of taking the time to discuss goals. Richard Robinson, Russell Hopping, Richard Pollack, and Helen Poynton acknowledged that they were in favor. Richard Robinson noted that Heidi Ricci should be present for the goal discussion and she had not yet joined the subcommittee meeting. Richard Robinson noted that Heidi Ricci had arrived at the subcommittee meeting. Cheryl Keenan recapped the agenda and goal discussion, and Heidi Ricci agreed that the subcommittee group should discuss goals.

Establish Goals:

Cheryl Keenan shared the policy structure subcommittee goal language that was discussed at the full task force meeting. Richard Robinson commented on clarification on the intent of the goal statement, as he was under the impression it was about establishing goals on mosquito management for the Commonwealth. The point was clarified with subcommittee members, to ensure the group understood.

Ricard Pollack suggested the group look at the policy structure subcommittee goal statement and to potentially shorten it. Russell Hopping discussed the goal statement and encouraged the group to make it more directional to fill gaps. Heidi Ricci agreed with either the short version or the longer version as it captured the essence of what she was interested in seeing. Kim LeBeau emphasized transparency and communication and Helen Poynton commented that she wanted to see social science added back into the draft goal statement language. Richard Pollack added that the word science should encompass social science as well. Heidi Ricci noted the social science was important and could be implicit in the term science and referenced a technical article from Arizona related to people's perception on mosquito problems. Richard Robinson noted that he could do without the phrase "relying on approaches such as IPM" and thought it was important to emphasize communication and education about the entire span of activities related to mosquito control.

Richard Robinson asked for thoughts on eliminating the IPM language within the goal statement. Russell Hopping noted it was a process on how to conduct business and Richard Pollack added that IPM was implicit so could be removed. Heidi Ricci discussed communication as a two-way street and that it was important to have transparency, education, and the opportunity for public officials to hear from the public. Richard Pollack corrected the goal language to include "mosquitoes and mosquito borne disease". Helen Poynton commented on

interventions and Richard Pollack suggested adding in “anti-mosquito interventions” as well. Russell Hopping recommended that the language be rephrased to just mosquito control. Subcommittee members discussed their understandings of next steps on draft goal statement.

Review the draft revised recommendations:

The subcommittee group started their discussions with the recommendations under Directive (iv) – *Developing procedures to protect human and ecological health and minimize non-target impacts of mosquito pesticides, including but not limited to, effects on persons with respiratory or immune system illness, drinking water supplies, pollinators, and aquatic life.* Anita Deeley commented that she wanted to make sure there was still time to discuss the protection of vulnerable populations and non-target species, as she had sent some language on the recommendation topic.

Online reporting for private applicators: Heidi Ricci commented that she was looking for a more systematic approach to capturing all information that was gathered by the MCDs and private applicators and noted that having all these different layers of data would assist MCDs and create a standardized integrated system that could be very beneficial and improve transparency. Heidi Ricci noted that she did support the recommendation even if it was drafted narrowly. Richard Robinson added that the information was very important but was concerned it would be the first to go if it was presented as a larger information management process. Richard Robinson commented that he wanted this to be front and center to understand the universe of private application. Russell Hopping noted he would like to see the recommendation as a standalone and added that the subcommittee would need to be clear what they wanted to see as a result of this recommendation.

Kim LeBeau commented that she was a proponent of including location information so it could be reviewed by state entities and MCDs and pointed out CBI was a consideration as part of the implementation. Heidi Ricci clarified language in the draft recommendation for tracking patterns and amounts and noted that this information was important, and people had the right to know where pesticides were being applied. Richard Pollack discussed the pesticide use of private applicators versus the MCDs and commented that there was no way the private applicators would divulge location information as it was confidential information. It was suggested to look at location information by town and to not stray to pesticide application for things outside of mosquito control.

Anita Deeley mentioned that real time data would be beneficial to beekeepers. Priscilla Matton flagged the word private applicator to ensure the subcommittee was using the correct terminology. Taryn LaScola provided context on the terminology and suggested reference to a commercial pesticide applicator that works in the private sector. Kim LeBeau suggested in the background and rationale section of the recommendation it be noted that this was currently a paper process.

Communication with public water systems: Kim LeBeau provided an overview of the draft recommendation language and noted funding and resources. Richard Pollack noted that MCDs do not target public water systems and added to what extent have these applications posed a risk to the public water systems, what measures could be taken to create greater protection, and was there anything holding back public water stakeholder reaching out to the MCDs to work cooperatively to get information. Priscilla Matton discussed modifying the draft recommendation language to focus on water systems telling MCDs where not to spray. It was added that this would address the point that MCDs don’t have water supply information. Priscilla Matton discussed DEP involvement on the current SRB. Kim LeBeau and Priscilla Matton discussed current mapping availability of public water systems and addressing concerns by making this a GIS based system.

Heidi Ricci commented on information related to surface watersheds and thought it should be part of the overall systematic approach that they be excluded from applications. Heidi Ricci discussed the parallels of utility companies and what they do with the mapping of water supplies and private wells to restrict which chemicals can be used in ground water areas. Richard Robinson commented on water supply personnel telling MCDs where not to spray and asked if that was a good first step. Kim LeBeau discussed the DEP GIS maps and suggested that DEP

could be the conduit to give that mapping to the SRB and MCDs. There was discussion on the 2019 sampling process, and it was noted that the recommendation included more than just the mapping piece. Richard Robinson suggested a reasonable alternative process that included water supply telling MCD's to not spray in a specific area. Kim LeBeau noted that it was unfortunate that the players didn't know each other and suggested that it would be a benefit for MA DEP to facilitate those conversations.

Heidi Ricci suggested that the process be more systematic than water supply telling MCDs not to spray in an area. Heidi Ricci commented on the Anvil product label related to harm that can be caused from application of the product to water bodies and aquatic organisms. Heidi Ricci also mentioned conversations that were presented from medical professionals related to exposure from pesticide. Kim LeBeau added that a risk still existed, which is why there is a 500-foot buffer to water supplies. Richard Pollack commented on the pesticide products that were applied and added that MCDs do not apply these products if there are not mosquitoes present and the same could not be said for private applicators. Priscilla Matton discussed the process for low volume truck-based application with a 300-foot buffer to provide perspective on the application rate and method.

QA/QC testing of chemicals used in mosquito control: Cheryl Keenan mentioned a potential overlap with the pesticide selection subcommittee. Kim LeBeau noted that this went beyond the EPA vetting of pesticide and focused on a systematic approach of a QA/QC of the product from the manufacturer and distributors. Kim LeBeau referenced an issue from 1998 of an incorrect chemical that was delivered and dosed into the water, and noted lessons learned that there needed to be a program that looked at chemicals of concern. Richard Pollack raised the concern that there was usually less than a week between pesticide delivery to aerial application and there would be limited time to do analytical work; however, it was done annually that was a different story. Kim LeBeau noted that there may be a need to review the recommendation together with the pesticide selection subcommittee.

Alisha Bouchard flagged for everyone that water supplies were excluded from aerial application. Heidi Ricci discussed shortcomings in the EPA registration process and referenced PFAS in pesticide containers as an example. Heidi Ricci thought it made sense to have a QA/QC program and referenced a previous aerial application where the plane may have had residue in the tanks that resulted in a large fish kill. Richard Robinson asked about the pesticide purchase process and testing amongst MCDs. Helen Poynton noted she was on the pesticide selection subcommittee and talked through her understanding of the current draft recommendation language and mentioned that the pesticide selection subcommittee was looking at taking a bioassay approach using the ToxCast model. It was noted that the pesticide selection subcommittee recommendation had different purposes but there may be an opportunity to combine. Kim LeBeau asked if she would be able to see the full draft recommendation from pesticide selection subcommittee.

Protect Vulnerable Populations and non-target species: Anita Deeley had drafted some suggestions which were shared with the subcommittee group. Richard Robinson commented that the group has done well discussing topics for environmental protection, but haven't necessarily covered this topic in detail. Richard Pollack commented on the lack of specifics and asked to what extent mosquito control applications had posed measurable risks to people, vulnerable or otherwise. Richard Pollack added that there was a need to understand how much damage had occurred if any. Heidi Ricci noted that there was a need to get independent input from medical professionals and it really came down to trust in the EPA registration process. Heidi Ricci discussed the new mosquito management plan as having an approach that would minimize the risk to people and the environment. Russell Hopping noted the legislative briefing that took place and recommended the subcommittee group review the content that was discussed. Russell Hopping discussed the goal statement and commented that this topic was a gap and should have a clear recommendation to conduct studies to try to answer vulnerable populations and non-target species. Richard Pollack mentioned the legislative briefing and noted the expertise from some of the speakers. Richard Pollack added that it was an error to extrapolate that malaria was similar to what MA was dealing with, because the scenario is not apples to apples.

Anita Deeley provided an overview of her draft recommendation language and noted the suggestion that beekeepers be exempted out of aerial spraying during public health emergencies, similar to certified organic farms. Helen Poynton commented on the testing of pyrethroid pesticides and noted the studies that have determined impacts were not due to mosquito control insecticides but were from other insecticides. It was added that this was based on three studies and there was still a need to fill in the gaps on the ecological effects. Helen Poynton commented on the need to mitigate issues for people that suffer from multiple chemical sensitivities. Heidi Ricci suggested keeping the recommendation separate to ensure a better understanding of issues going forward and referenced testimony from the legislative briefing that was very compelling. Richard Robinson recommended that anyone who wanted to make a proposal on this directive should write it out and send it to Cheryl Keenan so it could be discussed at the next subcommittee meeting. Anita Deeley discussed the potential separation of the recommendation into non-target species and vulnerable populations. Priscilla Matton noted the availability of the opt-out option and discussed vulnerable populations that could be impacted by mosquito borne illnesses.

Closing Remarks and Adjourn:

Cheryl Keenan noted the information that would be compiled and sent out to subcommittee members. Hearing no other questions or comments from the group Richard Robinson entertained a motion to adjourn from Priscilla Matton. Seconded by Heidi Ricci. All in favor voted aye. The meeting was adjourned at 11:02 a.m.

MCTF Best Practices Subcommittee Meeting Minutes 02 14 22

Minutes for the Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century (MCTF) Task Force Meeting

Subcommittee Meeting: Best Practices

February 14, 2022, 09:00 a.m. via Zoom

Meeting Topics:

- Open Meeting, Roll Call, and Welcome
- Review agenda and schedule
- Meeting Minutes Review and Vote – 10/13, 10/25, 11/8/21, 11/22, 12/6, 12/20, 1/5
- Review key points from the public listening session
- Review the draft revised recommendations
- Closing Remarks and Adjourn

Open Meeting, Roll Call, Housekeeping, and Welcome:

Richard Robinson called the meeting to order at 12:05 p.m. and roll call was conducted. Subcommittee members in attendance included Kim LeBeau, Anita Deeley, Russell Hopping, Richard Pollack, Priscilla Matton, Helen Poynton, Kathy Baskin, and Heidi Ricci. Jennifer Forman-Orth provided a housekeeping update. Heidi Ricci noted that she would need to leave the meeting at some point but would return.

Meeting Minutes Review and Vote – 10/13, 10/25, 11/8, 11/22, 12/6, 12/20, 1/5

It was noted that the meeting minutes vote would be delayed until the next subcommittee meeting to allow more time for group members to review.

Review agenda and schedule:

Cheryl Keenan reviewed the agenda and schedule with the subcommittee members and suggested that the group think about what recommendations needed additional discussion and utilize the next subcommittee meeting to make changes. Heidi Ricci noted that she sent an email regarding some of her thoughts from the listening session regarding wetlands management and noted that she felt strongly that topic needed to be elevated to be more prominent. Cheryl Keenan shared Heidi Ricci's suggestions related to wetlands management and organic farms. Heidi Ricci noted she would be happy to draft something on this for consideration related to interagency and partner coordination on this topic. Kathy Baskin and Kim LeBeau discussed source water protection plans and Cheryl Keenan noted that the information that was under discussion would be forwarded to the subcommittee members.

Review key points from the public listening session:

Richard Robinson commented that he thought the listening session was valuable and opened it up to the subcommittee members for comments and discussion. Heidi Ricci asked for clarity from EEA on the listening session comments related to the Cape Cod MCD. Jessica Burgess noted that there was no mandate or specific control related to adulticiding within an MCD and she was not aware of a time where the state would have pressured an MCD or a community to spray. Jessica Burgess added that in her almost ten years working at MDAR and on mosquito control she was not aware of any situation where the state had said to the Cape Cod MCD that they needed to be adulticiding. Jessica Burgess commented that we were taken aback by the characterization and it was not in line with our recollection of how things have worked. It was noted that the SRB was a public body and meetings were public and anyone could go back to the meeting minutes to see what the SRB stated. It was reflected in the Zoom Q&A that Heidi Ricci left the meeting at 12:32 pm and then returned to the meeting at 12:53 p.m.

Review the draft revised recommendations:

Protection of Receptor Areas from Pesticide Run-Off: Kim LeBeau provided an overview of the recommendation language. Richard Robinson pointed out that there were valuable comments that the subcommittee received related to public water systems and private wells. Richard Robinson also added there were comments about protecting the lobster industry and fisheries industry and it would be useful to see that language included in the recommendation. Anita Deeley suggested adding in apiaries to the recommendation language. Richard Pollack suggested the recommendation language identify who was going to do the work and added that the way it was written it seemed to suggest that mosquito spraying buffer zones were inadequate in some way. It was noted that the recommendation was getting broader and murkier and there was a need to be more focused. Kim LeBeau expanded on the ground water source supply recommendation language and agreed that the section needed to be modified a bit more. Kathy Baskin suggested that it would be helpful to hear from Jennifer Pederson on this topic and discussed the PFAS testing that was currently underway. Kathy Baskin noted that exclusion zones had not been set up yet and it would need to be site specific to the hydrology and geology of each of those locations.

Priscilla Matton noted that the recommendation language was too general, and the term pesticide runoff was not being used correctly. Priscilla Matton added that she didn't understand how pesticide run-off would be found. Helen Poynton noted that there was some overlap with recommendation twelve and asked if the group could put this recommendation aside and come back to it after looking at recommendation twelve. Richard Robinson pointed out that this recommendation was a research proposal not a proposal to set up exclusion zones and that this was research to determine if there was a problem. Anita Deeley commented that she preferred to have apiaries listed here and noted research for apiaries didn't seem to exist in any other recommendations. Kathy Baskin suggested that the legislature fund this research and it was noted that the 500-foot buffer language did not have anything to do with the research.

Monitoring and Evaluation After Spraying: Helen Poynton provided an overview of the recommendation language and noted that she did not propose the recommendation but did agree to work on it. Helen Poynton discussed what the surveys would include and noted the language related to the allocation of funding. Helen Poynton added that she was interested in feedback from the subcommittee on conducting seasonal monitoring. Anita Deeley suggested the testing of beehives both before and after aerial and truck-based spraying. Kathy Baskin commented on the need for clarity on the frequency of testing and state agency involvement. Helen Poynton clarified that season represented the season that mosquitos were active, and testing would take place after an aerial spray event. Subcommittee members discussed the timing and process for post aerial spraying events and testing. Kathy Baskin discussed the logistics of what the process would like in real life and noted that DEP does water sampling not sediment sampling, and a contractor would be needed to be nimble enough to do that type of testing. Helen Poynton mentioned that similar testing was done in 2006. Richard Robinson suggested it was ok to make the recommendation and let qualified agencies figure out the best way to implement and do the research. Kathy Baskin discussed the inclusion of parameters within the recommendation to make it more practical.

Priscilla Matton noted that the recommendation language was too open ended and added that there was currently no one at the state that could do this type of work and there was no way to know that an MCD was going to truck spray in one spot for three weeks. Priscilla Matton suggested the recommendation be focused as a research project and that was a switch she could get behind. Richard Pollack suggested that this should be done as a research program and he also noted that in the background and rationale language there was mention of the pre- and post-testing of honeybees. Group members discussed recommendations on other subcommittees that were looking at cooperative research projects. Heidi Ricci commented that it was important to recognize that the label for pesticides were highly toxic to a wide array of organisms and the absence of information did not translate to the absence of impacts. It was added that studying the impacts of spraying was difficult and research conducted by a targeted research institution would be useful, but it would not be practical to mandate it. Anita Deeley commented that seasonal monitoring was needed.

Protected Status of Certified Organic Farms: Richard Robinson provided an overview of the draft recommendation and noted that certified organic farms were protected by policy and the recommendation suggested that certified organic farms be written into law for protection. Richard Robinson commented that if an organic farm were incidentally sprayed, they cannot sell any of their produce as organic for the year. Richard Pollack noted the recommendation would preclude the use of pesticides and discussed the scenario of high transmission risk. Heidi Ricci supported the recommendation and commented that she thought it needed to be broader for small farmers that were growing food organically but don't have the time or money to become certified organic farms.

Russell Hopping added if it would be palatable for this to become law with a tight caveat for exception if it was deemed necessary for public health. Richard Robinson noted that currently certified organic farms were exempted from aerial spraying and that the recommendation proposed that state regulatory agencies do not get an opportunity to decide if farms get sprayed during a public health emergency. Anita Deeley discussed the comments from the public listening session and added that people wanted this protection for more than just certified organic farms, people wanted it to be broader. Helen Poynton suggested language in relation to organic farmers being compensated for losses if spraying needed to occur and Heidi Ricci also discussed the non-financial loss of health of the organic system on people's properties. Jessica Burgess discussed USDA process and noted that the USDA had indicated that if an organic farm was sprayed it would not impact the certified organic status of the farm itself.

Agricultural Opt-Out: Richard Robinson provided an overview of the recommendation language and noted it was originally written about organic production on commercial farms and was written as a series of options with a second part that had to do with bees and beekeepers not being able to become certified. Anita Deeley discussed comments from the public listening session and testimonies about smaller farms less than two acres that did not want to be sprayed with pesticides. Russell Hopping commented on the feasibility of excluding an area from aerial spray. Jennifer Forman-Orth discussed aerial spraying logistics and process and noted that the more time the plane spent in the air not spraying, the higher the cost and the less effective the spray operation would be.

Richard Pollack and Richard Robinson discussed what would be considered a farm. Richard Robinson commented on the adaptation of smaller acreage organic farms and Heidi Ricci noted that was the direction that people were going, with lots of groups growing food in densely populated areas. Anita Deeley asked why this recommendation was only focused on aerial and not truck-based spraying. Richard Robinson discussed the process for opting out of aerial spraying and truck-based spraying. Jessica Burgess commented on the ability to exclude from ground-based application versus aerial application and Priscilla Matton noted the use of the private exclusion as a great option. Priscilla Matton discussed that potential exclusion of all types of farms excluded would result in limited ability to conduct aerial application to reduce risk. Richard Robinson clarified that this was going to apply to a small handful of farms and noted that the process should be that a farm opt-out at the beginning of the season and it be required to renew annually. Jessica Burgess commented on DPH certifying a public health hazard and the exclusion and opt out requests under 333 CMR. It was noted that certified organic farms, aquaculture, and hemp farms continue to keep their exempt status during a public health hazard.

Criteria for Declaring a Public Health Emergency: Richard Robinson noted that he had some reservations about creating a set of research-based quantifiable criteria to inform a decision, but also asked if it was not impossible to create a reliable set of criteria. Jessica Burgess discussed public health hazard when talking about arbovirus and it was normally just for EEE. Jennifer Forman-Orth added that there was not a rule that the public health hazard designation is limited to EEE. Richard Pollack commented that he had sent an article and suggested that it be shared. In addition, Richard Pollack discussed the current process for declaring a public health emergency and noted that it was done by many people amongst many disciplines. It was added that it was not a simple cut and dry process. Heidi Ricci commented that she recognized it was not a simple process but when talking about aerial spraying a greater degree of transparency and accountability was required. Heidi Ricci commented that there were measurable criteria that could be considered, and the analysis should include things like the risks to vulnerable populations, organic lands, and pollinators. Priscilla Matton encouraged the group to review the

Emergency Response Plan on DPHs site before voting and noted the specificity of the response plan. Richard Robinson commented that transparency may be more about transparency into the decision-making process and lessons learned.

Closing Remarks and Adjourn:

Cheryl Keenan discussed the next steps and action items for the group before the next subcommittee meeting on 2/28. Richard Robinson suggested that subcommittee members that did not get to attend the public listening session should take an opportunity to review the comments and information. Hearing no other comments from the group, Richard Robinson entertained a motion to adjourn from Anita Deeley. Seconded by Richard Pollack. All in favor said aye. The meeting was adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

MCTF Best Practices Subcommittee Meeting Minutes 02 28 22

Minutes for the Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century (MCTF) Task Force Meeting

Subcommittee Meeting: Best Practices

February 28, 2022, 12:00 p.m. via Zoom

Meeting Topics:

- Open Meeting, Roll Call, and Welcome
- Vote on Official Meeting Minutes – 10/13, 10/25, 11/8/21, 11/22, 12/6, 12/20, 1/5
- Review Agenda and Schedule - Introduce Wetland Management Recommendation (#17)
- Discuss Selected Recommendations
 - #12 Monitoring and Evaluations After Spraying
 - #13 Research the Impacts of Pesticides on Vulnerable Populations and Non-Target Species
- Call for a Vote on Each Recommendation as Written
- Closing Remarks and Adjourn

Open Meeting, Roll Call, Housekeeping, and Welcome:

Richard Robinson called the meeting to order at 12:01 p.m. and roll call was conducted. Subcommittee members in attendance included Kim LeBeau, Anita Deeley, Russell Hopping, Richard Pollack, Priscilla Matton, Helen Poynton, Kathy Baskin, and Heidi Ricci. Jennifer Forman-Orth provided a housekeeping update.

Vote on Official Meeting Minutes – 10/13, 10/25, 11/8, 11/22, 12/6, 12/20, 1/5:

Richard Robinson entertained a motion to approve the meeting minutes as amended. Richard Pollack made a motion. Seconded by Priscilla Matton. A roll call vote was conducted to approve the amended meeting minutes for the meeting dates of 10/13, 10/25, 11/8, 11/22, 12/6, 12/20, 1/5. Kim LeBeau (abstain from 1/5 aye to all others), Anita Deeley (aye to 11/8 and abstain from all others), Russell Hopping (aye to all), Richard Pollack (aye to all), Priscilla Matton (aye to all), Helen Poynton (aye to all), Kathy Baskin (aye to all), Heidi Ricci (abstain from 10/25 aye to all others), Richard Robinson (aye to all).

Review Agenda and Schedule:

The meeting agenda was presented to the group and the addition of *Recommendation 17, Enhancing and Updating Wetlands Management within IPM*, drafted by Heidi Ricci, was discussed. Heidi Ricci commented that she felt it was important to highlight this as a separate recommendation and discussed background information on source reduction and how it had evolved over time. Heidi Ricci commented on the cooperation with regulatory agencies that she would like to see and wanted this to be recommended as an important part of the new mosquito management plan. Cheryl Keenan discussed the process for voting on this recommendation and noted that it could be circulated and discussed at the full task force meeting. Helen Poynton recommended that the text be shared with the entire subcommittee group since it was shared during the meeting. Heidi Ricci noted the local support for source reduction, salt marsh restoration, water management, the work being done with MCDs, and the regulatory hurdles that were being encountered.

Discuss Selected Recommendations

Recommendation 12, Monitoring and Evaluations After Spraying: Kathy Baskin offered a few minor edits related to the legislature providing funding and ongoing implementation support. Kathy Baskin also suggested removing DEP since they would not be looking at mosquitoes or honeybees. Russell Hopping suggested a wordsmithing change related to the phrase accumulating. Subcommittee members continued discussing wordsmithing language in the recommendation. Anita Deeley suggested adding in chemical testing language for honeybees, beeswax, pollen,

honey, nectar, and bee larvae. Heidi Ricci commented that she was fine with changes and noted that other things can be impacted as well, like fish, and was not sure there was a need to be as comprehensive in the recommendation language. Alisha Bouchard flagged that based on the suggested recommendation changes that funding and personnel resources be included in the language.

Recommendation 13, Research the Impacts of Pesticides on Vulnerable Populations and Non-Target Species: Anita Deeley suggested adding recommendation language focused on research for bees after truck-based spraying. Heidi Ricci discussed directly protecting human and ecological health and was concerned that the subcommittee had missed the mark in terms of what the directive asked the subcommittee to do, given the comments received from Dr. Oliver and the Association of Multiple Chemical Sensitive Individuals. It was added that compensating people was not something that would be possible and at a minimum there should be improved communication prior to spraying events and the establishment of a mechanism to report complaints and concerns. Richard Pollack addressed his concerns that the recommendation was based on highly controversial research and disagreed with the statements that he heard and suggested that they were not widely accepted.

Russell Hopping noted that recommendation twelve and thirteen were a bit redundant and suggested a wording change for the title of recommendation twelve. Subcommittee members discussed additional edits to the recommendation language in relation to what fit into recommendation twelve. Richard Robinson commented on the value of the recommendation and noted that the directive came directly from the legislature. Anita Deeley commented on a proposal to take pollinators out of recommendation thirteen, as long as the language about communication was put somewhere else. Cheryl Keenan proposed a group poll to see who agreed with the changes as proposed in the recommendation language. Heidi Ricci noted the communication process for pollinators and wanted to make sure it was captured somewhere. Priscilla Matton discussed the ability to opt-out of spraying as a solution. Anita Deeley commented that beehives were moved around a lot. Priscilla Matton noted the spraying schedule for her MCD and commented that spraying notifications were posted to their MCDs site. Anita Deeley noted that not all MCDs operated the same way.

Call for a Vote on Each Recommendation as Written:

Priscilla Matton asked a question on voting process. Jessica Burgess discussed the voting process related to the motion and the wording in the recommendation. Russell Hopping inquired if the group would be having any discussions related to the recommendation prior to voting and Cheryl Keenan responded yes. Jessica Burgess commented on the motion and voting and when the vote was taken that topic would be considered done. Jessica Burgess added discussion on what was done in other subcommittees related to the motion process, discussion, and vote. Richard Robinson noted that agreement with every single word in the recommendation was not necessary and there would be additional discussion at the task force level.

1. Improving Consistency in the Implementation of Integrated Pest Management – A motion was entertained by Richard Robinson to vote on recommendation one. Anita Deeley made a motion. Seconded by Kathy Baskin. A roll call vote was conducted. Kathy Baskin (aye), Anita Deeley (aye), Russell Hopping (aye), Kim LeBeau (aye), Priscilla Matton (no), Richard Pollack (no), Helen Poynton (aye), Heidi Ricci (aye), Richard Robinson (aye). The motion passed. Priscilla Matton discussed her no vote and noted that she could not support the last part of the recommendation. Richard Pollack commented that his no vote was due to his opinion that this recommendation would micromanage the MCDs.

2. Limiting Ground-Based Applications of Adulticides: A motion was entertained by Richard Robinson. Heidi Ricci made a motion. Seconded by Anita Deeley. A roll call was conducted. Kathy Baskin (aye), Anita Deeley (aye), Russell Hopping (no), Kim LeBeau (aye), Priscilla Matton (no), Richard Pollack (aye), Helen Poynton (no), Heidi Ricci (aye), Richard Robinson (aye). The motion passed. Russell Hopping noted that he voted no because based on what he heard, he didn't see this recommendation as a change to what was already occurring.

3. *State-Wide Mosquito Surveillance*: Richard Robinson entertained a motion to vote on the recommendation. Helen Poynton made a motion. Seconded by Richard Pollack. A roll call vote was conducted. Kathy Baskin (aye), Anita Deeley (abstain), Russell Hopping (aye), Kim LeBeau (aye), Priscilla Matton (aye), Richard Pollack (aye), Helen Poynton (aye), Heidi Ricci (aye), Richard Robinson (aye). The motion passed.

4. *Improving Consistency in MCD Staffing*: Richard Robinson entertained a motion. Richard Pollack made a motion. Seconded by Kim LeBeau. A roll call vote was conducted. Kathy Baskin (aye), Anita Deeley (aye), Russell Hopping (aye), Kim LeBeau (aye), Priscilla Matton (no), Richard Pollack (aye), Helen Poynton (aye), Heidi Ricci (aye), Richard Robinson (abstain). The motion passed. Priscilla Matton added that her no vote was due to her budget concerns for individual MCDs to be able to afford staffing changes. However, provided that the policy and funding structure changed then perhaps there was an opportunity for the recommendation.

5. *Statewide Education on Mosquito Management*: Richard Robinson entertained a motion to vote. A motion was made by Heidi Ricci. Seconded by Richard Pollack. A roll call vote was conducted. Kathy Baskin (aye), Anita Deeley (aye), Russell Hopping (aye), Kim LeBeau (aye), Priscilla Matton (aye), Richard Pollack (aye), Helen Poynton (aye), Heidi Ricci (aye), Richard Robinson (aye). The motion passed unanimously.

6. *Prohibit Aerial Applications of Adulticides*: A motion was entertained by Richard Robinson. Anita Deeley made a motion. Seconded by Heidi Ricci. A roll call was conducted. Kathy Baskin (no), Anita Deeley (aye), Russell Hopping (aye), Kim LeBeau (no), Priscilla Matton (no), Richard Pollack (no), Helen Poynton (no), Heidi Ricci (aye), Richard Robinson (aye). The motion did not pass. Subcommittee members who voted aye had the opportunity to comment. Russell Hopping noted that he still did not see the efficacy in aerial spraying that was done. Heidi Ricci commented that she did not see adequate safeguards and Richard Robinson noted that the state would be far better off educating the public versus spraying.

7. *Online Reporting for Commercial Applicators*: Richard Robinson entertained a motion. Anita Deeley made a motion. Seconded by Kim LeBeau. A roll call vote was conducted. Kathy Baskin (aye), Anita Deeley (aye), Russell Hopping (aye), Kim LeBeau (aye), Priscilla Matton (aye), Richard Pollack (aye), Helen Poynton (aye), Heidi Ricci (aye), Richard Robinson (aye). The motion passed unanimously.

8. *Communication with Public Water Systems*: Richard Robinson entertained a motion to vote. A motion was made Kim LeBeau. Seconded by Heidi Ricci. A roll call vote was conducted. Kathy Baskin (aye), Anita Deeley (aye), Russell Hopping (aye), Kim LeBeau (aye), Priscilla Matton (no), Richard Pollack (aye), Helen Poynton (aye), Heidi Ricci (aye), Richard Robinson (aye). The motion passed. Priscilla Matton discussed her rationale for her no vote and noted that it would be easier for a public water supply to provide their information to MCDs.

9. *QA/QC Testing of Chemicals Used in Mosquito Control*: A motion was entertained by Richard Robinson. A motion was made by Kim LeBeau. Seconded by Heidi Ricci. A roll call vote was conducted. Kathy Baskin (no), Anita Deeley (aye), Russell Hopping (aye), Kim LeBeau (aye), Priscilla Matton (no), Richard Pollack (no), Helen Poynton (aye), Heidi Ricci (aye), Richard Robinson (abstain). The motion passed. Richard Pollack discussed his no vote and commented that the program as drafted in the recommendation was not sufficiently justified and would be impractical and cumbersome.

10. *Protection of Receptor Areas from Pesticide Run-Off*: A motion was entertained by Richard Robinson. A motion was made by Heidi Ricci. Seconded by Anita Deeley. A roll call vote was conducted. Kathy Baskin (aye), Anita Deeley (aye), Russell Hopping (no), Kim LeBeau (aye), Priscilla Matton (no), Helen Poynton (abstain), Heidi Ricci (aye), Richard Pollack (no), Richard Robinson (aye). The motion passed. Russell Hopping commented that the recommendation was really intended for drinking water and did not capture what the subcommittee was trying to do. Richard Pollack added that he saw this recommendation as a research endeavor.

11. *Reduce Pesticide Applications for Nuisance Control*: Richard Robinson entertained a motion to vote. A motion was made by Heidi Ricci. Seconded by Anita Deeley. A roll call was conducted. Kathy Baskin (no), Anita Deeley (aye), Russell Hopping (no), Kim LeBeau (no), Priscilla Matton (no), Richard Pollack (no), Helen Poynton (abstain),

Heidi Ricci (aye), Richard Robinson (aye). The motion did not pass. Heidi Ricci commented that she hoped this was addressed through the larger overhaul of the program and was inclusive of private applicators as well.

12. Monitoring and Evaluations After Spraying: Richard Robinson entertained a motion to vote on the recommendation as amended based on subcommittee member discussion. Helen Poynton made a motion. Seconded by Anita Deeley. A roll call was conducted. Kathy Baskin (aye), Anita Deeley (aye), Russell Hopping (aye), Kim LeBeau (aye), Priscilla Matton (aye), Richard Pollack (aye), Helen Poynton (aye), Heidi Ricci (aye), Richard Robinson (aye). The motion passed unanimously.

13. Research the Impacts of Pesticides on Vulnerable Populations: Richard Robinson entertained a motion to vote on the recommendation as amended based on subcommittee member discussion. A motion was made by Kim LeBeau. Seconded by Russell Hopping. A roll call vote was conducted. Kathy Baskin (aye), Anita Deeley (aye), Russell Hopping (aye), Kim LeBeau (aye), Priscilla Matton (aye), Richard Pollack (no), Helen Poynton (aye), Heidi Ricci (aye), Richard Robinson (aye). The motion passed. Heidi Ricci inquired about voting yes and if it would preclude her from offering a minority opinion as she did not feel that the recommendation addressed the directives that the group was tasked with reviewing. Jessica Burgess noted that there was no preclusion to bringing up something that had not been addressed previously. Richard Pollack provided context for his no vote and commented that the recommendation was based on highly controversial and flawed assumptions.

14. Criteria for Declaring a Public Health Hazard: Richard Robinson entertained a motion to vote. A motion was made by Anita Deeley. Seconded by Heidi Ricci. A roll call vote was conducted. Kathy Baskin (aye), Anita Deeley (aye), Russell Hopping (aye), Kim LeBeau (aye), Priscilla Matton (aye), Richard Pollack (no), Helen Poynton (aye), Heidi Ricci (aye), Richard Robinson (aye). Richard Pollack discussed his vote and noted that this recommendation already existed in the DPH arbovirus response plan.

15. Agriculture Opt-Out: Prior to taking a vote, Richard Robinson discussed the various options and the multiple choices to try and narrow the recommendation down on which of the four options should be voted on. Subcommittee members discussed the rationale for choosing two acres as the threshold. Jessica Burgess discussed two acres being used for zoning and protection thresholds and Heidi Ricci noted that there were currently amendments underway to decrease the acreage threshold size to accommodate urban farming. Commissioner Lebeaux commented on the definition of a farm and the concept of food for sale or donation requirements and noted that MDAR did not have authority to certify farms. In addition, Commissioner Lebeaux expressed concern that trying to satisfy the recommendation would directly interfere should an aerial spray be necessary. Richard Robinson clarified what the subcommittee would be voting on. Richard Robinson entertained a motion to vote on the recommendation as amended based on subcommittee discussion. Anita Deeley made a motion. Seconded by Heidi Ricci. Kathy Baskin (no), Anita Deeley (aye), Russell Hopping (no), Kim LeBeau (aye), Priscilla Matton (no), Richard Pollack (no), Helen Poynton (aye), Heidi Ricci (aye), Richard Robinson (aye). The motion passed. Richard Pollack commented that the recommendation put the fiscal health of farmers ahead of public health considerations and Russell Hopping noted that he did not think the recommendation was implementable.

16. Protected Status of Certified Organic Farms: Richard Robinson entertained a motion to vote on the recommendation. A motion was made by Anita Deeley. Seconded by Helen Poynton. A roll call vote was conducted. Kathy Baskin (aye), Anita Deeley (aye), Russell Hopping (no), Kim LeBeau (aye), Priscilla Matton (aye), Richard Pollack (no), Helen Poynton (aye), Heidi Ricci (aye), Richard Robinson (aye). Richard Pollack and Russell Hopping discussed their opposition opinions. Richard Pollack noted that this should be pursued separately from mosquito management decisions and Russell Hopping commented that he did not see this recommendation being related to mosquitos.

17. Enhancing and updating wetlands management within IPM: Helen Poynton discussed the GEIR being out of date and if the recommendation needed to include language about updating the GEIR. Heidi Ricci noted that the update would be in the new mosquito management plan. Kathy Baskin noted that she was interested in hearing about wetlands restoration. Heidi Ricci discussed the collaboration, funding process for projects, and what

organizations were encountering on wetlands projects related to delays because certain practices were not in the GEIR because the GEIR was out of date. Richard Pollack noted that in principle this made sense and commented that there was not a roadmap to get to what was desired in the recommendation and he thought that was a problem. Richard Robinson envisioned that there would be a fair amount of circling back to subcommittees or members in the executive to figure out how to actualize some of the recommendation. Seeing no other comments from the group, Richard Robinson entertained a motion to vote. A motion was made by Heidi Ricci. Seconded by Russell Hopping. A roll call was conducted. Kathy Baskin (no), Anita Deeley (abstain), Russell Hopping (aye), Kim LeBeau (aye), Priscilla Matton (aye), Richard Pollack (aye), Helen Poynton (aye), Heidi Ricci (aye), Richard Robinson (aye). The motion passed.

Closing Remarks and Adjourn:

Cheryl Keenan noted that ERG would pull together the recommendation voting content and minority statements would be added into the file. Priscilla Matton asked a procedural question and noted that she felt that she was getting different information regarding what information would be passed to the full task force. Richard Robinson clarified that recommendations, whether they passed or not, would be sent to the full task force. Heidi Ricci noted that it was important that all the recommendations go to the full task force for consideration and include the vote tally. Seeing no other comments from the group, Richard Robinson entertained a motion to adjourn the meeting. A motion was made by Richard Pollack. Seconded by Priscilla Matton. All in favor said aye. The meeting was adjourned at 1:58 p.m.

**Local Engagement Subcommittee
Meeting Minutes**

MCTF Local Engagement Subcommittee Meeting Minutes 10 07 21

Minutes for the Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century (MCTF) Task Force Meeting

Subcommittee Meeting: Local Engagement

October 7, 2021, 12:00 p.m. via Zoom

The subcommittee meeting was started at 12:03 pm and Heidi Ricci (Chair) welcomed the subcommittee members. A roll call vote was performed. Derek Brindisi couldn't be heard but waved. All others subcommittee members were present. The meeting purpose was to introduce subcommittee members, ensure all members are clear about the subcommittee purpose, charge, process, and ground rules, review and clarify the MCTF subcommittee guidance, and clarify the process for recommendations development. Jessica Burgess (EEA Representative) is filling in for Alisha Bouchard (EEA Representative) and provided a housekeeping update related to the meeting requirements. Derek Brindisi rejoined with working audio. Heidi Ricci noted the purpose of the meeting is to establish a process and framework for operation and review key questions.

Jenny Helmick (ERG Facilitator) requested that subcommittee members introduce themselves and give name, affiliation, and expertise. Jenny briefly walked through the ground rules. Heidi noted that subcommittees were divided with language from the statute that created the task force, with recognition that there's some overlap. This subcommittee is about local engagement with directives about public participation, local options, and annual evaluations. Heidi also commented that while this is the general charge, we're not totally constrained by these exact words, it's possible to discuss related items although we need to keep focused given limited time.

Jenny Helmick noted that subcommittee members will attend these meetings and task force meetings (where Heidi as chair will present the subcommittee's progress) and to keep in mind the task force must approve the subcommittee's recommendations. Jenny read and explained the conduct of subcommittee meetings bullets in the guidance document. There were no questions or comments from the subcommittee group.

Jenny Helmick addressed the schedule which shows the phases of recommendation development and noted the deadline for final recommendations is under discussion. Eve Schluter commented that there's at least one meeting she can't attend. Jenny noted that we need three subcommittee members for a quorum and to please let her know in advance if you can't make it. Heidi asked that if a member can't attend a meeting, but the meeting has quorum and proceeds without them, could the subcommittee member provide input for the next meeting to Jenny? Jessica Burgess noted that we can determine a process for any comments go to ERG/EEA and not another member, and can present it at a meeting.

Heidi asked when will we get comments on the report? Abby Burton (ERG Facilitator) noted that the last she heard the plan was to try and release them at the next best practices subcommittee meeting. Jessica Burgess commented they are strategizing to use a meeting that is on the schedule and hope to update soon.

Jenny Helmick read and explained bullets for protocols for drafting recommendations. There are no questions or comments from the subcommittee on protocols for drafting. Jenny then read and explained bullets for voting with no questions or commentary from the group. Jenny Helmick moved

towards roles of subcommittee participants. Alisha Bouchard will be handling Zoom, taking notes, reminding members about OML. Chair, Heidi Ricci will be providing leadership on framing the charge, identifying when discussion is off-topic or out of scope. If time left over at end, chair may recognize other attendees to speak. The role of the subcommittee members is to work constructively and follow ground rules and the OML. There were no questions on the roles that were addressed. Facilitator will help with ensuring meetings are efficient with no influence on content. The facilitator will work with Heidi to prep agenda, and keep focused on agenda, make sure everyone can contribute. Also, the facilitator will work with Abby to support developing draft text. There were no questions on those two roles. The public can listen in, and Heidi as Chair can decide whether/when to recognize members of public. Subcommittee needs always take priority – opening to the public will be rare and their time will be limited.

Heidi Ricci asked if the team know how frequent updates from public comment portal will be. Jenny Helmick answered that she would get back on this question. Heidi Ricci commented that given this is local engagement and we've had limited input directly from municipal officials, that she would like to invite some folks to speak, including Uxbridge and perhaps other outside experts. Heidi indicated interest in hosting a few key people to provide expert information or outside perspectives for brief, focused perspectives. Jenny noted that later we'll go over our proposed process for filling critical data gaps and that would apply to written and speakers. Heidi Ricci wanted to distinguish this between members of public versus people who might be invited by the subcommittee.

Jenny Helmick read through the rules and explained them to the group. There were no questions or comments. Jenny asked if anyone feels as though they cannot agree to these rules? There were no hands or comments from the subcommittee. Jenny noted that in addition to these sections, the ERG technical team is developing a crosswalk between each directive and the report sections.

Jenny Helmick moved the conversation to subcommittee directives and understory questions – key questions were provided for each directive. The subcommittee may decide to use all, some, or add other questions. Jenny then reviewed the page of the guidance entitled "Overlapping Scope in Directives Assigned to Different Subcommittees." Heidi Ricci noted these issues around mosquito control are intertwined so should be interaction between subcommittees. For our committee, these are some overlapping areas that have been identified including annual evaluations and organic agriculture, which have overlap with best practices, in addition to the evaluation of efficacy and property exclusions.

An example recommendation was provided from the Cranberry Revitalization Task Force. Jenny noted these are not perfectly parallel to the recommendations needed for this subcommittee, but the examples give a sense of the type of language that is used, and the recommendation is provided to view at the group's leisure. Seeing no further questions or comments from the subcommittee group, Jenny Helmick turned the meeting conversation to clarify stage one: clarifying the process for recommendation development.

Jenny noted the first stage of recommendation development is the review and discussion of information. The schedule for the first stage lays the foundation for everything to come. We need to identify the information we have, assess whether it's sufficient, identify gaps, and if feasible, identify any information to fill those gaps. We have six hours for three directives, which means two hours per directive. Everyone will need to do some work in between meetings. Jenny showed slides with types of

tasks to consider for next meeting: consider understory questions, read the relevant section to the next directive (ERG will provide a crosswalk), and we hope the Task Force member comments will be distributed to review. There is a need to assess whether there is enough information and if not, identify critical data gaps and credible info sources to suggest. Heidi Ricci asked a question regarding the MCTF comments and if we'll also get all public comments on the report? Jenny responded that she believed so and noted this will help strategize for the next meeting.

Jenny then moved the conversation to review the process for identifying critical gaps and for filling them. Jenny noted that the subcommittee needs to be mindful that time/resources are finite.

1. Identify critical gaps. Read report to see if there are any gaps that prevent recommendation development
2. Identify sources to fill the gaps. These should be public – identify a link or confirm you can make it public and get a copy.
3. Evaluate each source. Some suggested questions to consider about the source are in the slides. Email your links to facilitator.
4. Propose gaps for subcommittee vetting. You'll have to describe gaps and why critical. Please email JH before next meeting with any gaps you've identified.
5. Present why you think source is credible and valuable.
6. Subcommittee vets proposed sources. Lack of info can be part of recommendations
7. ERG will distribute sources. Links will be in minutes.

Eve commented on identifying sources to fill critical gaps. Is there assistance from ERG for gap identification and research support? Jenny Helmick commented that we'd need to see what kind of support is needed and see what ERG can do. There was interest from Eve and Heidi Ricci that ERG should do this support work and research. Heidi Ricci flagged that there are gaps in the report itself where it identifies that information just doesn't exist. For example, there are no quantitative means of evaluating mosquito control – it's a gap but it's not something we could fill. Also, some sources were referenced in report but not adequately discussed in the text. For other sources – how will we ourselves find and evaluate those sources? Heidi noted one final point, outside experts/voices may fill gaps. Russ Hopping echoed what Heidi said, and indicated time sensitivity. Russ Hopping noted that he may know some things off the top of his head but thinks most gaps won't be able to be filled easily with published info. If subcommittees have overlap and identify overlapping gaps could we add a joint meeting to have some expert presentations? Heidi Ricci noted that Russ's suggestion is a good suggestion to consider. Some of this may be iterative. We may not be able to think of every gap in the next week and we might identify gaps later and need to maintain flexibility to bring in additional experts. Regarding ERG support, Jenny asked Abby Burton if an answer can be provided. Abby responded that we would need to see specifically what the gaps are and what ERG can do. Abby noted the report is thorough as a source. Russ commented on some sources that are cited in report and asked can we get those sources to review? Heidi Ricci noted that most of those sources are linked in the citations. Jenny let the group know that if there's anything they can't get, ERG should be able to provide it. Heidi indicated that she would like to hear from ERG on how they made the model in the report and ask some follow-up question questions. Jenny requested that the to allow for time to finish discussing these steps and then loop back for further discussion on gaps.

Heidi Ricci asked who came up with the process? Jenny Helmick responded that this process was developed by ERG in collaboration with EEA. Heidi commented that one of the biggest issues with this

program is public transparency. Especially regarding municipal input and municipal opt-out. Heidi commented that we haven't heard those voices. We didn't get sufficient reasoning on how the opt-out process was run or how decisions were made. We need to hear from people as the local engagement subcommittee. Derek Brindisi commented that these were great points from Heidi. This was one concern Derek raised to the full task force, about having a public dialogue prior to issuing guidance for the municipal opt-out process. Derek noted that over the course of the summer, articles have shown the difficulties municipalities have had opting out and he doesn't know of any guidance that's been provided since. Heidi Ricci noted that she has been part of many processes where hearing input has been a key part of the process. Heidi emphasized Uxbridge has some very qualified people, with degrees in Public Health, and experience working with DPH, and coming up with alternative mosquito control processes. knows at least one Board of Health (BOH) member that she would like to speak with. Derek had asked about holding public comment period on the municipal opt-out process and stated that we should have a public comment period for anything we're going to recommend.

Heidi Ricci noted that it would be a good idea to set up one of our meetings as a public comment meeting. Jenny Helmick commented that we'd need to circle back and check what would be involved in having a whole meeting as a public comment session. Jenny asked the group if there were thoughts on the process of suggesting speakers for subcommittee meetings? Russ Hopping asked what the process might look like, and if members would suggest ideas, to raise and present at the next meeting? What if multiple people suggest the same thing? Jenny responded that we'll consolidate whatever we're sent. Russ Hopping and Heidi Ricci indicated agreement as proposed.

Heidi Ricci asked the group to set a date for members to have info to Jenny to compile ahead of next meeting. Heidi Ricci had a request as Chair, noted that the process may be iterative, we could identify key gaps later, and if things come up later, we aren't shut out from addressing them. Jenny noted that it's a balance between time and the need to do this right. Heidi Ricci asked if Priscilla has thoughts? Priscilla Matton answered that she is concerned about the potential to volley with sources at the expense of progress. Priscilla is interested in hearing from towns that had opt-out issues. Priscilla noted that the process was done quickly, which might be the reason why things weren't done as we might have wanted. But because our directives are very specific, we could get overwhelmed with comments and lose focus. Heidi Ricci agreed some questions are unanswerable – we need to use best judgement, recommend better practices. We need to focus on these directives. Some gaps we identify we might be able to pass to other subcommittees.

Jenny Helmick noted that the key question is, if we don't have certain info, will that prevent us from creating recommendations? Jenny asked the group if they wanted to start with a focus on one directive or more than one, and if one, which. Priscilla Matton commented that she wanted to hear from someone about the municipal opt-out process. Jessica noted that the municipal opt-out concept is in legislation only for one more year and it only applies in relation to SRB activity. Heidi Ricci commented that she wanted to hear from municipal officials regarding their experience this year. Interested in local input on what happens in their own towns. She noted that heard from towns that they want more local control over what's happening, they want help with education, and source reduction, in addition to concern over arbovirus and nuisance species Sometimes they want larviciding, and want more control over adulticiding and thresholds for how those are done. Local options are about more than just pesticides. Jessica Burgess commented that this is good to know so we can formulate information to share. Heidi Ricci noted this also relates to the first directive on public participation. A partnership

across levels of government. Local source control might be more effective in partnership with local officials. What are the different roles for individual, town, region, state?

Jenny Helmick noted the idea of the understory questions is to provide more granularity to the directives. Some of what Heidi just raised could be folded into the understory questions. Jenny reminded Heidi to identify when she's speaking as the chair or as a subcommittee member. Heidi Ricci responded that she expressed details there as member but speaking as Chair, she sees our issue as local engagement, broadly. Jenny commented that it seemed like the group was landing on focusing on directive (iii) for our next meeting – identifying gaps and sources for that directive would be the next step. Heidi Ricci commented yes, but she'd like to write the directive more broadly. Jenny commented that she thought we can re-write the directives. Heidi Ricci clarified looking at the task force charge from the law that she is talking about #2. Heidi noted that our first and second directives are very intertwined. Jenny suggested that people work on both #2 and #3 to the extent they can by 10/18 in order to identify critical gaps and identify how to fill the gaps. Jenny asked the group if this approach was appropriate and no one disagreed.

In the remaining meeting time, Heidi Ricci wanted to spend a time discussing some more about ideas for speakers. Heidi had in mind Uxbridge and some people from Harvard. Jenny noted that we would want people to be thorough in considering a source's quality and relevance before it's proposed and to go through the process systematically, first thinking about the critical gap it meets. It might be premature to propose sources now, and instead might be best to discuss at the next meeting. Heidi Ricci indicated concern that it gap identification wouldn't be possible without the report comments. Jenny noted that comments would be available hopefully by the end of this week and acknowledged urgency.

There are no other comments regarding process. The next subcommittee meeting will be held on 10/18. Heidi Ricci asked for a motion to adjourn. Priscilla Matton motioned, and Derek Brindisi seconded the motion. All in favor said aye and the meeting was adjourned at 1:57 pm.

MCTF Local Engagement Subcommittee Meeting Minutes 10 18 21

Minutes for the Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century (MCTF) Task Force Meeting

Subcommittee Meeting: Local Engagement

October 18, 2021, 12:00 p.m. via Zoom

Heidi Ricci (Chair) called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m. with roll call and a quorum was established. Subcommittee members in attendance included Russell Hopping, Priscilla Matton, Derek Brindisi, and Eve Schluter. Alisha Bouchard (EEA Staff Lead) started the webinar. Like previous meetings, the meeting is being hosted as a Zoom webinar. All task force members and state staff are panelists and can participate freely throughout the duration of this meeting. All non-task force members are attendees and questions can be submitted through the Q&A function and will be addressed throughout the dialogue or at the end of the meeting. Alisha also noted that meeting minutes were being cleaned up with the hope of being caught up within the week for all subcommittees.

Jenny Helmick (ERG Facilitator) shows meeting agenda to the group with the purpose of the subcommittee meeting to:

1. Review subcommittee directives and questions
2. Discuss any data gaps identified and determine which the subcommittee considers to be critical
3. Discuss proposed sources to fill critical data gaps and determine which the subcommittee considers to be essential

Jenny Helmick noted that she and Heidi Ricci went over the agenda and they made a few adjustments in how to approach the overall review of the directives and questions. The group had eight days and most people were not able to submit data gaps or sources. The purpose of the meeting is to start digging into that. Jenny noted the need to go around to each person to get a take on the directives, the status quo, and what the issues are with the status quo as a starting point for identifying data gaps. Then the group will look at the data of the sources that had gaps and sources that have been submitted. One additional adjustment to the agenda was to leave a few minutes at the end to read out and acknowledge any contributions from the public who are listening, in the Q&A.

Heidi Ricci asked if Jenny had received any input from anyone on the committee in writing. Jenny commented that Heidi was the only committee member to submit. Heidi noted what she wanted to go around to the other members of the committee and ask if they had questions or thoughts on the directives and questions that subcommittee are working to address; and in particular, if any critical gaps were identified or if there are suggestions on important information to add.

Russell Hopping commented that he had no changes on the directives and he thought the underlying questions were broad enough from his point of view, Russell thought they captured anything that he would be concerned about. Russell also noted one area that he is interested in exploring more with the subcommittee is opting out. Derek Brindisi commented that like Russell, his major concern, also brought up in policy structure subcommittee is trying to engage local municipalities regarding local engagement process. Derek sent some articles highlighting frustration from local officials. Other priority is to try to engage local officials around having more flexible options to enter Mosquito Control Districts (MCDs) which was also brought up at policy structure subcommittee meeting. Derek noted that it would be

good to have other ways to join MCDs that would allow local officials to choose. Jenny Helmick noted that she did not get those links and Derek Brindisi commented that he would send again.

Priscilla Matton commented that she is interested in exploring more about how to fill data gaps around evaluating effectiveness at controlling arbovirus. Difference between nuisance control and vector control. Priscilla noted that we need a more precise definition to understand each other. For example, to Priscilla, vector control equals controlling mosquitoes that could transmit virus, not requiring virus to have been detected. Priscilla commented that some folks seem to think of that as nuisance control and it is only vector control if the virus has been detected. We need to be clear about what kind of spraying is being conducted and how that impacts our conclusions. There may be more comfort with spraying for vector control, and possibly more if there have been virus detections. Heidi Ricci noted that might be discussed at Best Practices and Policy Structure subcommittees and she can report back.

Eve Schluter wanted to understand better how we'll address making recommendations from this subcommittee when there's significant overlap between subcommittees. For example, thinking about data gaps, whether we could make a recommendation on understory questions about which decisions should be subject to public input. Eve noted it is hard to know without understanding what Policy Structure subcommittee is talking about. There is much overlap and we need to make sure we're communicating and can make it into appropriate recommendation. Heidi Ricci commented that raises the question of when and what actions should have public input. Eve responded that if different subcommittees are making recommendations that we don't know about, it's hard to know if there should be public input at those steps. Trying to manage the feedback loop between subcommittees so all the recommendations can work with each other.

Jenny Helmick noted that some members of this subcommittee are participating on other subcommittees as well. ERG is watching all the subcommittees so we can keep you informed and there is the option for subcommittee members to attend other meetings. Eve commented that she doesn't have time to attend other meetings. Alisha noted that it might be possible to have a joint meeting between subcommittee to raise those meetings. Heidi Ricci agreed we may need to do that as we go forward.

Heidi Ricci noted that she is putting on member hat and much of her initial feedback was on best practices and policy subcommittees. Heidi commented that it is important for those committees to start reaching agreement on the overall framing to allow us to focus more on local engagement. Heidi Ricci noted that she and Russell can bring extensive experience with landowner optout. These are some things we might need further outside input on. Heidi echoed what Derek was saying. What are the barriers to a locality joining a district, meeting local needs? Mosquitoes don't respect local boundaries. Heidi noted that one gap is what are the barriers now we need to overcome. Second gap is questions and concern around municipal opt-out. Even though that process is only one more year. Heidi asked if others have any thoughts/input about these gaps?

Priscilla Matton commented that she doesn't know much about decisions or issues with municipal opt-out. Priscilla would be fine listening to someone, or if a subcommittee makes the decision to go forward with municipal opt-out, it would be good to hear what difficulties they had. Priscilla commented that it is hard to narrow down exact criteria every year when the decisions need to be made in April and we don't know what will happen in August. Heidi noted that it would be good to know what towns think they can do to have local control. One additional thing Heidi identified was about folks with chemical

sensitivities, health risks. Heidi noted there was a comment from an MD that hundreds of thousands of people in the state have chemical sensitivities to pesticide exposures, not just from mosquito control. Jenny Helmick noted that she wasn't sure if that fell into this subcommittee, perhaps needs to be brought to the full Mosquito Control Task Force or to another subcommittee.

Russell Hopping asked if municipal opt-out is off the table or could it come back? Heidi Ricci noted that we could recommend continuing it or do a hybrid version allowing more choice. Russell then asked if we didn't recommend anything, what would happen in 2023? Heidi noted that the legislature might do something. Russell asked if it could go back to the way it was before the 2020 law that created the task force was adopted? Heidi answered that yes that's what would happen if the legislature did nothing.

Jenny Helmick called on Derek Brindisi since Priscilla Matton mentioned him. Derek commented that Uxbridge has done good work. Some towns have appointed boards. For example, Upton has a five-member board reviewing options. Derek commented that there are probably many such across the state. As a strategy, we could engage these communities and board members and get their feedback on what improvements could be made.

Heidi Ricci commented that Uxbridge got a large grant under municipal vulnerability preparedness program. They did a big review of ecological arbovirus management. Dr. Joann Lindenmayer on the Uxbridge board of health has technical expertise. Heidi noted that we could see about having her speak or provide a written summary of her findings. On some of these Heidi recommended bringing speakers with set amount of time and prescribed topics. For example, the town of Harvard would be good – their opt-out application was thorough, but it was not approved. Senator Comerford worked across municipalities that applied for opt-out and has expressed interest in coming for a bit of a meeting. Derek Brindisi noted that would be great and he would like to consider it because some of these issues are also at the policy structure subcommittee. Derek commented maybe we should have a joint meeting with the policy structure subcommittee for these presentations.

Jenny Helmick noted the subcommittee would need to decide on whether to ask people to provide written input or to come as speakers, how much time they should have, and which meetings to come to. Jenny recommended the subcommittee formulate specific questions, not just to have the presenters talk, but have specific questions the subcommittee would like them to answer. Russell Hopping noted it would be helpful to clarify what the gap is more specifically for each of these. Russell commented that it looked broad right now, and he's wondering if there were specific questions, it might streamline how we get the answers.

Heidi Ricci commented that she can narrow it more. From an alternative municipal perspective, for example, Uxbridge and Upton have made attempts to join a MCD but it didn't pass the town meeting because of cost and the way services are provided (concerns regarding truck-based spraying and lack of local control once in a MCD, for example). If towns could choose among services, what would that look like? Heidi noted that Uxbridge found a way to get testing through a private entity and get into the DPH system. Heidi commented this is a case study example of municipal struggles with existing structure and looking to find an alternative structure. Heidi also noted that Senator Comerford and Harvard would be focused on opt out as it is currently structured. Heidi mentioned that we need a whole other understory question on landowner opt-out. For Senator Comerford, her districts would be more concerned with municipal opt-out. Russell Hopping asked if we will be making this current process clear, or will we be

making a bigger recommendation about making it easier to have local options, a plate of private options, etc.?

Heidi Ricci noted this question does get back to Policy. One perspective Heidi heard at last policy structure or best practices subcommittee meeting is that we need a clarifying goal for the program. Identifying what local engagement will look like must fall in that framework. Heidi Ricci commented on proposing speakers, making sure we're informed on current landscape and all perspectives and she thinks we need to hear them. Priscilla Matton noted some of these issues may have been written about or provided in some of the comments. Priscilla is not against having speakers, but maybe we need to look at public comments before bringing in too many outside people. Heidi Ricci commented that she checked with some of these people. Senator Comerford as state senator, has been very involved. Heidi thinks we should give her five to ten minutes. She's available on 11/4, but Dr. Joann Lindenmayer isn't. Heidi was going to see if she can write something. Derek Brindisi commented that many people we've talked to have had challenges with joining MCDs or with the opt out process. Derek noted that there must be some who have had success, it would be useful to learn from them what they learned from the process. We can't just all be negative, so it's going to be some positive pieces we can take away.

Heidi Ricci emphasized one reason to bring Dr. Joann Lindenmayer in is because Uxbridge has found a path forward. Priscilla Matton commented that DPH does not prohibit MCDs from conducting surveillance only virus testing on their own or through an outside laboratory. Can't get EEE results from the bench, need to get a lab. MCDs aren't allowed to go outside DPH to do testing. Priscilla noted that her district could test for much less money than DPH. There could be an alternative but it's not part of the framework and not an option a local MCD or town has. On the Islands, if they don't have an MCD, they aren't allowed to send mosquitoes for testing. Alisha Bouchard commented that her understanding is DPH made an exception for Uxbridge. They have standardizations with testing. DPH should be part of these conversations.

Priscilla Matton noted that EEE is considered a biological hazard. Not allowed to test for it outside a BSL-3 lab. Heidi Ricci commented that she'd like to understand more from DPH. Maybe for the next full MCTF. Alisha Bouchard stated that she would talk to DPH and see if we can get them to come to meeting. Heidi Ricci noted that would be very helpful because she heard from municipalities that there is a desire to get testing but not have to join an MCD and get unwanted spraying. Heidi wanted to understand what's involved with testing and getting it done safely, securely. Heidi heard strong consensus across the board that people want to know when and where virus is present. DPH understandably doesn't reveal exactly locations of test sites. Confounding to not have much location information. Derek commented about Kevin Cranston speaking since he's on the full Task Force. Derek asked if it would help to survey municipalities and get a sense of what they're looking for?

Priscilla Matton brought the conversation back to testing. Priscilla commented that she really supports having DPH speak and feels there are significant barriers in understanding the data without more specific information. Priscilla asked if Alisha or Jenny can make another request for DPH to explain how they collect data and why they release it in the way they do. If DPH samples in towns outside MCD they don't charge which isn't fair for towns in MCDs. Priscilla also noted education, if that should come from DPH or local, not sure what's best.

Heidi Ricci commented that she did not know if DPH is charging Uxbridge. Alisha commented that they're not. Alisha noted that charging a district is agency to agency via the State Reclamation Board (SRB). Uxbridge isn't being charged, DPH does some of its own surveillance. Statewide surveillance is a baseline, we've never seen any town not want surveillance and education. Heidi Ricci noted that she would like to hear from DPH what best practices are to avoid getting disease. Heidi commented when she sees articles, they recommend source reduction and personal protection. Heidi asked a question regarding surveillance data; do you get to know which samples were positive? Priscilla Matton responded yes, we know exact trap locations, we're told detail on human and horse cases, as is local Board of Health. Neighboring cities/towns may be told. Risk may be adjusted for more than one town, which is to protect patient info, also if they live on border, better to show larger risk area since mosquitoes move.

Heidi Ricci commented that she didn't know if DPH had done any analysis of disease incidence in relation to surveillance and response data. Heidi commented that it is a horrible disease but so rare. Even in 2019 when hundreds of mosquito samples had EEE, there were still millions of people being bitten without getting EEE. Priscilla Matton responded that's because we're taking preventative actions to prevent disease spread. We're doing truck-based spraying and reducing the risk. We're not eliminating risk, but we're at least reducing risk - can't prove we prevented a case because that is not how the data works. Heidi asked if they interviewed patients or family members to try to understand when and where they were likely infected, and whether they were following personal protection measures. Priscilla responded – yes, they ask questions like: did you travel, do you camp, do you think you know when/where you got bitten?

Jenny Helmick noted that she added a few things to this spreadsheet that were sent by Derek Brindisi. Heidi Ricci commented not sure how we would conduct a survey or if we have the resources to do that. I think if we did do it, we'd probably want to have a survey that listed all the different services and ask them to check off which ones they want and maybe an open-ended question. Russell Hopping noted documenting a running list of draft potential recommendations. Another recommendation noted by Russell Hopping was a baseline statewide surveillance plan that functions as a baseline. Just wondering if that's something valuable that we should be thinking about tracking these potential records.

Heidi Ricci commented that another one that she'd like to put in that placeholder category would be a statewide mosquito or mosquito borne disease management plan that is drafted by the experts. Russell Hopping was thinking we would do the survey in the limited time that we have. It could have important outcomes for the recommendations and would add that if policy is going to be directed at all by a municipal survey that it be conducted every ten years, as things change. Jenny Helmick mentioned that one of our functions will be to go through the notes of these meetings and pull those kinds of things out and present back or hear something that a subcommittee member said that could be formed into potential recommendations.

Russell Hopping also added that a policy topic of note is that EEE testing can only be done by certain types of labs and agencies. He requested that there at least be a protocol that's made available if a town hires a private company. Heidi Ricci commented that a survey that was done through the Mass Rivers Alliance, which includes eighty different organizations and was distributed to watershed groups and

environmental groups after the 2019 aerial spraying. There are individual responses and a summary that are available. Heidi wanted to make those available for people to review, acknowledging again, it's probably a biased summary, but it's got some interesting information about statewide dialogue. Jenny Helmick commented that we'll make all these available to the group.

Eve Schluter commented that she worries about going too far down one direction and then it's in direct contradiction with a recommendation from another subcommittee. Eve asked about check-ins on potential recommendation overlap more frequently. Eve feels like there's overlap and commented on how we're addressing those questions that come in through chat during this meeting from an external person. Jenny Helmick commented that at the end of the meeting we would give ten to fifteen minutes and read out Q and A's and to recognize them and take them into consideration. Russell Hopping commented that ERG is in the best position to look across all of these subcommittees and what's coming out of them to potentially alert us to anything that could be a major conflict and then raise that in the monthly overall task force meeting. Jenny Helmick noted that here will be a report out by the subcommittee chairs at the task force meetings with opportunity for question and answer and ERG will be looking across these subcommittees too.

Jenny Helmick wondered if we needed to circle back to see if any of the speakers being proposed are valuable and credible to fill gaps. We can all look at the documents with these PDFs. Heidi Ricci noted here was some interesting GIS mapping analysis that was presented by Harvard that wasn't addressed in the response from the state. Priscilla Matton commented that she needed a little bit more time to go back through all the public comments to the report and then comments that people made, including comments that were made during the public meeting that took place back in May. Priscilla would like to see if some of these things were addressed more closely so we won't need to bother someone to come in if they don't have to. Eve Schluter commented that these are very specific to certain municipalities, and wants to be mindful if we're inviting people from municipality---that could be seen that we're not giving everyone the opportunity to meet and talk that may have submitted something that wasn't accepted or have a concern. Heidi Ricci responded not sure that we're going to have the resources to do a survey. Eve Schluter understood, but posed the question why are we only bringing in Harvard and Uxbridge? Heidi Ricci commented that she could make the case for Uxbridge more so than Harvard because of the fact that they spent the state's money examining this issue in great detail and they engaged other people from other municipalities and their regional conference. Also, given Joann's technical background, it just seemed like that might be worthwhile. But again, Joann is not available on 11/4. She might be able to come later if we decided to do that.

Eve Schluter commented that it would be useful to think about what we want them to address to consider if it's worth it, not that it's not valuable, but is it worth the time, what would we get that we wouldn't get. Alisha Bouchard noted during opt-out process, most applications were from western MA. None received from southeast MA – that's where they have the most disease activity. Could be a place to think about to get different perspectives. Priscilla Matton commented she is interested to learn more about Uxbridge regarding how they plan to move forward. Priscilla commented none of her towns pay \$230k to be in the district. Most is \$180k. Priscilla noted she could do a lot if they all paid \$230k. Priscilla asked how do they plan to sustain process without the grant? Maybe Derek Brindisi can talk about his experience in Worcester which is bigger.

Heidi Ricci clarified that the grant wasn't to conduct the services, the grant was to study, they convened conferences, counted catch basins, went well beyond traditional mosquito control services. The grant also covered other climate resiliency topics beyond just mosquito control. Heidi also added that she'd like to allow Senator Comerford a little time. She has expressed interest and she's a legislator who was involved in legislation that created our Task Force and she has perspectives from many municipalities. Maybe ten minutes. We can think more about other potential speakers or ways to get input. I'd still like to get more input on the medical question although maybe it's not for this subcommittee – overall concern for chemically sensitive individuals.

Russel Hopping asked if Heidi could clarify that last point regarding chemical sensitivity. Is this regarding roadside spraying, or a one-time event because of an emergency designation? Heidi noted this is an area where she would like more medical expertise. Heidi's understanding is people could have single exposure to a chemical that affects them in a way that makes them more sensitive to many chemicals in the future. It could be from multiple lower-level exposures. Heidi has names of some people at MGH, MIT. It could be good to understand from the medical community regarding impacts on sensitive people like asthmatics or long-range Covid. Russell Hopping noted we could list items that need to be included in a plan. Priscilla noted we work closely with the other side of DPH (human, environmental health) during aerial spraying. perhaps somebody from that side of DPH can be helpful since they sit on the Task Force. Let's put it back on our other committee members to see what they can help us with. Let's ask DPH to see if we can get them to give us some more information.

Jenny commented that it seems like we are honing in on two speakers – DPH and Senator Comerford, although there was no feedback from other subcommittee members on recommendations for speakers. Alisha commented that we have DPH environmental health bureau contacts. Alisha offered to take the lead trying to get someone or a couple people from DPH for the group. Heidi Ricci asked the subcommittee what people think? Anyone object to giving Senator Comerford ten minutes? Eve commented that she didn't object but she didn't understand specifically what we want to ask. With every speaker, whether Senator or not, what are we trying to ascertain from having them come and speak. Heidi responded the Senator heard from many people in her area and she made an effort to go back and forth with EEA and had some outstanding questions. Heidi feels the Senator's perspective is valuable and she would like to hear what the Senator would like to see from this aspect of the Task Force, what in her view would've made this process work better.

Jenny commented that we'll need to hear from everyone on this before moving forward with that suggestion. Derek Brindisi noted we should include as many voices as possible. Senator Comerford would be a natural next step given her involvement and Alisha had mentioned DPH. He indicated interest in continuing to engage communities like Harvard that had barriers and challenges to set course for us to make changes. Russell Hopping noted that he is not opposed to having anybody come. He'd like to see a more refined, clear question around filling the data gaps. Priscilla Matton agreed. There are some very direct questions for DPH. Senator Comerford's representative has been at some Task Force meetings and there are likely written comments from him. Maybe as we move further, if we decide it's for us or another subcommittee decides to continue the municipal opt-out, then we could ask Senator Comerford to attend. Priscilla noted she gets nervous about asking any single person because you can

get different answers depending on who you ask. She indicated agreement with the concept of a survey, but noted that responses would vary based on who answers the question.

Heidi Ricci noted that a variety of opinions is important. From Sen Comerford, Heidi is looking for municipal perspective on how this impacted their roles as town officials. Given she helped write that part of the law, the group should hear how the Senator thought the process should work. Jenny noted that she is hearing agreement on having a few people from DPH and maybe this could be arranged for the November meeting. Back to the points on Senator Comerford, Heidi commented that we do have one more year of opt-out coming up. We heard communities need a lot more advance notice to prepare. Even if we don't have Senator Comerford come to speak, we will want to know what the criteria is going to be and what do communities need to do. Heidi noted we need to hear something more specific from EEA.

Jenny asked Alisha, if she thought we could get DPH for the next meeting? Alisha responded scheduling DPH is difficult with Covid, but she would reach out and see. Heidi noted what DPH could share would be good for the policy structure and best practices subcommittees as well. Heidi commented that she has questions for DPH. Eve asked if we could call out for subcommittees to develop specific questions and have DPH give a presentation at the full task force meeting addressing those questions. We need feedback from subcommittees about what we'd want addressed. Priscilla noted that she made a request to Caroline Higley to have DPH at full task force meeting especially if policy structure requests will be adding DPH to the SRB. Russell agreed it should be at the full task force meeting. Heidi asked could we record part of a meeting where there's a speaker and make that available. Jenny responded that would need to be proposed to EEA. Heidi noted that most presentations that have been given have made it onto website, yes? Jenny responded that she was not sure, but we'll need to figure out if DPH speakers will come to full task force meeting or this one. In any event, coming up with specific questions is needed. Jenny recommended that can be part of homework. Formulating specific questions for DPH or any other source and pulling out potential recommendations the subcommittee has already come up with and what are gaps in developing recommendations. For example, specific questions and additional info sources we might need.

Heidi recommended other items most relevant for this subcommittee. This included perspectives from Utah Physicians for Healthy Environment and CDC/EPA joint statement and to reserve some time for Russell and Heidi to speak to landowner opt-outs. Jenny noted that time will be carved out on the agenda for that at the next subcommittee meeting. Heidi asked if the consensus for Senator Comerford is that we don't want to schedule her now, we'd taken written comment, we might come back to her later in process. Jenny noted that she thought we had said we wanted to come up with more specific questions to make best use of Senator Comerford's time. Russell asked if Senator Comerford is an expert on understanding barriers for municipal opt-out and what's preventing towns from opting into MCDs. Heidi noted that it is more the former. Russell noted that he is trying to think about how to make a more specific request. Russell added, municipal opt out goes away after next year unless changes are made to keep it in place, right? Heidi responded, yes and added that maybe we can make recommendations to EEA for next year but maybe it's not a priority for us.

Priscilla commented that she is not sure if we have authority to make those changes. It's a separate part of the legislation. We can make it part of recommended new legislation. Priscilla commented that she thought Senator Comerford or her office needs to bring it up to EEA sooner than later. Heidi noted one question she heard was what is it the MCDs are doing that towns aren't that the state considers essential? Eve noted that we've talked about a lot of things, which is great, but as perspectives, we're talking about what happens next, rather than what's on the books now. Eve keeps coming back to our charge and she wants to make sure we're understanding the charge and what our next steps are. As Russell said, municipal opt-out is going to go away so we should be mindful of what our charge is. Heidi noted that looking at our directives, we haven't discussed much on the third directive yet. Heidi stated that has the most overlap with best practices subcommittee. Jenny mentioned to maybe consider info sources that could be used for that directive. Eve commented for this meeting we were supposed to focus on directives two and three, so it's worth moving along to think about directive eight. Heidi noted there's a lot of overlap there with the best practices subcommittee.

Jenny noted she'll send a follow up email with ERG notes and a summary of what to focus on for next meeting. Jenny also mentioned that there will be a public listening session in December and maybe one later, too, for the whole task force. Derek asked how is that listening session being advertised to local communities? Alisha responded that she was not sure and that we would have to ask Caroline. Derek notes there are many listservs. Alisha commented that she thought EEA had that MMA listserv but thought it was a great idea. Jenny acknowledged and read two questions that were received via the Q&A function (received at 1:04 and 1:18 from Barbara Katzenberg) Alisha noted that DPH would have to answer the questions. Heidi responded these might be questions to share with them when they present. Eve noted that it is important to keep this in mind when we're talking about what points are appropriate for public input in the decision-making process. Something heard a lot in conversations is the idea of relative risk and is the action proportionate to the risk. Heidi commented that's why she wants to understand more about public health issues with chemicals in the environment.

Heidi Ricci thanked subcommittee members and staff for helping and for their time. The work is important and will have implications for years to come. Heidi entertained a motion to adjourn from Eve Schluter, seconded from Priscilla Matton. All in favor said aye. The meeting was adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

MCTF Local Engagement Subcommittee Meeting Minutes 11 04 21

Minutes for the Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century (MCTF) Task Force Meeting

Subcommittee Meeting: Local Engagement

November 4, 2021, 12:00 p.m. via Zoom

Meeting Topics:

- Meeting opening, roll call, welcome (chair)
- Housekeeping notes (EEA representatives)
- Meeting purpose and agenda (chair and facilitator)
- Identify relevant issues/overlap from other subcommittee and Task Force meetings (for later discussion)
- Review Directive ii and iii gaps and sources
- Presentation (Russ and Heidi) and discussion on landowner opt out
- Begin discussion of gaps and sources for Directive viii
- Action items and input on Meeting 4 agenda
- Wrap up (chair)
- Closing remarks and vote to adjourn (chair)

The subcommittee meeting was called to order by Chair Heidi Ricci at 12:04 p.m. and a quorum was established. Members in attendance included, Russell Hopping, Priscilla Matton, Derek Brindisi, and Eve Schluter. Jenny Helmick reviewed the agenda items with the group and noted the letter from Senator Comerford regarding the opt out process. Heidi Ricci informed the group she would only act as chair when she states she's acting as chair otherwise Jenny Helmick would run the meeting and Heidi Ricci would act as a participant.

There was discussion about DPH presentation and participation in meetings (Best Practices and Task Force). Alisha Bouchard stated that it is her understanding that EEA is coordinating with DPH to provide presentations and answer questions that were asked of DPH.

Flag relevant issues/overlap regarding development of recommendations that overlap with other Subcommittee and Task Force meetings

Overlapping issues that were identified included: education/outreach, and community needs.

Review Directives 2 and 3: Gaps and Sources

Municipal Opt Outs: When tackling gaps and sources, Jenny Helmick directed the subcommittee to identify the gap that a resource they are providing fills. In that context, a discussion about Senator Comerford's letter and comments from the Uxbridge Board of health ensued. Jenny Helmick noted that the subcommittee members should review the documents and if there was more information and dialogue needed then the subcommittee would revisit the idea of public participation and listening sessions. Priscilla Matton noted that whoever is speaking to Senator Comerford needed to communicate and make it clear that this subcommittee will not be making changes to the opt out process for next year. Priscilla Matton recommended that the letter should be shared with the full task force and not just the Local Engagement subcommittee. Derek acknowledged that communities that had problems with the opt out process have been identified and mentioned that this has been one of the objectives to try and provide recommendations for. Derek commented that getting information from these communities would help the subcommittee come up with strong recommendations to come back to the full committee. Russell Hopping noted that it would be helpful hear from a town that was approved for the opt out and a town that was not approved for the opt out to provide a balanced approach. Priscilla Matton noted that perhaps the subcommittee could get more information from DPH on the characteristics that determine if towns were approved or denied. Priscilla Matton also suggested the subcommittee speaking to a town that doesn't have

mosquito control and a town that does have mosquito control could be helpful in determining their options for mosquito control. Russell Hopping noted the need to focus on long term recommendations rather than the specific opt out for one more year.

Listening Session: Heidi asked if the listening sessions can be structured in a way that Legislators can speak and that transparency, input, and participation was important, not just for the committee, but for this process. Eve Schluter noted that the report did allow for public comments, and that these comments had been compiled. Eve Schluter mentioned that the subcommittee should be open to the idea of talking with people who are open to providing feedback.

The group discussed the need for additional input to supplement existing information. Jenny Helmick asked the subcommittee group if there was anything else for gaps and sources related to directive 2 and 3. There were no responses and comments from the subcommittee members

- Presentation from Russell Hopping and Heidi Ricci on Landowner opt out

Russell Hopping provided an overview of how the Trustees go through the opt out and exclusion process. He noted that the Trustees opt out about 500 parcels in 47 towns and the process to compile this information could take a few days. The Trustees provide GIS/GPS based mapping data for parcel information. Russell Hopping discussed another layer to their process related to the three organic farms on Trustees land. Russell Hopping noted that the opt out on-line does not give the Trustees an option to identify certified organic farms. Additionally, relative to the organic farms, they get a notification from MDAR every year that certification is still relevant and that they want to opt out. Each certified organic farm has their own person that oversees the process and MDAR initiates the confirmation with on an annual basis. Russell Hopping noted that he has appreciated the work of the MCDs; however, the burden for the Trustees is that the opt out is only for one year and that can be a challenge. Russell Hopping mentioned that perhaps having it for more than one year would be helpful. Also, Russell Hopping noted that the Trustees never know accurately what gets treated. Russell stated that they have yet to see a map of what gets treated and he would consider that a data gap for the Trustees at this time.

Jenny Helmick then turned the meeting over to Heidi Ricci. Heidi provided an overview of Mass Audubon's perspective and shared reasons why she believes people opt out.

- Concerns about human health and general desire to reduce chemical exposures. Concerns from individuals with underlying health concerns.
- Concerns about health impacts such as links to disease.
- Concerns about non-target impacts to insects and other beneficial organisms.
- Questions about efficacy of spraying compared to other methods.
- People are moving away from chemical lawncare and may have home gardens
- Who requests opt-outs: conservation organizations, federal lands, individual landowners? Increasing trend in number of landowners opting out.
- Mass Audubon's Drumlin farm – sales of 500k/year; uses organic methods but not certified.
- Working to do ecological restoration at many sites. For example, Tidmarsh restoration.
- Procedural aspects – improved but still burdensome. A volunteer spends a whole day every year submitting the same information every year. Signage requirements are a big concern for cost, unsightliness, signs blow down and become litter. Use of GIS instead of pie plates is on a case-by-case basis, we're not sure which districts are doing it, it's burdensome, and if pie plates aren't posted they're not protected legally if there were an incident.
- Concern about inability to opt out of aerial spraying even in cases like Drumlin and Tidmarsh.
- Work to do ecological restoration to see how much that can reduce mosquitoes – research seems to indicate healthy wetlands produce many fewer mosquitoes.

Eve Schluter noted that natural heritage review maps of where mosquito control might apply pesticides and they identify areas with rare species that should not be sprayed. Eve Schluter noted that both presenters highlighted procedural concerns with the opt out/exclusion process and that one recommendation could be for a user-friendly online system using mapping technologies. It is noted that some of the other things previously discussed fall more under Directive 8 ***Directive: (viii) providing for comprehensive annual evaluations of each season's mosquito control process, including the effectiveness of the process in controlling arbovirus and any effects of spraying on the environment, agriculture, and wildlife.***

Eve mentioned that the Subcommittee may be straying from the charge and wanted to harness what we're talking about into concrete recommendations; for example, promoting public participation, local options, and comprehensive annual evaluations.

Jessica Burgess noted that opt-out is statutory, exclusion is regulatory. Jessica Burgess commented that she can pull that together and provide it as foundation to structure recommendations.

Heidi asked Priscilla Matton if it would be possible to provide aerial maps of spraying and other various MCD data. Priscilla Matton responded that it would not be possible to provide a specific map of spraying due to the volume of the request but if a town/member municipality asked what was used in a particular area, the MCD could provide that. The group discussed the use of GPS data in determining areas that are treated for mosquitoes. Jessica Burgess confirmed spray information was public, but specific location of traps was not publicly disclosed as there have been examples of tampering. Russell Hopping commented that if the subcommittee wants to focus on local engagement, we need to have access to this data on where spraying occurs. Heidi added that there could be an interactive map and people could zoom to their area of interest.

Priscilla Matton also mentioned that MCD's can't predict where there will be an arbovirus issue each year. While the MCD's have some idea, random human cases can pop up for WNV or EEE which can change things. They use an IPM approach where data is used. Eve Schluter suggested that after a certain time perhaps data could be shared through MA GIS to help inform the towns regarding requests for opt outs. Heidi noted that not knowing about where testing is taking place and how decisions are made to do treatments in relation to disease risk makes it very difficult for local officials and residents to understand what is going on.

Heidi asked Priscilla how they address the label provisions on adulticide chemicals about avoiding spraying to fish bearing waters, blooming weeds, or crops when there has been no evidence of disease in that season. Priscilla Matton responded that based on the interpretation of the label, they are not making applications to water. For bees and blooming crops, the SRB came out with a directive back in 2007 or 2006 that bees are active between sunrise and sunset, so if we are applying after those time frames, they interpret that to be in compliance with the label. Heidi questioned the interpretation of the pesticide label since many wild species of bees are present on flowers at night, and felt that may be something for other subcommittees to address. There was discussion between members regarding spraying to water, mosquito habitat, and label interpretation. Jessica Burgess provided clarification to Heidi's questions regarding bees and pesticides and noted that this was something that EEA will need to circle back on as this topic overlaps with the Pesticide Selection and Best Practices subcommittees.

- Begin discussion of gaps and sources for Directive 8

Directive: (viii) providing for comprehensive annual evaluations of each season's mosquito control process, including the effectiveness of the process in controlling arbovirus and any effects of spraying on the environment, agriculture, and wildlife.

Heidi noted that there are gaps about efficacy and mentioned that there isn't a system in place to track both degree of effort and effectiveness. Eve Schluter commented that it's a challenge to design a study that can tease out what the variables may be to direct linkage to impacts. Department of Fish and Wildlife understands there are impacts they work to exclude areas with state listed species. Eve Schluter discussed that regulations are written, and the process is based on areas with records of these species. The group discussed that this may be an area of needed input, for example, future restoration efforts. Russell Hopping commented that the subcommittee

should start thinking about what, where, and when relative to a study and there may be value in considering a pilot program to determine how we get to these unknowns. The group discussed pilot projects and collaborating on existing community science projects to gather baseline data as a potential recommendation the subcommittee could make. Heidi added that the subcommittee may want to think about adding efficacy and aerial spraying to this program. Priscilla Matton noted that a pilot program should go outside of the MCDs and she recommended that a third party to do the pilot to provide a more objective approach. Priscilla Matton recommended a line item with funding for colleges or other third-party entities to do the study.

Abby asked if anyone would like to volunteer to start to draft a skeleton of threads related to documenting recommendations. There were no volunteers from the subcommittee, but ERG offered to come to the table with some straw proposals.

- Action items and input for next meeting
 - Discuss Directive 8
 - Next subcommittee meeting will be on 11/18
 - Senator Comerford and other supporting docs will be distributed prior to next meeting – ERG will circulate that information
 - Jessica Burgess to provide excerpt on Statute's and Reg's – ERG will circulate prior to next meeting
 - Public comments will be provided

Abby turned it over to Heidi Ricci to close out the meeting. Heidi addressed any public comments via the Q&A function in Zoom. The Zoom commenter asked to ensure that we are looking at and receiving all the public comments. Heidi thanked everyone for their time, effort, and listening to one another. Heidi took a motion to adjourn at 1:54 pm. The motion is seconded by Eve Schluter and Priscilla Matton. All members raise their hand to acknowledge and agree to the motion to adjourn the meeting.

MCTF Local Engagement Subcommittee Meeting Minutes 11 18 21

Minutes for the Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century (MCTF) Task Force Meeting

Subcommittee Meeting: Local Engagement

November 18, 2021 12:00 p.m. via Zoom

Meeting Topics:

- Meeting opening, roll call, welcome (chair)
- Housekeeping notes (EEA representatives)
- Meeting purpose and agenda (chair and facilitator)
- Identify any additional overlap from other subcommittee and Task Force meetings
- Process for outlining recommendations
- Any feedback/questions following DPH presentation to Task Force
- Letters about municipal and landowner options and opt-outs: Relevance for filling gaps/developing potential recommendations
- Directive viii: Any additional gaps/sources?
- Read any Q&A/Wrap up (facilitator and chair)
- Vote to adjourn (chair)

The subcommittee meeting was called to order at 12:05 by Heidi Ricci. Roll call was conducted, and a quorum was established. Subcommittee members in attendance included Eve Schluter, Priscilla Matton, and Russell Hopping. Jan Connery provided an overview of the agenda and communicated the primary purpose for the meeting was to determine the process for outlining recommendations.

Jan Connery asked if the subcommittee members had noted any items that may be overlapping with other subcommittee groups and there was no feedback from the group. The conversation moved towards the process for outlining recommendations. Jan noted there were three ideas harvested from the notes. Eve Schluter asked if the group could spend some time reviewing to flush these out a bit more. There was some concern amongst the group about the time frame related to when the group would need to present and to ensure there was enough time to consult on these topics within the meeting.

Jan Connery noted an option for the subcommittee was to think about having another meeting prior to the 12/14 task force meeting. Heidi Ricci noted that might be an option, but not sure about coordination. Heidi Ricci liked Eve Schluter's suggestion for subcommittee members to throw out ideas during the meeting to capture thoughts. A point of clarification was made that the group needed to get this information back to ERG by the end of day 11/29. Heidi Ricci and Russell Hopping noted that they had some ideas that might better fit on other subcommittees. Jan Connery commented that ERG could facilitate that and noted that the group will want to clearly indicate which directive applies to the subcommittee.

Jan Connery showed the group the recommendation process and moved to items #2 and #3. She provided an overview of the template and opened to the group for thoughts. Russell Hopping noted that he would prefer to see an approved collaborated list from step one before the group started picking from individual ones that may or may not be present yet. The majority of the subcommittee agreed with Russell's recommendation.

Jan Connery asked the subcommittee group to start getting a sense of top 1-3 ideas that may make the most difference and be feasible. She noted that the group will want to get input on the list and it's a tool to move towards which ideas have critical mass that may be top candidates. She stated that she would share the document to the subcommittee but would modify the document based on the comments from this meeting and to be

prepared to discuss at next subcommittee meeting. Russell Hopping noted that he would still like to see the full list developed as a subcommittee team to get the benefit of the entire team perspective.

Heidi Ricci commented that the subcommittee still had not heard from DPH. Alisha Bouchard commented that DPH is working on the questions that were submitted and will be presenting at the next full Task Force meeting. Heidi Ricci reminded the group of the documents that were previously shared and encouraged the group to review and read them. Jan commented on the schedule and the December 30th meeting to determine if it needed to be rescheduled. She suggested two alternative dates during the week of 12/9-12/13, or mid-January. Priscilla Matton, Russell Hopping, and Eve Schluter preferred pushing it into January. Heidi Ricci entertained a motion to adjourn from Priscilla Matton, seconded from Eve Schluter. All in favor said aye. The meeting was adjourned at 1:00 pm.

MCTF Local Engagement Subcommittee Meeting Minutes 12 02 21

Minutes for the Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century (MCTF) Task Force Meeting

Subcommittee Meeting: Local Engagement

December 2, 2021, 12:00 p.m. via Zoom

Meeting Topics:

- Meeting opening, roll call, welcome (chair)
- Housekeeping notes (EEA representative)
- Meeting purpose and agenda (chair and facilitator)
- Identify any additional overlap from other subcommittee and task force meetings
- Discuss process for outlining recommendations
- Review subcommittee input on initial list of recommendation ideas and brainstorm recommendation ideas for outline development
- Read any Q&A/Wrap up (facilitator and chair)
- Vote to adjourn (chair)

Heidi Ricci opened the meeting at 12:01 p.m. and conducted roll call and a quorum was established. Subcommittee members in attendance included Priscilla Matton, Eve Schluter, and Russell Hopping. Derek Brindisi was not in attendance due to active military duty and it was yet to be determined when Derek would be back with the subcommittee. Heidi noted that this session represents the fifth meeting of the subcommittee and stated she would be participating as both chair and participants and will only be acting as chair when identified as such. Jenny Helmick shared the agenda for the meeting. Heidi discussed purpose and agreement on process of outlining and brainstorming recommendations. Heidi inquired about meeting minutes. Alisha Bouchard notified Heidi that draft minutes have been completed and were in final review.

Heidi asked if there was any input regarding subcommittee overlap. Priscilla noted at the Best Practices meeting a recommendation was discussed to move education out of the MCDs and make it the sole responsibility of DPH. Priscilla noted that this was something to consider as we talk through what we mean by local engagement. Heidi noted that it was difficult to make recommendations when there was no designated policy structure. Also, Heidi thought messaging coming from the MCDs and local Boards of Health was important and related to the question of overall framework.

Jenny Helmick asked a question to the group of how we frame this up in the subcommittee. Heidi asked Priscilla to clarify which subcommittee recommended the education point and Priscilla noted it was the Best Practices subcommittee. Heidi noted that the MCDs get inquiries and respond to people and thought that the messaging should be consistent amongst DPH, MCD's and local Boards of Health. Russell Hopping noted that these were just Richard Robinson's recommendations and it had not been vetted yet by the entire subcommittee. Jenny commented that it would be good to take this up as an overlap item. Heidi noted that she still felt that education was a topic that should be taken up by the Local Engagement subcommittee.

Hearing no other comments on overlap items, Jenny moved to the topic of agreement from subcommittee members on the process to engage and to outline recommendations. Jenny noted that each subcommittee member would take on responsibility to draft recommendations based on their expertise. Jenny presented a listing of recommendations that have been drafted so far for input and additions if needed. Jenny recommended two ways to look at the recommendations. First, any low hanging fruit or recommendations the group could readily come to agreement on. Second, to think in terms of priorities – what were must haves to determine success of the subcommittee. Jenny asked the subcommittee group if they wanted to spend time on overall program goal and

framework? Russell Hopping noted that it may make sense to start with a goal to define what local engagement means and for him he was thinking about the opt out process.

Alisha Bouchard offered to provide the MCD framework and the MCD local board of commissioners. Alisha noted they have legislation that defines certain positions, and it may be something for the subcommittee to look at. Jessica Burgess noted that other than Cape MCD, all other MCDs have their commission appointed by the SRB. The SRB appointment process applicants were voted on by member communities, they were local representatives from local communities. Heidi Ricci noted that she was aware of those local representatives and noted the issue was there was no public engagement in the framework and operations, and it was not addressing the framework and best practices of mosquito control statewide. There was nothing tying what happens at the MCD level to comply with the state arbovirus plan and, zero public input into those statewide plans and updates. Russell Hopping commented similar to Heidi and noted that the commissions seem far removed from engagement with the local community. Russell asked how we can make that more effective in terms of local Engagement and noted perhaps we have a two-tier system.

Jenny asked Priscilla Matton or Eve Schluter if they had any comments. Eve noted if there should be a recommendation of two levels, higher level input and recommendations more on the local level. Priscilla noted that the commission does hold monthly meetings that were open to the public that no one attends. Priscilla commented that information was sent to cities and towns regarding budgets and operations and there was minimal feedback from member communities. Priscilla commented that anyone can come to a commission meeting as they were public bodies. Heidi noted that it was helpful to know the information that Priscilla provided. Heidi commented that there was currently no ability for communities to have operations done in a different way and no amount of public comment changes that. Heidi noted that was why a science-based plan was needed that was more responsive to community desires. Eve noted regardless of structure there might be a general lack of understanding of how communities interact and since we were talking about local engagement it will be critical to get the word out regarding education and public input.

Russell asked if the MCD committee meetings meet at one location in the district every month and can we look at recommendations that these meetings be done through Zoom to create greater participation. Jessica Burgess noted the commissions were all state public bodies subject to open meeting law (OML) and they must meet in a particular location each month. Meeting notices and agendas were posted and MCD budget policy was posted on the website. Jessica noted if it was helpful, information can be provided to the subcommittee to help understand how the commissions were structured. Heidi commented on environmental justice policy and protocols and how to engage the public. Heidi noted that many people even if they have the time may not feel comfortable speaking up and posed the question if there were other ways to engage the public and to think creatively on how else we can engage to ensure we were providing information in a form that was accessible to large segments of the public.

Jenny asked the subcommittee if they wanted to spend more time on new ideas that have come up. Such as, engaging the public, surveys to the public, and MCD commissions. Jenny shared her screen with the group and presented the framework document that Heidi drafted. Heidi noted that the framework needs to be based on science. Heidi proposed that DPH be in the lead. Reconstitute the SRB with ecological, wildlife expertise, and ecotoxicologists and within that framework develop a plan to consider new information and IPM with measurable thresholds. More local engagement for land use. Heidi noted IPM, education, and source reduction as the most bang for the buck and to only use adulticiding in limited cases. Larviciding was also of concern due to the development of resistance, but this may be a topic for some of the other subcommittees to explore. Heidi commented that the overall theme was science based with public input and that the MCDs still exist but under a different coherent system.

Jenny opened it up to the group for conversation and input. Eve thanked Heidi for drafting the framework that was shared with the group and thought the framework should be shared with the full task force. It was noted that the draft framework should be on the agenda for the overall task force to review and comment on. Heidi and Russell agreed with Eve regarding the framework being included on the next task force agenda as this was something that needs to be discussed a layer above this subcommittee. Priscilla noted the framework was over the subcommittees head but was part of the underlying theme of how we make recommendation, and it will be interesting in figuring out how to get more engagement. Engagement may be seen differently for member and nonmember communities.

Jenny commented that she heard from the group that we need to carry on making specific recommendation but need to figure out how we get the proposed framework on the task force agenda on 12/14 for consideration.

Alisha commented to the group to come up with what the agenda item and it can passed forward to Caroline Higley. Alisha acknowledged that something was in the Q&A section from Brian Rosman on behalf of senator Comerford's Office that played a key role in drafting the legislation. Brian Rosman commented "we envisioned recommendations for comprehensive overhaul to be within the task forces charge". Heidi proposed for the next task force meeting that there be an item on the agenda for the task force to discuss the overall goal and potential framework for mosquito control.

Eve asked if the framework can be distributed to the task force in advance of the meeting for consideration and potential discussion. Jessica noted that the best way to do it was to draft it as an agenda item to get it out sooner and flag it for people for people to come prepared to discuss at the task force meeting. Jessica noted that we would figure out a way to get out in the most appropriate and effective way. Heidi noted that she did submit the framework to the ERG facilitators for the best practices and policy structure subcommittees and she was hoping to submit some further thoughts on their directives. Heidi also noted that she agreed with sharing the draft goal and framework with the full task force. Priscilla commented that because she was not a member of the policy structure subcommittee, she was not sure how the recommendation would be received. Priscilla noted that those recommendations should not come from the whole local engagement subcommittee but rather from Heidi specifically. Heidi noted that she was ok with that approach as they were her viewpoints.

Russell asked Jenny if the other two directives were listed in the document that Jenny was sharing with the subcommittee and Jenny noted that they were. Russell commented that he was using the directives to frame his recommendation and it sounded like most agreed with the local landowner opt out process that was recommended and documented. Priscilla noted that opt out was being discussed in the best practices subcommittee as well and has a lot of crossover. Eve commented that clarity was needed on how decisions were made when municipalities meet criteria for opting out. For example, were things weighted more heavily. Clarity was needed on how the opt out process work. Heidi agreed that there was a lack of clarity on the opt out criteria and how things work. Eve noted that this may overlap with the best practice and policy structure subcommittees.

Russell asked if the recommendation could be made that the municipal opt process not go past next year. Priscilla agreed we could make a recommendation. Priscilla noted that the decision to opt out needed to be made in April and what happens in August can be very different. Priscilla commented that it was a difficult balancing act and gave a bit of an edge to DPH as they were balancing a benefit towards health. For example, if DPH was suggesting a town be sprayed it was in the best interest of the town. Russell commented that he thought a new framework was the way to go and recommended an opt in process for towns versus an opt out process. Priscilla responded to Russell that there were criteria in the state response plan and provided an overview of the criteria and asked Russell what other criteria he would want. Russell noted that in terms of best practices where was this town in the grand scheme of risk and that may not be enough to say to the town you were high or low risk. Russell noted that it did not seem like there were clear thresholds and we were trying to move away from variability over time. There may be some spikes but where does the town sit in risks going forward.

Priscilla noted that DPH may be able to provide a heat map of where arborvirus may occur and Russell noted that would be helpful information for a town to have. Heidi commented that it was important to recognize that WNV and EEE were different. Heidi noted the need of frequent coordination with the communities getting messages out to the public about managing their properties to avoid WNV. Heidi noted EEE was rare but was nothing to ignore considering the implications of the disease, again noting that WNV and EEE were very different. Heidi also pointed out the DPH arborvirus plan said aerial applications cannot and do not eliminate risk. In extreme high cases DPH was doing it to reduce risk not to eliminate risk. Heidi commented that there were a lot of technical issues beyond what the task force can do and the best we can do was to set up a framework for ongoing agencies and experts to continue to revise protocols and thresholds of the plans.

Priscilla commented on the cyclical nature of EEE. Priscilla noted that it was a rare event when aerial applications were done. Priscilla cautioned making hard and fast recommendation when we may not see EEE again in 10 years and she would like to keep in consideration that we don't do this every year, data and science was used when deciding to spray. Eve commented on the concern of emerging diseases. Certain diseases may be rare now but that may not be the case moving forward and building in flexibility and an adaptive approach will be critical.

Jenny asked the group if they wanted to formulate a recommendation more specifically at this point. Eve noted a need to closely examine the opt out process. Some of the model warrants more discussion and cross pollination between the various subcommittee. Priscilla agreed and noted how to move forward with municipal opt out will be the question and a recommendation needs to be as clear as possible regarding criteria for opt out consideration. Jenny asked about what Russell brought up regarding opt in versus opt out. Priscilla commented from a mosquito control perspective the MCD's would need to have an opt out not an opt in. Priscilla noted that about one tenth of 351 towns in the Commonwealth applied to opt out. It was noted that opt out from the state side referenced opting out from aerial spraying for EEE.

Jessica noted that the group should think about the formal role for taking action with a local legislative body. Eve commented on how many towns submitted to opt out and noted that we needed to be careful about how many towns opted out as it could have been a timing, capacity, or understating issue with communities. Eve noted that feedback was heard. Heidi agreed with Eve's commentary and noted that this pointed to the subcommittee's other directive around availability or option of services. Heidi noted that all communities should have access to education and surveillance. There was a need to be adaptive over time as more information was received. Heidi noted that the problem currently was that there was not good data on efficacy and non-target impacts to people and the environment. There was a need to structure a framework that addresses EEE while also still respecting the rights and desires of local communities and residents. Heidi noted that this was a tough balancing act, and a Framework may be more beneficial than coming up with a formula that addresses everything.

Priscilla noted the need for public input during town meetings if residents wanted to opt out of spraying. Jessica commented to what Priscilla had mentioned to consider the framework. Was it a board of selectman, city council, or board of health, or was it the local legislative body operating under a town meeting structure? There were opportunities once or twice per year for town meeting for decision making. Two different options to think through about the implications of picking one or the other for public input and municipal action. Jenny asked if the committee needed to decide on one of those avenues or would that be part of examining the process? Eve noted that it be part of examining the process and to gain a better understanding of the pros and cons of different perspectives. Russell agreed and asked if the provision for municipal opt out goes away after this year? Jessica commented that it does and all of 2A goes away after this year. Heidi noted that she thought that it was very important that there be public input at the higher level for when the state steps in and there should be improved lines of communication during that timeline. Heidi commented that public information about aerial spraying could be communicated better. Heidi noted she has never received more than 24-hour notice.

Priscilla commented that once a decision was made to spray, people want to know where, when, why, and what. Priscilla noted that maybe public education was exactly what we need to help to inform the public. Heidi commented that this was where we need to get into more technical analysis. Was there efficacy and how do we measure that? Heidi noted that she was interested to go the other direction on public education and protection because she was not convinced there was efficacy in aerial spraying. Heidi noted she could be convinced but needs to see the data.

Jenny asked the group if anyone would like to start drafting recommendations. Russell offered to start drafting landowner opt outs, but not municipal opt outs. Eve commented that she was wondering about feedback on the framework for the full task force meeting on 12/14 and noted that it would help inform how some recommendation may be developed. Jenny noted that she will be circulating the table of documentation to the group and the subcommittee will be providing an update at the task force meeting on 12/14. Jenny noted the subcommittee meeting on 12/16 would prioritize recommendations that will need to be drafted over the next couple meetings.

It was noted that the 12/30 meeting was canceled and rescheduled for 1/18 from 11-1. Priscilla asked if the group should make a recommendation to the task force for a fill in on the subcommittee. Heidi noted that it would be beneficial if we could get clarity on Derek's timeline. Heidi commented that if it was going to be more than 3-4 weeks, we may want to get someone to step in in Derek's place. Heidi recommended Joanne Lindenmayer, or perhaps Derek had someone he could recommend from his community. Jessica responded regarding the appointment process to replace Derek and noted the decision would need to be made to formally replace him and would need to be go through a process. Priscilla recommended adding someone that was already on the task force. Heidi commented that she was not sure about having another existing member of the task force, she was open to it but noted that Derek brought municipal perspective. Jessica commented that she believed Derek's appointment may be an SRB appointment and the SRB would need to identify a replacement and go through the formal process for subcommittee member replacement. Russell seconded the idea that if someone was going to replace Derek that they have a municipal perspective.

Jenny noted that there were no questions or comments in the Q&A chat function. Heidi asked if the public listening session had been scheduled. Alisha noted that she would check with Caroline Higley on the public listening session. Priscilla commented that she thought it had been pushed to January because of the December task force meeting. Heidi asked if there were any additional requests for future agenda items and nothing was noted. Heidi thanked everyone for their time, effort, and participation. Heidi Ricci took a motion to adjourn the meeting. Motion was made by Priscilla Matton and seconded by Eve Schluter. All in favor said aye. The meeting was adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

MCTF Local Engagement Subcommittee Meeting Minutes 12 16 21

Minutes for the Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century (MCTF) Task Force Meeting

Subcommittee Meeting: Local Engagement

December 16, 2021, 12:00 p.m. via Zoom

Meeting Topics:

- Meeting opening, roll call, welcome (chair)
- Housekeeping notes (EEA representatives)
- Meeting purpose and agenda (chair and facilitator)
- Approve meeting minutes (if available in advance)
- Identify any additional overlap from other subcommittee and Task Force meetings
- Continue discussion of recommendation ideas and outline(s) developed
- Set priorities for further outline development and assign members
- Read any Q&A/Wrap up (facilitator and chair)
- Vote to adjourn (chair)

Heidi Ricci conducted roll call at 12:02 p.m. and all subcommittee members were in attendance other than Derek Brindisi. Jenny Helmick discussed the need to identify an alternate chair and asked if anyone was willing to step into an alternate chair role. Jenny and Heidi discussed the role and responsibility as chair. Russell Hopping offered to co-chair. Jenny noted that meeting minutes were distributed for the first two meetings. The vote on meeting minutes would be tabled until the next meeting so subcommittee members have time to review.

Identify any additional overlap from other subcommittee and Task Force meetings

Heidi Ricci commented that she did not feel that her questions were answered by the DPH presentation that was given at the full task force meeting. Heidi noted that she felt as though the human health topic was important to the full task force. Heidi referenced a 2021 article and asked that it be shared with the subcommittee and the full task force as it is foundational to the human health discussion. Heidi provided a link to the article and Jenny pulled it up for the group to review. Heidi asked if the link could be sent as a follow up to full task force members. Jessica Burgess noted there is no OML reason why this link can't be shared with the task force. Jessica commented that the link itself was fine as long as there was not an opinion-based narrative along with it. The group discussed the need to solidify direction through a purpose statement and general framework. It was noted that the Policy Structure subcommittee agreed that this topic be discussed at their next full meeting after the holidays.

Continue discussion of recommendation ideas and outline(s) developed

Jenny brought up the calendar of meetings and presented it to the group and discussed the remaining meetings in January and February and the need to start outlining draft recommendations expeditiously. In addition, ERG could take what has been heard and draft straw recommendations for the subcommittee to work with. It would need to be things that have been deliberated on. Jenny opened it up to thoughts and comments from the subcommittee group. Subcommittee members agreed with the proposed approach and Jenny noted the need to identify the content that the group needs assistance with.

Jenny showed the group Russell Hopping's draft recommendation on landowner opts which was focused on easing the burden of landowner opt outs. Jessica noted that Russell's recommendation was regulatory and would need to go through a regulatory review process. Russell commented that was helpful to know. Jessica discussed two different types of opt outs and described the regulatory aspects within MGL 252 and Section 2A. The discussion focused on how the regulation would apply to MCD and SRB activity. Subcommittee members and meeting attendees discussed the aerial application regulation language related to markings and the need for some clarity. Heidi noted fleshing out the regulatory language through MDAR and ERG would be helpful. Jessica noted that regulatory information could be provided.

Heidi asked Priscilla if GIS data could be incorporated into MCD systems for exclusions? Priscilla responded that she believed for the most part yes but the more information the MCDs received the better it would be. Russell explained the rationale for his recommendation. Russell clarified his draft recommendation was for landowner opt out not municipal opt out. Russell took the underlying questions and highlighted anything that intersected with opt out exclusion requests. Russell's intent was to support the case that all three directives would at least be partly addressed and set the stage for a two-part recommendation: First, reduce the requirement for ground and aerial markings by adding in GIS boundary data. Second, recommend a data-based option for automatic annual renewal.

Heidi Ricci commented on the annual renewal process and acknowledged that this recommendation would require funding to make it happen. The group discussed this as a larger IT effort and thought that there may be a desire to do something like this in the Commonwealth. Alisha Bouchard highlighted the point about funding and the notion that in the draft recommendation there be language that we get the IT resources to facilitate this. It was noted by some members of the subcommittee that IT resources are currently stretched thin in the state due to ongoing Future of Work initiatives. Eve Schluter also mentioned the need to support an IT system and provide ongoing maintenance and dedicated resources would go a long way.

Jessica Burgess commented that thousands of exclusion requests are received every year and that MDAR also gets many requests not to be excluded from spraying. Jessica also discussed the regulatory amendment process. Heidi Ricci appreciated the time involved on both sides and mentioned the current system was a large cost and burden on large landowners and would hope that a new system would create efficiencies for landowners and state agencies. Priscilla and Russell discussed the landowner exclusion process of providing information outside of the online portal. Jessica responded regarding the current process and legal requirements of submitting through the online system or by mail to MDAR.

Priscilla commented that there still needed to be a submission method for individuals that are not tech-savvy. The concern was that there could be long-term difficulties getting the process through all the steps to be approved and a paper form could take off some of that burden. Russell commented that his recommendation did not eliminate the paper option, but paper would become more difficult to use. There was a preference to get away from paper. Heidi Ricci noted that since the parcel data is in GIS, parcel data should be easier to find. Heidi also agreed that there should still be a paper option for those that do not want to submit electronically. Priscilla thanked Russell for putting the recommendation together and the laws and regulations that would be impacted. Jenny noted that Russell's document would be distributed to the group.

Members of the subcommittee discussed coordination with Heritage for rare species habitat. Eve noted that this was limited by regulation as there was no jurisdiction over areas that one day may become habitat. Heidi commented that this was an area that may need to be flagged for regulatory change. The conversation continued between Heidi and Eve. Eve noted that this would require review of things that aren't under current purview. Heidi recommended flagging this and flushing out what the concern is and what we are looking for, as it would become increasingly important as more restoration projects come up. Russell added that there may be a tool already in place and just need to develop a process. Heidi clarified that this was only for emergency spraying events. Heidi volunteered to flush this out a bit more through background and rationale documentation.

Set priorities for further outline development and assign members

Jenny pushed the group to identify recommendations that may be critical and the highest priority for the subcommittee to develop for public input. Russell brought up the periodic survey of municipalities and annual reporting of treatment areas. These recommendations were areas that provide real data and feedback to address goals. Heidi recommended public input into the overall plan, annual reporting, and engaging the public as priority areas. Priscilla noted engaging with the public by letting them know the MCDs are there, having the public participate in commissions, and provide an opportunity for the public to provide input into the plan, although the average person may not know how to address mosquito control.

Eve noted that this may be a broader recommendation on the development of an outreach plan for the MCDs. Priscilla recommended caution in putting this on the MCDs as there needs to be more focus on those towns that

don't have MCD's to ensure information is consistent. It was stated that there was a recommendation being drafted in the Best Practices subcommittee for the state to be responsible for outreach and education and it would be optional for the MCDs. Heidi reiterated the framework for a broader statewide system of outreach on what people can do towards personal protection and source reduction. It is mentioned that municipal public engagement is needed for communities. There needs to be more structure on the municipal approach and there needs to be public input and public engagement for decision making.

Russell stated he could see the Best Practices subcommittee handling this as a best practice that all towns come up with a good housekeeping plan to address mosquito control. For example, what you are doing around your yard and roadside trash that could reduce the risks of WNV? Jessica clarified that not every city or town is in an MCD, but there is an MCD that every city or town could join if they are not a member. Russell noted that he would not want to see an obstacle with opting into an MCD and that there should be funding available to remove a burden of allowing an MCD to assist a town or city.

Jenny asked the subcommittee members what they thought about priority development and prioritizing recommendations. Heidi thought the overall plan with local options was falling under the two directives. Noted there may be one solution to two of the directives. Priscilla stated that she could not support a municipal tiered option, as a menu-based option does not follow an IPM approach. Priscilla noted that there may be assumptions that towns must have surveillance and education and other things are optional. A true menu-based system would mean towns can ask for just larviciding or just adulticiding. Priscilla was concerned that she couldn't support some of the other recommendations about public engagement if this was put into the same recommendation.

Heidi envisioned the recommendation would be IPM with public education and surveillance as a baseline statewide. Members of the subcommittee discussed the efficacy of aerial based larvaciding and adulticiding and steps in the process of determining necessary pesticide application. Russell noted the need to flesh this out more to get down to the definition of IPM. Jenny noted that perhaps this is one that ERG should take to develop some sort of straw recommendation. Heidi referenced Boulder. Priscilla responded that Boulder had very different mosquitos and disease issues. Heidi noted that we need to know about mosquito populations not just disease which can lead to activities like water management. Heidi acknowledged this may not get fleshed out in the recommendation and perhaps we lay out a few options here if full agreement cannot be reached.

Read any Q&A/Wrap up (facilitator and chair)

Jenny noted the need to return to directive 3. Jenny mentioned that ERG could take on the municipal option or survey to put together straw recommendations. There was discussion related to homework assignments. There was a question in the Q&A from Brian Farless that Jenny reviewed with the subcommittee group. Heidi Ricci and Priscilla Matton discussed larval dips prior to application. It was noted that Brian Farless is the Superintendent of Suffolk and East Middlesex MCD's

Vote to adjourn (chair)

Seeing no other questions or comments Heidi Ricci took a motion to adjourn from Priscilla Matton. Seconded by Russell Hopping. All those in attendance voted aye. The meeting was adjourned at 2:01 pm.

MCTF Local Engagement Subcommittee Meeting Minutes 01 10 22

Minutes for the Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century (MCTF) Task Force Meeting

Subcommittee Meeting: Local Engagement

January 10, 2022, 12:00 p.m. via Zoom

Meeting Topics:

- Meeting opening, roll call, welcome, housekeeping notes
- Meeting purpose and agenda
- Approve meeting minutes (10/7, 10/18, 11/4, 11/18)
- Review updated MCTF calendar (12/27 email)
- Continue discussion of recommendation ideas and outline(s)
- Assignments for 1/18 Subcommittee meeting; input on Meeting 8 agenda
- Read any Q&A/Wrap up
- Vote to adjourn

Meeting opening, roll call, welcome, housekeeping notes:

The subcommittee meeting was initiated, and a roll call was conducted by Heidi Ricci at 12:04 p.m. Subcommittee members in attendance included Priscilla Matton, Eve Schluter, and Russell Hopping. Alisha Bouchard provided an overview of housekeeping updates.

Meeting purpose and agenda:

Heidi Ricci noted that the meeting purpose was to develop recommendations and to ensure that the subcommittee was on schedule to have draft recommendations submitted to the full task force. Heidi Ricci inquired about scheduling for the public listening session and Alisha Bouchard stated that she would follow up related to the public listening session scheduling. It was mentioned that ERG had drafted some recommendations based on previous subcommittee conversations and that material would be reviewed during the meeting.

Approve meeting minutes (10/7, 10/18, 11/4, 11/18):

The meeting minutes from 10/7 were brought up first; however, some of the subcommittee members had not reviewed the minutes from 10/7 and 10/18, so it was agreed that the meeting minutes would be voted upon at the next subcommittee meeting. The group moved to the 11/4 and 11/18 meeting minutes. Priscilla Matton, Russell Hopping, and Heidi Ricci isolated meeting minute language that required clarification and edits. The recommended edits to the 11/4 meeting minutes were updated based on the feedback that was provided. Heidi Ricci took a motion to approve the amended minutes from 11/4. A motion was made by Russell Hopping and seconded by Priscilla Matton. A roll call was conducted: Russell Hopping (aye), Eve Schluter (aye), Priscilla Matton (aye), Heidi Ricci (aye). The group moved to the 11/18 meeting minutes. Heidi Ricci noted a minor correction, which was updated in the minutes. No other recommended edits were suggested. Heidi Ricci took a motion to approve the amended 11/18 minutes. A motion was made from Priscilla Matton and seconded by Eve Schluter. A roll call was conducted: Russell Hopping (aye), Eve Schluter (aye), Priscilla Matton (aye), Heidi Ricci (aye).

Review updated MCTF calendar:

It was discussed that there would need to be three subcommittee meetings in February. It was noted that a poll was distributed by ERG to determine additional meeting times. The group discussed the 2/24 meeting logistics. Heidi Ricci asked Caroline Higley if the listening session had been scheduled and Caroline Higley noted that the listening session scheduling was in process and further information would be announced at the full task force meeting.

Continue discussion of recommendation ideas and outline(s):

Ten recommendations were presented to the group, and it was noted that the first six were sent to subcommittee members. It was discussed that ERG could provide additional assistance and direction on drafting if needed. The first two recommendations that were discussed, Exclusion/Opt-Out Online Form and Property Marking Methods, which had been fleshed out by Russell Hopping. Starting with Exclusion/Opt-Out Online Form, Russell Hopping discussed the need to understand how many people opt-out on an annual basis as it would be helpful when evaluating a statewide mosquito control program. Priscilla Matton noted that information was currently available through the annual MCD reports and provided an overview of annual report information and process. Heidi Ricci and Russell Hopping clarified that they were thinking of this in the context of an online system that would track annual registrations and where information could be housed in one place.

Russell Hopping commented on some of the terminology in the recommendation language and clarified that he meant both adulticiding and larviciding related to spraying. Heidi Ricci discussed the aerial spraying process for landowners with sensitive habitat. Jessica Burgess provided an overview of the exclusion and opt-out process. It was noted that opt-outs are statutory, and exclusions are regulatory. Jessica Burgess and Heidi Ricci discussed the opt-out/exclusion process in a public health hazard situation. Heidi Ricci noted that if it didn't fit here, she would still like it documented for future discussion and input about whether certain entities are excluded. Eve Schluter discussed excluded land that was made available through the Natural Heritage permitting process and added that there was some level of information that was not available for the public. For example, specific species information would be excluded from public record. Jenny Helmick noted that some of these items had been flagged for later discussions.

Russell Hopping discussed the opt-out and exclusion language in the recommendation. Jessica Burgess clarified the statute's language that addressed the spray activity that was conducted by the SRB. It was noted that private landowner opt-out requests historically had not been honored because spraying was only conducted when there was a public health emergency. Subcommittee members discussed including larvicide in the recommendation wording. Priscilla Matton provided her perspective regarding both larvicide and adulticide being chemical controls. There was conversation regarding the use of the term "spraying" and it was agreed the language in the recommendation would be changed to include "application of pesticides". Jessica Burgess noted the suggested recommendation language may not be consistent with the statute language and suggested that MDAR would review.

The subcommittee members discussed the timeline and feasibility of implementing an online system. Eve Schluter noted that a three-to-five-year timeline seemed too long. Subcommittee members noted that there was an ability to make this recommendation a priority and suggested including language that would ask for the system to be implemented as soon as possible. Jessica Burgess provided context regarding timing of the regulatory amendment process and Alisha Bouchard added to Jessica Burgess's point that we could be working with EEA IT to get the project in queue while the regulation was being worked on. All subcommittee members agreed to move this recommendation forward to the task force for review.

Subcommittee discussion moved to the property marking methods recommendation. Russell Hopping commented on the public health designation regarding the three areas that are opted-out from spraying, certified organic agriculture, aquaculture, and areas that have been identified by Natural Heritage. All subcommittee members agreed that the recommendation could be shared with the task force.

The next recommendation that was reviewed by the group was a menu-based approach. Priscilla Matton noted that she could not support a menu-based mosquito control program and did not think it would be feasible for a city or town to know how much it would cost. Priscilla Matton mentioned that she would consider this recommendation for any new town joining an MCD, but for existing towns it would be difficult to comply. Heidi Ricci noted that other subcommittees are discussing basic mosquito control services provided statewide and hoped there could be agreement to move the recommendation forward even if the details remained murky. Eve Schluter suggested that if this was a broader recommendation it may need to be addressed through a working group. Subcommittee members discussed how funding was currently set up for mosquito control and it was noted that the Policy structure subcommittee had discussed including a line item in the state budget for mosquito control with the ability for municipalities to add services through cherry sheet deductions if they wanted.

Heidi Ricci noted that there was a need to map out what the state IPM process was and have the state and the MCDs follow that process. Priscilla Matton discussed the need to balance what made sense based on surveillance versus private applicators applying pesticides. Heidi Ricci commented that her vision was that the state would be providing baseline funding for MCDs to provide services and what other subcommittees have discussed was that private applicators should also be subject to the same rules as the MCDs. Heidi Ricci noted that she would not want a community to get spraying through private applicators. Subcommittee members discussed if there were ways to incentivize communities to rely on services that are prioritized based on IPM and how a menu-based system could be done equitably. Priscilla Matton discussed mosquito habitat and the lack of available source management for EEE mosquitos. It was noted that adulticiding was the best option for controlling EEE and that a state-based funding mechanism would be reasonable in non-EEE risk communities.

Jessica Burgess noted that it would be helpful if this was flagged for the Policy Structure subcommittee. Other than East Middlesex and Pioneer Valley MCDs, it was funding that came through the cherry sheet funding structure. Heidi Ricci commented on the need for a goal and framework that presumably all the MCDs, private contractors, and municipalities would follow.

Eve Schluter noted that the recommendation needed additional thought and suggested the subcommittee highlight the issues to make sure it was addressed with more time and thought. Heidi Ricci commented that there may not be time to do this recommendation based on OML requirements and thought the communication to the task force could be general related to the barriers of communities joining MCDs based on the current structure. Jessica Burgess discussed the draft recommendation revision process related to OML to ensure information could be shared with subcommittee members. Russell Hopping noted that he would be comfortable sending this forward with the suggestion that it required additional funding. It was also suggested that there may be potential for including this into the recommendation to repeal and replace M.G.L. 252. Heidi Ricci asked for permission to share what she had drafted regarding a goal statement and framework since it was pertinent to the discussion.

The subcommittee group moved to the next recommendation of municipal survey. Heidi Ricci thought that the recommendation should also include a broad-based survey to the public. Russell Hopping recommended having language regarding implementation to get the best feedback and to determine what the timeline looked like, for example, a five- or ten-year timeline for survey distribution. Eve Schluter noted that ten years felt too long as it was too much of a gap. Priscilla Matton suggested that this may be better placed in communities that are not part of an MCD. Heidi Ricci noted that the survey be included in the larger framework of the statewide mosquito management plan with options for public input. Subcommittee members discussed the usefulness of having geographic information in discerning certain opinions across the state. Russell Hopping noted that he saw this as more objective about what types of mosquito control not necessarily the service. Jenny Helmick suggested that the details needed to be worked out and asked for subcommittee consensus on a broader survey versus non-MCD community survey. Eve Schluter commented that she would not want to limit potential feedback and input and there was additional discussion amongst the group on the usefulness of having this opened as a broader survey for feedback. The suggestion was made to move this forward with the caveat that the scope of the survey was still under discussion.

The subcommittee group moved to the next recommendation, pilot evaluation of non-target impacts, and agreed with recommending a study, but also suggested that this included a full suite of services versus just spraying. Subcommittee members noted that this may require more discussion and recommended something more broadly such as partnerships for research. It was agreed that there was a need to return to this to flush it out more, but that it could be mentioned to the task force as a topic for recommendation.

The next recommendation, revision to the municipal opt-out process, was reviewed and subcommittee members agreed to move this forward to the full task force. Jenny Helmick shared the preliminary draft language for the remaining recommendations. Eve Schluter noted that there may be an opportunity for consolidation in the remaining recommendations. Heidi Ricci asked to screen share a document with the subcommittee related to the framework that she drafted. Heidi Ricci noted that she would send the draft language to Jenny Helmick and requested that she also be able to share it with the entire task force. Russell Hopping recommended putting Heidi Ricci's framework document on the agenda for the next meeting so the subcommittee could review.

Read any Q&A/Wrap up:

Russell Hopping mentioned that there was a comment in the Q&A regarding the opt-out process. The comment was read to the subcommittee group and an answer was provided.

Vote to adjourn:

Heidi Ricci asked if there were any other questions from subcommittee members. Priscilla Matton asked about the time that was allotted for subcommittees to provide their updates during the full task force meeting. Caroline Higley clarified that there would be time ten minutes allotted for each subcommittee draft recommendation update and 20 minutes each for discussion. Seeing no other comments from the group Heidi Ricci took a motion to adjourn from Priscilla Matton. Seconded by Russell Hopping. All in favor said aye. The meeting was adjourned at 2:04 p.m.

MCTF Local Engagement Subcommittee Meeting Minutes 01 18 22

Minutes for the Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century (MCTF) Task Force Meeting

Subcommittee Meeting: Local Engagement

January 18, 2022, 11:00 a.m. via Zoom

Meeting Topics:

- Meeting opening, roll call, welcome (chair)
- Housekeeping notes (EEA representatives)
- Meeting purpose and agenda (chair and facilitator)
- Approve meeting minutes 10/7 and 10/18
- Calendar: Confirm additional meeting
- Review 1/13/21 Task Force feedback
- Input on goal/framework statement
- Recommendations: identify top priorities and continue discussion
- Assignments for next subcommittee meeting; input on Meeting 9 agenda
- Read any Q&A/Wrap up (facilitator and chair)
- Vote to adjourn (chair)

Meeting open, roll call, welcome, housekeeping notes:

Meeting initiated at 12:05 pm and roll call was conducted by Heidi Ricci. Subcommittee members in attendance included Russell Hopping, Priscilla Matton, and Eve Schluter. Alisha Bouchard provided a housekeeping update.

Meeting purpose and agenda:

Heidi Ricci commented that recommendations were being developed and referenced the conversation on overall goals and framework. It was noted that the group would spend the meeting building on draft recommendation language. Jenny Helmick shared her screen and addressed the agenda items with the group.

Approve meeting minutes from 10/7 and 10/18:

10/7 minutes were approved for vote. A motion was made by Priscilla Matton and seconded by Eve Schluter. A roll call was conducted. Heidi Ricci (aye), Russell Hopping (aye), Eve Schluter (aye), Priscilla Matton (aye). 10/18 minutes had recommended edits which were amended during the meeting with subcommittee member feedback and input. A motion was made to approve the amended meeting minutes by Eve Schluter and seconded by Priscilla Matton. A roll call was conducted. Heidi Ricci (aye), Russell Hopping (aye), Eve Schluter (aye), Priscilla Matton (aye).

Calendar: Confirm additional meeting:

Jenny Helmick recommended holding Feb 2nd from 9:00 – 11:00 a.m. as the proposed date for an additional subcommittee meeting. Priscilla Matton reminded the group that she was not available on 1/27 for the subcommittee meeting.

Review 1/13/21 Task Force feedback:

Jenny Helmick recapped some of her notes from the full task force meeting and opened it up to the group for comments and feedback. Russell Hopping commented on a section of the ERG report that referred to the MCDs having the available technology to do what the subcommittee was recommending. Alisha Bouchard clarified that the Pioneer Valley was a newly formed MCD that was scaling up and does not have all the required technological

capabilities yet. Priscilla Matton flagged that not all the MCDs use the same program and equipment for larviciding and adulticiding and that having the ability to see physical markings would be helpful. Heidi Ricci discussed a potential short term and long-term solution related to a unified system that worked together. It was also acknowledged that the recommendation would need additional funding.

The subcommittee discussed boundary markers as a possible solution as well. Jessica Burgess commented that this was specifically related to the MCDs and not to anyone else performing the same type of work. Russell Hopping noted that he was looking at technology to address many problems. Russell Hopping also mentioned that the Trustees have signs that disappear all the time and would rather build into recommendations that funding be made available for applicable technology to fill the gaps. Russell Hopping added to Jessica Burgess's point, that he was not sure who else would be doing wide area application. Jessica Burgess discussed the regulations definition of a wide area application and noted that the group wouldn't want to create blanket changes that cause conflict. For example, a municipality hiring a private company to do wide area application. Jessica Burgess noted that the regulation was set up broadly and was flagging that this regulation was not written just for mosquito control.

Priscilla Matton noted that she spends \$7,100 a year on maintenance support for existing technology in her MCD and added that recommendations should have additional funding to address on-going support. Eve Schluter added that all the recommendations need that have the caveat that they are funded with financial support for implementation. Based on the subcommittee meeting discussion, Jenny Helmick recommended clarifying the recommendation language and asked if the group agreed with revisions based on the conversation. The subcommittee group agreed with ERG making the minor revisions to the recommendation draft language. Eve Schluter asked about subcommittee background from the full task force meeting since she had to leave that meeting at 1:00 pm. Jenny Helmick provided a synopsis of the meeting to get Eve Schluter up to speed.

Input on goal/framework statement:

Jenny Helmick presented the document to the group for their review. Heidi Ricci discussed the high-level approach and provided her thoughts through the framework and goal statement. Heidi Ricci noted that this was a start with the overall goal and how it should be structured and was put together from her perspective on the establishment of a logical program. Heidi added that she was hoping that this was food for thought so people could identify some areas of agreement or identify areas of change. Russell Hopping and Eve Schluter thanked Heidi Ricci for putting this document together. Eve Schluter commented on the ask to figure out where the subcommittee goes with something like this. Jenny Helmick recommended that the team goes through the document to prepare for task force discussion. Heidi Ricci asked if Derek Brindisi was receiving subcommittee e-mails in the event he was able to review to provide feedback to be shared back to the subcommittee group. Jenny Helmick noted that Derek Brindisi was included on all information that was distributed to the subcommittee.

Recommendations: Identify top priorities and continue discussion:

Jenny Helmick presented a document to the group to prioritize eight draft recommendations in order of importance. Each subcommittee member went through a forced ranking exercise of their highest to lowest rated draft recommendations. Priscilla Matton added that her review was focused on how to get people involved since this was the Local Engagement subcommittee. Based on the feedback that was provided from the group on the forced ranking exercise, Jenny Helmick suggested that the subcommittee focus on "public input for annual mosquito control planning" and "municipal opt out". Russell Hopping also shared his feedback regarding the ranking decisions that he made. The "pilot evaluation of environmental impacts" recommendation was discussed as potentially being better suited with Best Practices subcommittee.

Subcommittee members commented on DPH providing statewide education and surveillance. Priscilla Matton discussed the complexities of the recommendation and added that MCDs couldn't be tasked to do surveillance for a town outside of an MCD and added that there was uncertainty on how DPH would want this to happen. Russell

Hopping emphasized the importance of nailing this down to determine how the subcommittee would approach this. Heidi Ricci noted that there should be base state funding for regional surveillance and discussed other surveillance options with a reference to Uxbridge as an example. Heidi Ricci commented that it was tough determining the role of the state and MCDs working with towns on surveillance and operations. Jessica Burgess clarified that the MCDs are the state. Heidi Ricci added that state dedicated funding for surveillance had been identified as a need so every municipality could have access to surveillance and education with a process for additional municipal service options if needed. Alisha Bouchard posed a question regarding statewide surveillance and if there was a virus finding in a community that was not part of an MCD, what would the town do? Alisha noted that this was a flag for the group.

Priscilla Matton discussed the difficulty of addressing these issues if a municipality was not part of an MCD at the beginning of the season and added that the MCDs may not have the resources or staff to address the needs. Heidi Ricci noted the point was well taken. If a municipality were to opt-in it would need to be done a year in advance and built into the budget for the community and the MCD. Heidi Ricci and Priscilla Matton discussed land management services that were available for communities that were part of an MCD. Priscilla Matton added that if there was a menu-based suggestion for towns that are not part of an MCD that there would have to be dedicated funds ensuring MCDs could stay afloat. Jessica Burgess noted that under current legislation the MCDs are only allowed to provide services to municipalities in certain geographic areas and there was no ability under the current legislative structure to have membership of communities that don't reside in the geographic areas of MCDs.

Russell Hopping noted that surveillance data and education assist in reducing risk and would allow people in communities to become more engaged. Russell added that it was important for the subcommittee to determine how to move forward with implementation because it would be beneficial and useful in thinking about public and local engagement. Eve Schluter discussed working under the current structure in the context of ensuring the loop of information was being shared across subcommittee groups. Eve Schluter noted that she wouldn't want the subcommittee to narrow the view of recommendation discussions. Heidi Ricci and Russell Hopping agreed and commented that they were thinking about this beyond the status quo.

Jenny Helmick discussed the "statewide mosquito surveillance" recommendation language and addressed the comments and questions that were documented. Russell Hopping asked about statewide surveillance and if it would cover all 351 towns and municipalities. Heidi Ricci added that the intention of statewide mosquito surveillance would be for every town and there could be prioritization of areas where there was a known threat of EEE. There was additional conversation in relation to statewide education and the subcommittee group discussed how to address open questions while also addressing the needs of local municipalities.

Priscilla Matton noted that she had attended local events where DPH provided education and she recommended getting feedback from a town that was not part of an MCD to get their perspectives. Russell Hopping discussed the need for a road map for communities to disseminate information so there was a clear understanding of what needed to happen on the municipal level about education and how it should be delivered. Heidi Ricci commented on communities wanting surveillance and land management services that were not part of an MCD and how this could happen so communities could benefit from MCDs and their equipment. It was added that some communities may want some of these services but not spraying. Priscilla Matton noted that she hoped communities looked at mosquito control information from DPH and MDAR as they are the experts and would make decisions that were in their best interests of local communities. Priscilla Matton added that people still need to take personal protection, and this was reiterated on every call received by the MCD.

Subcommittee members discussed communities that want spraying and communities that do not want spraying and that there was a need for a system that enabled communities to get the services that were appropriate for them. Jenny Helmick asked the group for ideas on how to move forward with the recommendations. Priscilla Matton noted that she did not support a menu-based approach and would need to defer to other subcommittee members. Eve Schluter suggested that recommendations are advanced with broad concepts that highlight what

consideration ideas should be. Heidi Ricci asked Priscilla Matton for clarification on how responding to resident calls to spray was IPM. Priscilla Matton noted that the MCDs have more data than just residential requests and they don't spray every request the moment they are received. It was added that MCD surveillance data could be utilized to reinforce an IPM approach. Priscilla Matton discussed towns deciding that they wanted to join an MCD but didn't want adulticiding and that residents could request to become a no spray. Heidi Ricci discussed the impacts of pesticides and was interested in data and statistics on reduction in disease. Heidi Ricci also wanted to be on record that it was her belief that the ERG model in the report was not scientific and deeply flawed.

Assignments for next subcommittee meeting; input on Meeting 9 agenda:

Jenny Helmick recommended that the topics for the next subcommittee meeting focus on the "public input for annual mosquito control planning" and "municipal opt-out" recommendations. Russell Hopping asked about straw polls and Jenny Helmick noted that ERG had created some rudimentary straw polls for these recommendations.

Q&A/Wrap up, vote to adjourn:

There was no Q&A noted. Heidi Ricci thanked everyone for the work and participation and mentioned that the sponsors of the mosquito control legislation were holding a briefing on 1/26. Seeing no other comments from the group, Heidi Ricci entertained a motion to adjourn from Priscilla Matton. Seconded by Russell Hopping. All in favor said aye. The meeting was adjourned at 1:04 p.m.

MCTF Local Engagement Subcommittee Meeting Minutes 01 27 22

Minutes for the Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century (MCTF) Task Force Meeting

Subcommittee Meeting: Local Engagement

January 27, 2022, 12:00 p.m. via Zoom

Meeting Topics:

- Meeting opening, roll call, welcome (chair)
- Housekeeping notes (EEA representatives)
- Meeting purpose and agenda (chair and facilitator)
- Recommendations: Review drafts and continue discussion/refinement
- Assignments for next subcommittee meeting; input on Meeting 10 agenda
- Read any Q&A/Wrap up (facilitator and chair)
- Vote to adjourn (chair)

Meeting opening, roll call, welcome, housekeeping notes:

The meeting was called to order by Heidi Ricci at 12:05 p.m. Subcommittee members in attendance included Eve Schluter and Russell Hopping. A housekeeping update was provided by Alisha Bouchard and it was noted that Derek Brindisi was back from his National Guard assignment.

Meeting purpose and agenda:

An overview of the agenda was provided, and Heidi Ricci noted that the subcommittee was in the midst of drafting recommendations. The public listening session date was confirmed for February 10th from 4:00-6:00 p.m. Heidi Ricci also commented on the legislative briefing that took place on the reform bill. The link for the briefing was shared with the group via chat. It was noted that a letter was sent from Senator Comerford's office to EEA regarding the municipal opt-out process and the letter was shared with the group via chat. Jenny Helmick provided an overview of the future subcommittee meetings and discussed the subcommittee forming draft recommendations with background information and minority opinions that would go to the task force for presentation. The final meeting for the subcommittee would be on February 24th which would provide an opportunity for the subcommittee to incorporate public input into the draft recommendations.

Recommendations: Review drafts and continue discussion/refinement:

The priority ranking table was presented to the subcommittee group and Jenny Helmick discussed Priscilla Matton's suggestion regarding the municipal opt-out recommendation. Heidi Ricci noted that comments were sent in regarding rare species and habitats and she asked that it be shared so it could be circulated to the subcommittee group. The subcommittee members discussed folding the municipal survey recommendation into the recommendation that focused on promoting creative ways to engage the public. Heidi Ricci supported that approach and asked for feedback from the group. Both Russell Hopping and Eve Schluter agreed with that approach. Jenny Helmick shared Priscilla Matton's feedback that she did not support a municipal survey because the details were not there, and it would only have a limited benefit to towns that were not part of an MCD. Russell Hopping noted that he understood what Priscilla Matton was saying but he still thought it was an important tool for communities in relation to improvements and results that should be made public to improve the goal of local engagement.

The recommendation draft for promoting creative ways to engage the public was presented to the group. Jenny Helmick shared Priscilla Matton's feedback regarding the topic being too broad and the suggestion was made that the recommendation should focus on the language within the first paragraph. Heidi Ricci discussed a few different concepts with the recommendation and commented on source reduction, personal protection, public engagement on best practices, the mosquito management plan, annual reporting back to the public, and more public

engagement around the program and activities. Eve Schluter commented on what fit under the recommendation or what could potentially fit under a different recommendation. Russell Hopping thought the recommendation needed to be broadened since it was providing data and how communities wanted to use the data to perform education and engagement at the local level. Subcommittee members discussed the opportunities for source reduction and mosquito control. Heidi Ricci commented that some of the other subcommittees were heading in the direction of major reorganization of the whole program and noted that currently the response plans under SRB and DPH did not have public input into the process. It was added the plan should be based on science with options for public input.

Eve Schluter discussed the sub-components for the recommendation in relation to outreach and soliciting input and noted that both were important concepts with the potential for overlap with other subcommittees. Heidi Ricci noted she would agree with merging into one recommendation with two separate components. Subcommittee members discussed the benefit and process. Jenny Helmick provided Priscilla Matton's comments related to her disagreement on public commentary into the plan. Eve Schluter noted that public input was inflowing information to be considered by decision makers versus dictating the decision-making process. Jenny Helmick noted that if there was agreement on the suggested recommendation changes, ERG could complete the edits to reflect the input feedback loop and the outreach component.

Subcommittee members discussed changes to the recommendation language. Russell Hopping commented on the need to clarify the term "recent" and if it made more sense to change the term to "annual". Heidi Ricci discussed the need for IT systems to create better reporting so agencies and the public could better understand the information. There were additional conversations amongst the subcommittee members in relation to the timeline and intent for what was meant by "recent". Heidi Ricci noted that compiling data and having it all in one place would take some investment from the state. Eve Schluter added that there were ways to build dashboards to present information within systems that were currently available. Subcommittee members commented that may be a solution to assist with closing the gap sooner. Jenny Helmick commented that ERG would take all the discussion content and consolidate into one recommendation and would also review with other subcommittees to see what they were thinking of as well.

Jenny Helmick commented on the recommendations that Russell Hopping had drafted. Russell Hopping added he was still concerned about the marking language and noted that he thought that should be an option and not a requirement. Russell Hopping discussed how the MCD GIS process was working on the Trustees opt-out area without issues. Jessica Burgess flagged for Russell that not marking property would be a failure of compliance under the existing regulation and without a regulation change there could be risks. Heidi Ricci agreed with Russell Hopping and commented on the need to not get too specific with recommendations due to evolving technology. It was added that methods may evolve over time and there was a preference to see this in guidelines versus regulation. Subcommittee members discussed potential modifications to the existing recommendation language. Alisha Bouchard reiterated to the group that not every MCD had this technology due to budget restrictions. Russell Hopping went back to a question he had on property markings that had to do with the scope of spraying and if it was restricted to just mosquito control. It was suggested that based on the subcommittees charge it needed to be specified that this only applied to mosquito control activities.

The subcommittee group moved to the on-line system recommendation that Russell Hopping had worked on and there were no other thoughts or comments from the group. It was also suggested that the subcommittee wait until Priscilla Matton was back to discuss the menu-based approach recommendation. All subcommittee members in attendance agreed.

The group shifted to the municipal opt-out recommendation. Heidi Ricci inquired about spraying requests within 300 feet of excluded property and asked if that was a general practice or was that something that was in regulation. Taryn LaScola responded that was a best practice and it was not required by regulation. Heidi Ricci discussed if the subcommittee wanted to make a recommendation to make this a regulation as opposed to best practice. Russell Hopping noted the Trustees get these requests from MCDs and the Trustees allow the MCDs to spray property owners that border Trustee land. Heidi Ricci added that this may be a broader topic that covers private mosquito control applicators as well. Subcommittee members discussed a subcomponent of the

recommendation to establish a best practice in the regulation to prevent drift onto properties that have opted out. Jenny Helmick noted that the subcommittee needed to find a place to fold that in as part of the recommendation.

Subcommittee members discussed baseline services and an opt-in process for communities that wanted services beyond the baseline that was being provided. Heidi Ricci commented on aspects of state versus local control and noted that she had not seen any evidence that aerial spraying was effective. Heidi Ricci thought local control was important and would support the sunset of the current municipal opt-out process in favor of moving to an opt-in program. Eve Schluter noted that this was an opportunity to determine what the subcommittee wanted the program to look like to replace 2A. Subcommittee members discussed the current local option to opt-out but only with state approval and the suggestion was made to change the recommendation language to include baseline services and additional opt-in services which could include wetland restoration projects and culvert replacement. Heidi Ricci noted that with a statewide system there could be a more efficient sharing of equipment and services and added that regionalization could help improve efficiencies. Heidi Ricci asked for permission to share the letter from Senator Comerford's office that was sent to EEA regarding the municipal opt-out process. There were no objections from the subcommittee members and the letter was shared with the group. Heidi Ricci provided an overview of the letter and it was noted that the letter would be distributed to the subcommittee group.

The subcommittee group moved to the next recommendation topic, increase transparency on operational exclusions for rare species/sensitive habitats. Heidi Ricci provided an overview of the comments that she had regarding the recommendation and discussed the MOA between MDAR and Fish and Wildlife on endangered species habitat. Eve Schluter provided her understanding of the emergency spray process to remove habitat from any aerial spray event. Heidi Ricci noted that landowners did not have a role in this process and asked if annual maps were available. Eve Schluter commented on what was published and available and noted that the permits that were issued were a public document. Jessica Burgess added that permits that were issued were narrow and tailored and was not the type of permit that was open ended. The permit was issued to MDAR, SRB, DPH, and contained areas that were based on a review that was relevant at the time of a spray event.

Heidi Ricci discussed the protection of endangered species and noted that a lot of data comes from conservation organizations to Natural Heritage and she would like to see an opportunity for landowners that were interested to have input. Eve Schluter commented that it was the mandate of Natural Heritage to review these activities and have these protections in place for rare species. Eve Schluter added that Natural Heritage's expertise based on the data and the level of impact were working towards minimization as much as possible in the face of public health issues. Heidi Ricci discussed conservation landowners protecting their own lands and noted the Statewide Mosquito Management Plan related to the criteria for drawing the maps for exclusion and the overall criteria on how decisions were being made. Eve Schluter noted that conservation organizations can already work with Natural Heritage related to overall management plans and she did not think there was a need to create a new system. Heidi Ricci and Eve Schluter continued their discussion on the maps that were available for review for aerial spraying events. It was clarified that priority habitat maps already existed and Natural Heritage was doing the overlay of what species were within the footprint and response and feedback was provided to the MCDs annually.

Jennifer Forman-Orth discussed the process that MDAR participated in with Fish and Wildlife on an annual basis through an MOU that gave the MCDs the ability to see priority habitat. Alisha Bouchard noted that Priscilla Matton may be helpful to the conversation to provide an MCD perspective. Heidi Ricci commented that conservation organizations didn't understand what went into the maps for emergency declarations and they also didn't get notified. Heidi Ricci added that she was looking for a way to provide input and noted that there may be increased sensitivities that Natural Heritage was not aware of and it seemed odd that there were no opportunities to exchange feedback and input. Heidi Ricci noted that she was looking for a comment process to consider all the efforts that were going into restoration. Russell Hopping discussed Trustee properties in Southeastern MA and inquired if the Trustees knew of endangered species on those properties could they talk with Natural Heritage to exempt the area from mosquito control. Eve Schluter answered yes and discussed the process further. Heidi Ricci recommended that this topic may be best suited for the Statewide Mosquito Management Plan.

Assignments for next subcommittee meeting; input on Meeting 10 agenda:

It was noted that the subcommittee would review the recommendations that focused on increased sharing of pesticide application locations and pilot evaluation of environmental impacts. These recommendations were not reviewed during the meeting, but attention would be paid to these recommendations at the next subcommittee meeting on February 2nd. Russell Hopping commented that he was able to look at the recommendations and provided his feedback. Heidi Ricci also added that the document that she marked up be shared with the subcommittee members.

Read any Q&A/wrap up, and vote to adjourn:

There were no comments in the Q&A. Seeing no other comments from the group, Heidi Ricci took a motion to adjourn from Eve Schluter. Seconded by Russell Hopping. All in favor said aye. The meeting was adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

MCTF Local Engagement Subcommittee Meeting Minutes 02 02 22

Minutes for the Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century (MCTF) Task Force Meeting

Subcommittee Meeting: Local Engagement

February 02, 2022, 09:00 a.m. via Zoom

Meeting Topics:

- Meeting opening, roll call, welcome, housekeeping notes
- Meeting purpose and agenda
- Approve meeting minutes
- Recommendations: Review drafts and continue discussion/refinement
- Assignments for next subcommittee meeting; input on Meeting 11 agenda
- Read any Q&A/wrap up, vote to adjourn

Meeting opening, roll call, welcome, housekeeping notes:

The meeting was called to order at 9:08 a.m. A roll call was conducted, and a quorum was met. Subcommittee members in attendance included Priscilla Matton, Eve Schluter, Russell Hopping, and Heidi Ricci. A housekeeping update was provided by Jessica Burgess

Meeting purpose and agenda:

The meeting agenda was presented to the group. Heidi Ricci mentioned the distribution of documents to subcommittee members, which included the letter from Senator Comerford that was sent to EEA. Heidi Ricci asked if there were key things that the subcommittee members would like her to highlight during the task force meeting and there were no suggestion made by the group. Eve Schluter noted that she would not be able to attend the subcommittee meeting on 2/24.

Approve meeting minutes:

Subcommittee members agreed to vote on meeting minutes at the next meeting so they could have more time to review.

Recommendations: Review drafts and continue discussion/refinement:

Jenny Helmick provided an overview of the six recommendations that had been previously discussed. It was noted that the seventh recommendation had not been discussed in detail and Eve Schluter had drafted a process document for sensitive habitats which would be presented to the group.

Online system for requesting property exclusions and property opt-outs & Marking methods for property exclusions and property opt-outs: Jenny Helmick asked the subcommittee members if there were any needed edits to the recommendation language. Heidi Ricci recommended clarifying language in the recommendation to include “carryover” versus “re-submit”. Russell Hopping discussed the second recommendation in terms of it being incorporated into the new statewide mosquito plan. There were no other suggested changed to the draft recommendation language.

Public engagement: Priscilla Matton had a question on verbiage related to “effectiveness” and noted that the group had not decided what constituted effectiveness. Heidi Ricci discussed input on routine operations, emergency response, and the DPH surveillance and response plan as the new structures the group was talking about. It was added that a reconstituted board and a mosquito management plan would include all these things

with public input and periodic review. Russell Hopping added that the municipal survey needed to be more inclusive in representing how the community felt versus a board of health or an individual making decisions. Secondly, the public may not understand the IPM process and Russell Hopping noted that it would be worthwhile including what the IPM process looked like. Jessica Burgess noted that IPM was defined in 132B and the group could refer to that statutory language. Priscilla Matton commented on the dashboard to enter data and discussed the need to include funding in that language. Eve Schluter added that resources and funding was a reoccurring theme on many recommendations and suggested coming up with a consistent sentence on funding and support which could be used throughout. Heidi Ricci noted on the previous recommendation there was a section that addressed capacity and funding resources that were needed.

Menu-based approach: The recommendation was assuming the revisions to M.G.L. 252 would be pursued by the full task force. It was noted there were aspects of the recommendation that the subcommittee would not be able to determine in the time allotted. Priscilla Matton discussed the language on surveillance, education, and source reduction. Heidi Ricci noted she would prefer that every community have access to source reduction. Priscilla Matton commented on the operational process of planning ahead, especially in relation to equipment needed for source reduction. Heidi Ricci discussed examples of regionalization and increases in operational efficiencies in the use of equipment and services.

Priscilla Matton noted that she did not support the recommendation and inquired about how to communicate her minority opinion and commented on the current process and requirements for joining an MCD due to the enabling legislation. Jessica Burgess clarified the requirements and funding mechanisms to join an MCD and commented on the differences in funding for Pioneer Valley MCD and East-Middlesex MCD. Jessica Burgess also discussed the enabling legislation and the parameters set up for membership by the SRB. Eve Schluter asked what in the recommendation Priscilla Matton could support. Priscilla Matton discussed the individual landowner opt out process and noted that a town could join an MCD and people and landowners could potentially make the decision to be a no spray. Priscilla Matton commented that she would like to leave it to the MCDs to make the best choices for the communities.

Eve Schluter discussed if there was a way to incorporate Priscilla Matton's suggestions in consultation with a plan approved by the MCD. Priscilla Matton added to the discussion by expressing her concerns on funding levels needed to run an MCD. Heidi Ricci noted the directive of the subcommittee and commented on the concerns from local towns that wanted surveillance, education, source reduction, limited larviciding, but didn't want adulticiding. Heidi Ricci mentioned the model for Pioneer Valley and East Middlesex MCD was good and the subcommittee needed to provide something on local options. Subcommittee members discussed who would make the decision, such as a local board of health or select board and it was noted that this was something that had not been addressed yet.

Jenny Helmick noted that the subcommittee group could continue to work on the recommendation or there could be the creation of a minority opinion. Heidi Ricci commented as chair that it would be important to highlight in the task force meeting that the group has not come to consensus on this recommendation noted that it related to the determination if there would be a larger structural change. Priscilla Matton commented on Pioneer Valley MCD's lack of funding, resources, facility, and capacity. Jessica Burgess added that it had been a significant struggle getting funding and membership for Pioneer Valley MCD and the MCD had been fortunate that there was federal funding available to provide some services. It was noted that Pioneer Valley MCD was a \$5,000 per year buy-in for service and the district struggled to get communities to sign up. Heidi Ricci noted that it pointed to municipalities struggles with their budgets and determining their priorities. Heidi Ricci added that the recommendation was trying to ensure all communities had access to education, surveillance, and source control, and that the base level funding should be provided by the state.

Pilot evaluation of environmental impacts: Heidi Ricci noted that she preferred that this recommendation be broader and wouldn't be too prescriptive in how this was structured on approaches related to environmental and non-target impacts. Priscilla Matton discussed experimental design related to non-treatment, control areas, and areas within an MCD. Russell Hopping suggested focusing on two different geographic areas to add robustness to the study. Subcommittee members commented that the studies could be on various things like efficacy, non-target impacts, and operations with the concept being the encouragement of partnerships.

Subcommittee members continued discussing the recommendation language in relation to research programs that could include the effectiveness of innovative approaches like ecological restoration projects. Russell Hopping noted the need for a broader research recommendation to address knowledge gaps. Priscilla Matton and Eve Schluter discussed funding within sister state agencies. Eve Schluter added that she saw this as the development of a research program with input from state agencies on the process. Heidi Ricci noted that there could be existing grant programs that could and Eve Schluter added a suggestion related to leveraging existing partnerships such as UMASS and USGS on research opportunities.

Increase sharing of pesticide application locations: Priscilla Matton asked about the nature of the information and if it was private. Jessica Burgess clarified that spray location information was available to the public but was not sure how detailed the information was. It was also noted that trap location information was not shared publicly. Priscilla Matton asked the group what benefit they would get from the data. Russell Hopping provided his perspective representing a large landowner and noted that currently he has no way to know what was sprayed or to see the actual treatment areas. Russell Hopping added that there should be some way to narrow down what has been treated, how much was being applied, and was it applied in the same spot every year. It was added that this information would be helpful for planning. Heidi Ricci commented on areas that were treated repeatedly and noted that there should be work with that landowner on some type of management. Heidi Ricci added that it was also about transparency and public access to information on where these treatments were taking place.

Priscilla Matton noted that not all MCDs have catch basins predetermined in GIS and that it would be a much bigger lift with funding implications. Russell Hopping had a question related to how many catch basins were treated in a season. Priscilla Matton provided an answer on how catch basins were treated within Bristol MCD and noted that she did not have GPS locations on each catch basin that was treated. Priscilla Matton discussed that sometimes towns have this information and may be able to share the data. Subcommittee members discussed the treatment process for catch basins and it was noted that this information potentially tied in with another subcommittee on how stormwater systems were designed within communities. It was added that this information could be useful for the subcommittee and their recommendations.

Increased transparency on sensitive habitat/rare species exclusions: A document drafted by Eve Schluter was presented to the subcommittee to clarify the process on the Mass Wildlife review of mosquito control activities under MOA with MDAR. Eve Schluter discussed the three parts of the process related to mosquito control and clarified what fell under the different categories and how the various activities were reviewed. Heidi Ricci noted that the 2007 MOU should be shared with the subcommittee and may already have been shared through the GEIR. Heidi Ricci asked if the MOU needed to be updated and Eve Schluter noted that there could be an opportunity for updates and revisions to make it more current. Heidi Ricci commented on information that could be made public related to certain points in the draft document. Eve Schluter discussed what information could and could not be made public and it was noted specificity in exact locations were normally done through data release agreements. Eve Schluter mentioned that there will always be species that information will be withheld on because of the need to be extremely protective of those species. Heidi Ricci suggested a recommendation on the information that would be allowed to be provided and shared publicly. Eve Schluter referenced MESA and noted that the GIS site specific data would not be shared publicly. Heidi Ricci inquired if information could be shared from Natural Heritage on areas that were requested as no sprays. Eve Schluter noted that she needed to think through that more related to the permit and the memorandum. Eve Schluter also discussed the activities of open marsh water

management and that there was guidance that could be sent to the subcommittee to be shared more broadly. Heidi Ricci noted that that would be helpful related to what could be shared.

Read any Q&A/wrap up, vote to adjourn:

It was noted that there were no questions in the Q&A. Heidi Ricci provided a recap of the meeting and asked the subcommittee members if there was anything they wanted highlighted or discussed at the task force meeting. There were no suggestions from the group. Seeing no other questions or comments, Heidi Ricci entertained a motion to adjourn from Priscilla Matton. Seconded by Eve Schluter. All those in favor voted aye. The meeting was adjourned at 11:00 a.m.

MCTF Local Engagement Subcommittee Meeting Minutes 02 10 22

Minutes for the Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century (MCTF) Task Force Meeting

Subcommittee Meeting: Local Engagement

February 10, 2022, 12:00 p.m. via Zoom

Meeting Topics:

- Meeting opening, roll call, welcome
- Housekeeping notes
- Meeting purpose and agenda
- Approve meeting minutes 12/2 and 12/16
- Subcommittee input on goal statement
- Recommendations: Review drafts and continue discussion/refinement
- Assignments for final subcommittee meeting; input on Meeting 12 agenda
- Read any Q&A/Wrap up
- Vote to adjourn

Meeting opening, roll call, welcome, housekeeping notes:

The meeting was called to order at 12:04 p.m. A roll call was conducted, and a quorum was met. Subcommittee members in attendance included Priscilla Matton, Eve Schluter, Russell Hopping, and Heidi Ricci. A housekeeping update was provided by Alisha Bouchard.

Meeting purpose and agenda:

The meeting purpose and agenda was reviewed by Heidi Ricci. Jenny Helmick reminded the group of the public listening session and addressed the items that needed to be addressed before the next subcommittee meeting on 2/24.

Approve meeting minutes 12/2 and 12/16:

Heidi Ricci entertained a motion from Priscilla Matton to approve the amended meeting minutes for 12/2. The motion was seconded by Eve Schluter. A roll call was conducted. Priscilla Matton (aye), Eve Schluter (aye), Russell Hopping (aye), and Heidi Ricci (aye).

Heidi Ricci entertained a motion from Priscilla Matton to approve the amended meeting minutes for 12/16. The motion was seconded by Eve Schluter. A roll call was conducted. Priscilla Matton (aye), Eve Schluter (aye), Russell Hopping (aye), and Heidi Ricci (aye).

Subcommittee input on goal statement:

A goal statement was shared on the screen for subcommittee discussion. Russell Hopping asked if it was the same goal statement the best practice subcommittee came up with and Priscilla Matton clarified that it was not. Heidi Ricci provided her recollection of the goal language as was discussed in the best practice subcommittee meeting. Eve Schluter noted that she was more in favor of a framework versus a goal statement. Eve Schluter added that she would be interested in seeing the goal statement that the best practice subcommittee created. Jenny Helmick noted that ERG would be compiling all the different goal statements and would share them. Heidi Ricci commented that she thought the goal statement would be helpful in areas where people disagree and asked the group if anyone disagreed with best available science, protection of public health, and transparency and accountability as part of the goal statement. Eve Schluter noted that the general concepts made sense and Russell Hopping added that the concepts laid out by Heidi Ricci were right.

Heidi Ricci discussed a piece of information that she wanted to share with the group that related to several of the recommendations. Jenny Helmick shared the information with the subcommittee and Heidi Ricci provided an overview of public health perspectives from Dr. Christine Oliver who was formerly of MGH and Harvard Medical School and was an expert in occupational and environmental medicine. Heidi Ricci provided an overview of the content that was provided by Dr. Oliver. It was also noted that Dr. Oliver reviewed the DPH responses to Heidi Ricci's questions. Jenny Helmick commented that the document would be sent to the subcommittee.

Recommendations: Review drafts and continue discussion/refinement:

Jenny Helmick presented information related to feedback from the local engagement recommendations that were captured from the task force meeting. Russell Hopping asked a question related to the funding structure with Pioneer Valley MCD and the menu-based approach as described by Commissioner Lebeaux during the task force meeting. Alisha Bouchard provided a clarification on how Pioneer Valley MCD was funded based on a member community buy-in of \$5,000. Heidi Ricci discussed the competing priorities of municipality budgets and statewide baseline services being supported by the state. Jessica Burgess discussed that the legislature was not permitted to submit an unfunded municipal mandate and suggested during the feasibility review a funding option could be identified that might work. Eve Schluter noted that the funding piece seemed to be consistent across all the recommendations. Heidi Ricci agreed that funding was cross-cutting recommendations and that should be highlighted. Heidi Ricci commented on the new statewide mosquito management plan and envisioned it would require effort to pull together, but then periodic updates would be easier. Subcommittee members elaborated on the comments from the task force and Eve Schluter discussed the detailed review conducted by MA related to the endangered species act.

Online system for requesting and tracking property exclusions and property opt-outs: The subcommittee reviewed the draft recommendation background and rationale language. Heidi Ricci discussed clarity on landowners granting temporary waivers from exclusions or opt outs. Russell Hopping commented on the 300-foot buffer from MCD spraying and neighboring properties that requested MCD spraying and the tendency of the Trustees to grant those requests. Heidi Ricci clarified that she wanted it to be more landowner directed and discussed examples in 2019 of Mass Audubon approving spraying in communities that had elevated risk. Subcommittee members discussed the vision for the process for both landowners and MCDs. Russell Hopping noted that the Trustees only receive a few waiver requests every year and Heidi Ricci added that Mass Audubon denied requests in low-risk years. Eve Schluter provided a suggestion on the temporary waiver process. Jessica Burgess discussed regulatory oversight of the department and noted there was more to consider than system upgrades. Jessica Burgess explained the MDAR oversight regulatory process and what was needed in writing and noted that there are thousands of requests per year, and most were individual private property homeowner requests.

Heidi Ricci asked a question in relation to an MCD reaching out to Mass Audubon to ask if it was ok to spray neighboring properties. Jessica Burgess discussed general best practices and noted if there was going to be an exclusion to the process it was best to have something in writing. It was added that sometimes decisions need to be made in the moment based on the situation taking place. Heidi Ricci discussed the ability for landowners to revoke exclusion requests as part of the ideal overhaul of an IT system for statewide mosquito control. Taryn LaScola clarified that the 300-foot buffer for spraying was not a requirement but was best management practice and discussed the regulatory and enforcement perspective between the property that was excluded and the MCDs. Priscilla Matton added that exclusion information should be made available to the public. Russell Hopping asked Heidi Ricci if waivers do not happen very regularly, could the process revert to the way it was done between landowners and MCDs and Heidi Ricci agreed with that approach.

Marking methods: Subcommittee members discussed regulation language related to marking methods for the specific types of applications and discussed GIS boundary language in the recommendation. Heidi Ricci noted the exact language would need to be tweaked further. Russell Hopping noted he could not see anyone marking for aircraft.

Public engagement: It was noted that there were two parts to the recommendation, outreach and input. Priscilla Matton commented on how to define effectiveness. Heidi Ricci noted that measures of effectiveness was something that would need to be worked out in the new mosquito management plan and she didn't think the group could answer all the questions here. Heidi Ricci envisioned that during the development of a statewide mosquito management plan there would be public input, public comment, and periodic updates. Russell Hopping discussed the need for a statement that all public meetings that occur for mosquito control should include an option for people to participate remotely. Russell Hopping asked if there was a way the mosquito management board could assess the work of the MCDs. Priscilla Matton commented that she did not think there was a belief by others that MCDs were effective at anything and suggested that the assessment of effectiveness would be subjective. Priscilla Matton used an example of a water management project and the difficulty of showing a town the effectiveness of the project at reducing mosquitos. Jessica Burgess followed up on Russell Hopping's comments regarding remote public participation in meetings and noted that OML requirements on remote participation would determine what could and could not be allowed for meeting process. Russell Hopping suggested adding this in as it would be an important means to explore for public participation.

Heidi Ricci commented on measurements of effectiveness and moving towards standardization. Eve Schluter discussed effectiveness related to outreach efforts. Russell Hopping commented on what the Trustees thought of as measurements of success related to tools, education, and water management projects. Russell Hopping added that you might see a decrease in the number of phone calls in a specific area. Priscilla Matton commented on the summary of control efforts and effectiveness of IPM strategies and recommended taking out the word control and replacing with IPM tools. Russell Hopping suggested linking these to the goal statement.

Menu based approach: Priscilla Matton voiced another perspective to see if she could fit it into IPM and referenced towns that don't want to pay because they don't want all the services. Eve Schluter asked if there was a recommendation that could come out of this that would be productive. Priscilla Matton discussed surveillance, outreach, source reduction, and getting those services through the state for towns that are not part of an MCD, or to offer those services going forward for towns that were not part of an MCD. Priscilla Matton noted concern when hearing from MCDs that had a menu-based approach, like Pioneer Valley, and they didn't know where there funding was coming from. Heidi Ricci noted that Priscilla Matton was expressing real practical concerns and discussed a transitional process over time where a lot of work was involved with a variety of finding sources. Heidi Ricci added she saw providing services on source reduction, wetland management, and education to residents on how they were managing their properties.

Heidi Ricci commented that she believed there should be an option for municipalities that do not want adulticiding and expressed her concerns on the pesticide label directions. Heidi Ricci noted that regardless of how the label was interpreted she did not think we should be doing adulticiding unless there was a need. Subcommittee members discussed the process moving forward and the potential for minority opinion. Priscilla Matton commented on why communities that don't want mosquito control services would supersede those communities that do want mosquito control services. Priscilla Matton noted that she could draft clarifying text for the recommendation.

Increased transparency on sensitive habitats/rare species exclusions: Eve Schluter provided an overview of the 2021 Mosquito Control Routine/Standard Operations Guidelines for Compliance with MA Endangered Species Act document and noted that it was a public document and could be disseminated to the group to communicate the level of detail that goes into the review. Heidi Ricci recommended that the documents that Eve Schluter presented be made public as part of the recommendation language. Eve Schluter thought the inclusion of the process and guidelines pursuant to MESA compliance was relevant towards transparency.

Read any Q&A/Wrap up, vote to adjourn:

It was noted that there were no questions or comments in the Zoom Q&A. Heidi Ricci thanked everyone for their time, effort, and participation. Hearing no other questions or comments from the group, Heidi Ricci entertained a

motion to adjourn from Eve Schluter. Seconded by Priscilla Matton. All in favor said aye. The meeting was adjourned at 2:02 p.m.

MCTF Local Engagement Subcommittee Meeting Minutes 02 24 22

Minutes for the Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century (MCTF) Task Force Meeting

Subcommittee Meeting: Local Engagement

February 24, 2022, 12:00 p.m. via Zoom

Meeting Topics:

- Meeting opening, roll call, welcome
- Housekeeping notes
- Meeting purpose, agenda, and process
- Recommendations: Consider public input and vote
 - Recommendation 1 (Online system)
 - Recommendation 2 (Marking methods)
 - Recommendation 3 (Public engagement)
 - Recommendation 5 (Pilot evaluation)
 - Recommendation 6 (Increased sharing locations)
 - Recommendation 4 (Menu-based approach—new draft)
 - Recommendation 7 (Increased transparency—new draft)
- Any Additional Relevant Public Comment
- Read any Q&A/Wrap up

Meeting opening, roll call, welcome, housekeeping notes:

The meeting was called to order at 12:07 p.m. by Heidi Ricci. A roll call was conducted, and a quorum was met. Subcommittee members in attendance included Priscilla Matton, Eve Schluter, Russell Hopping, and Heidi Ricci. A housekeeping update was provided by Alisha Bouchard.

Meeting purpose, agenda, and process:

The agenda was shared with the subcommittee group. Heidi Ricci noted that the subcommittee would be voting on recommendations and there would be time for discussion based on feedback from the public listening session. Jenny Helmick discussed the timeline, review, and voting process for each recommendation and noted that recommendations would be passed on with a vote tally to the full task force.

Recommendations - Consider public input and vote:

Recommendation 1 (Online system): Jenny Helmick noted the deletion of one sentence from the recommendation. Priscilla Matton asked if this was the latest updated version of the document and Jenny Helmick confirmed that it was. There was no further discussion from the subcommittee. Heidi Ricci entertained a motion to vote on the recommendation. A motion was made by Eve Schluter, seconded by Russell Hopping. A roll call vote was conducted. Russell Hopping (aye), Priscilla Matton (aye), Eve Schluter (aye), Heidi Ricci (aye). The motion was unanimously approved.

Recommendation 2 (Marking methods): A wordsmithing change was noted. Seeing no further discussion from the subcommittee Heidi Ricci entertained a motion to approve the recommendation. A motion was made by Eve Schluter. Seconded by Russell Hopping. A roll call vote was conducted. Russell Hopping (aye), Priscilla Matton (aye), Eve Schluter (aye), Heidi Ricci (aye). The motion was unanimously approved.

Recommendation 3 (Public engagement): Heidi Ricci suggested clarifying the explanation on IPM and noted that the GEIR defined IPM for mosquito control and was out of date and more than a decade old. Heidi Ricci presented her edited version of the recommendation language. Heidi Ricci noted that she wanted the recommendation to be

a bit more forward-looking but also to include standardization in the material. Taryn LaScola noted that IPM should be able to flex based on new technologies, chemicals, etc. Taryn LaScola added that there was a lot of information from the EPA and MDAR on what IPM was as a technique. Taryn LaScola commented on the need to have the flexibility to change when different techniques and technologies change and noted that prescribed actions could be difficult because situations were different.

Heidi Ricci noted that she was looking for coordination and consistency amongst state agencies on what IPM was for mosquito control and suggested adding in language to the recommendation to reflect that content be updated as appropriate. Subcommittee members agreed with the suggested approach. Hearing no further comments from the group, Heidi Ricci entertained a motion to vote on the recommendation with amended language. A motion was made by Eve Schluter. Seconded by Russell Hopping. A roll call was conducted. Russell Hopping (aye), Priscilla Matton (no), Eve Schluter (aye), Heidi Ricci (aye). The motion was approved three to one. Priscilla Matton discussed her rationale for voting no and noted that the recommendation as currently written was too broad and she did not think the municipal survey would provide additional information.

Recommendation 5 (Pilot evaluation): It was noted that there were a few recommendation components that were not resolved. Priscilla Matton discussed topics for general research from PFAS, to non-target species, to pesticide run-off. Heidi Ricci was supportive of a recommendation on pilot research but was concerned the mark was missed on providing a comprehensive annual evaluation in order to address the directive. Russell Hopping suggested adding language from the directive into the recommendation. Heidi Ricci noted that would make it a different recommendation. Priscilla Matton noted the recommendation as written was too general and she could not support it. Priscilla Matton added that the state should not be providing money for pilot programs and that outside funding might be a better way to do it. Heidi Ricci noted that she wasn't thinking that the state would provide funding, but that the actual pilot research would be funded through different partnership projects. Eve Schluter commented that this was not what the recommendation stated and if that was the intent, then the recommendation should be updated.

Russell Hopping added that he thought it would be totally appropriate for the state to fund something like this and noted that there was a need to be clear on how funding would be provided, otherwise it would never be implemented. Alisha Bouchard flagged that it may be better to keep the recommendation broad as it can get tricky with private/public partnerships from a research and procurement standpoint. Priscilla Matton suggested that issues could be resolved through a literature review and if through the literature review a problem was identified then a study could be conducted. Heidi Ricci noted that she quickly wrote something on the topic and shared it with the group. Russell Hopping commented that he recalled that the ERG report and subcommittee discussion confirmed that there was very little data on impacts and this recommendation was created to address those data gaps. Jenny Helmick commented that this recommendation had been on the table for a while and the group was not in a position to create a whole new recommendation and recommended that the group move forward with the vote.

Heidi Ricci sent her revised draft language to Jenny Helmick so it could be shared with the subcommittee members. Priscilla Matton noted that she read the revised recommendation language differently and thought it was a brand-new recommendation that the public hadn't seen and thought the subcommittee should stick to the recommendation language that was drafted and vote yes or no. Russell Hopping and Eve Schluter noted the language was different and lacked some of the specificity the subcommittee had been discussing. Eve Schluter suggested establishing a committee that would take this on to focus on the details regarding partnerships and state funding. Heidi Ricci agreed with modifying her draft language to include the establishment of a committee to help develop plans, identify funding sources, and coordinate resources to conduct research. Russell Hopping discussed the need for funding and the need to be clear what the funding was for. Jenny Helmick suggested that the subcommittee members look at the new recommendation language so a vote could be conducted on recommendation five. Priscilla Matton commented that she supported the concept but did not think it supported the directive and fell short on the environmental impact question the subcommittee was asked to address. Heidi

Ricci noted that she couldn't support only doing a pilot program and added that her inclination would be to support the newly discussed version, and if the new version did not pass, she would want to submit it as a minority opinion. Russell Hopping noted that he could support the newly suggested language within the recommendation. Heidi Ricci discussed process and noted that the subcommittee should be able to vote on both of the recommendation versions and suggested that the newly drafted recommendation language be called "comprehensive evaluation program". Abby Burton commented that from a process standpoint it should be easier to vote on both recommendations. Heidi Ricci entertained a motion to vote on recommendation five, pilot evaluation of environmental impacts. A motion was made by Eve Schluter. Seconded by Russell Hopping. A roll call vote was conducted. Russell Hopping (no), Priscilla Matton (no), Eve Schluter (no), Heidi Ricci (no).

Heidi Ricci entertained a motion to vote on the amended language and renamed concept for recommendation five, comprehensive evaluation program. Heidi Ricci entertained a motion to vote on new recommendation language. A motion was made by Russell Hopping. Seconded by Eve Schluter. A roll call vote was conducted. Russell Hopping (aye), Priscilla Matton (no), Eve Schluter (no), Heidi Ricci (aye). The motion was a split vote. Jessica Burgess clarified that if the motion is a tie it does not pass. Heidi Ricci asked if the recommendation could be submitted as a minority opinion with two subcommittee members in favor. Abby Burton noted yes, it would go to the task force with a minority opinion. Heidi Ricci commented that she wanted it noted that there were two subcommittee members that voted aye on the new recommendation.

Recommendation 6 (Increased sharing locations): Priscilla Matton commented that someone would have to fulfill this recommendation and she did not think the subcommittee would get what they were looking for from this recommendation and the data. Eve Schluter noted that the recommendation had been developed to provide capacity so there may be different technological ways to handle it. Eve Schluter added that she could understand under the current scenario this could be burdensome but with new technological capacity and different advancements it could make it less burdensome and address some of the concerns of the public not knowing where spraying was going. Subcommittee members discussed the consideration language being moved up in the recommendation. Hearing no further comments from the group Heidi Ricci entertained a motion to vote on recommendation six. Eve Schluter made a motion. Seconded by Russell Hopping. A roll call vote was conducted. Russell Hopping (aye), Priscilla Matton (no), Eve Schluter (yes), Heidi Ricci (yes). The motion passed three to one.

Recommendation 4 (Menu-based approach—new draft): Priscilla Matton discussed her concerns with a menu-based approach not representing IPM and noted the fact that some towns do want adulticiding and making it a separate cost could make it cost prohibitive. Priscilla Matton discussed the recommendation for statewide services paid for by the Commonwealth where everyone in the state would get surveillance and local MCDs would still be able to conduct surveillance for their member towns. Priscilla Matton added that if a town would like to join, they could have a conversation with the MCD on what they want and towns that were part of an MCD could drop out but would be covered for surveillance and education from a department or an appropriate agency and not the MCD. Heidi Ricci referenced the last paragraph which addressed what she had heard municipalities wanted and noted broader comments on the overall recommendation based on what was heard at the public listening session. Heidi Ricci discussed the comments from Dr. Christine Oliver related to multiple chemical sensitivities and noted the important technical context that Dr. Oliver provided.

Heidi Ricci commented on the roles of the state, MCDs, and municipalities related to state opportunity to step in to do spraying even if the municipality did not want it and having an opt out process that would go away and municipalities would have more local control through a menu-based process. Heidi Ricci asked if this menu-based approach included that the state override stays or goes away. Priscilla Matton noted that she was under the impression that the subcommittee voted not to make a recommendation to include municipal opt-out going forward and that it was a municipal opt-in that was the preferred option. Priscilla Matton noted that she would have voted to keep a municipal opt-out from an aerial application conducted by the state. Heidi Ricci commented that the recommendation needed to be clear on whether the state should be able to come into a municipality and override their desire to not have broad scale aerial or ground based applications of adulticides. Priscilla Matton

commented that if you were not part of an MCD, the MCD would not provide services and noted the benefit of having a full menu of options for a town to join an MCD.

Eve Schluter commented that she was concerned with the number of alterations to the recommendation language and noted that this was a complex topic and would depend on how things were structured going forward and may change based on recommendations from another subcommittee. Heidi Ricci noted that she did not see a lot of substantive changes between the original recommendation and Priscilla Matton's suggested recommendation. Priscilla Matton clarified the difference between the two recommendations was based on municipalities opting in for services that they wanted, and noted it all came back to funding and infrastructure for services. Heidi Ricci discussed available funding structures, source reduction, and wetlands management and suggested that the group go back to the original recommendation. Heidi Ricci added that she would not be averse to voting on this recommendation version as well.

Priscilla Matton discussed her concerns with the original recommendation and noted that there were a lot of questions left unanswered. Priscilla Matton added what she addressed was based on MCD activity and did not address statewide aerial adulticide. Heidi Ricci noted there was another recommendation under the best practices subcommittee about banning aerial spraying and there was a need to look at vulnerable people and ecological impacts. Heidi Ricci added that she would rather submit the previous recommendation even with the unanswered questions saying that this was complicated, and the group didn't have the time or the resources to figure it all out. Jenny Helmick discussed process and asked if the subcommittee wanted to vote on Priscilla Matton's version of the recommendation. Priscilla Matton clarified her recommendation version did not cover aerial adulticiding. Heidi Ricci entertained a motion to vote on Priscilla Matton's amended draft recommendation on a menu-based approach. Priscilla Matton made a motion. Seconded by Eve Schluter. A roll call was conducted. Russell Hopping (no), Priscilla Matton (aye), Eve Schluter (no), Heidi Ricci (no). The motion did not pass, and Heidi Ricci noted that this could be submitted as a minority opinion. Heidi Ricci entertained a motion to vote on the original version of recommendation four on a menu-based approach. Eve Schluter made a motion. Seconded by Russell Hopping. Russell Hopping (aye), Priscilla Matton (no), Eve Schluter (no), Heidi Ricci (yes). The motion did not pass. It was noted that this recommendation would still be recorded for minority opinion.

Recommendation 7 (Increased transparency—new draft): Eve Schluter questioned why this needed to be a separate recommendation if public documents were available and were already provided. Heidi Ricci noted that it was important to her to understand if her properties were being treated. Priscilla Matton discussed public input being added into the recommendation. Eve Schluter commented that she could not support that. Priscilla Matton clarified public input related to risk profile, not the specific information about rare species or habitat. Eve Schluter discussed her concerns and noted that she did not see how this was different than the status quo. Heidi Ricci discussed the difference was the transparency, the public would have the opportunity to weigh in, and people would be able to see the documents readily. Eve Schluter commented that she has no problem with the inclusion of public documents, but she was concerned about specificity as it related to location information. Russell Hopping noted that if the group was going to vote on this today the recommendation language needed to be reconciled.

Priscilla Matton commented that the disconnect could be that no one knows if the document exists. Eve Schluter disagreed and noted that permits were issued all the time and those permits were posted. In addition, permits and the MOU were there for aerial spraying. Eve Schluter noted that she did not have an issue including the public document in the overall plan, but she could not support the recommendation the way it was written. Heidi Ricci suggested changing the background and rationale language to indicate that guidelines existed, and they be part of the new mosquito management plan. Heidi Ricci also noted that she was willing to include language that they were not trying to change Natural Heritage's authority. Hearing no other comments from the group Heidi Ricci entertained a motion to vote on recommendation seven, increased transparency on sensitive habitat/rare species exclusion. A motion was made by Priscilla Matton. Seconded by Russell Hopping. A roll call vote was conducted. Russell Hopping (aye), Priscilla Matton (no), Eve Schluter (no), Heidi Ricci (aye). The motion did not pass, but the split vote would be communicated to the full task force. Eve Schluter noted that she was not comfortable with the

way the recommendation was written with last minute changes and the language was too broad. Russell Hopping noted that he wanted to make sure that these documents be included in the new management plan.

Any Additional Relevant Public Comment:

Heidi Ricci noted that there was strong support for wetlands water management and source reduction work. Heidi Ricci noted that the MCDs did some really good work with their innovative methods and she took note of that.

Read any Q&A/Wrap up:

There were no comments in the Zoom Q&A. Priscilla Matton asked that ERG or EEA provide the group with some guidance on process during the task force meeting. Heidi Ricci noted that once content was made available through subcommittees the more information that could be pushed out ahead of the task force meeting would be helpful. Abby Burton commented that guidance materials would be distributed to task force members soon. Eve Schluter noted that she would not be able to make the task force meeting due to a personal matter. Heidi Ricci thanked the group for their work. Hearing no other comments from the group, Heidi Ricci entertained a motion to adjourn the meeting. Priscilla Matton made a motion. All in favor of meeting adjournment said aye. The meeting was adjourned at 2:03 p.m.

**Pesticide Selection Subcommittee
Meeting Minutes**

MCTF Pesticide Selection Subcommittee Meeting Minutes 10 05 21

Minutes for the Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century (MCTF) Task Force Meeting

Subcommittee Meeting: Pesticide Selection

October 05, 2021, 12:00 p.m. via Zoom

The meeting was called to order by Bob Mann. Roll call was conducted with all subcommittee members in attendance. The subcommittee had a quorum present, and members included:

- Nicole Keleher: Forest Health Program Director for Massachusetts
- Bob Mann: Works on state and local government relations with landscape professionals
- Priscilla Matton: Superintendent for Bristol County Mosquito Control District
- Brad Mitchell: Executive Director of Massachusetts Farm Bureau Federation
- Jennifer Pederson: Executive Director of Massachusetts Water Works Association
- Richard Pollack: Public health entomologist
- Helen Poynton: Professor at UMass Boston with a background in ecotoxicology. Researches the effects of emerging contaminants, specifically the effects of pyrethroids and organophosphates on aquatic life.

Additional attendees included:

- Taryn LaScola (EEA Representative)
- Judi Rubin (EEA notetaker)
- Alisha Bouchard (Deputy Commissioner of MDAR)
- John Wilhelmi (ERG Facilitator)
- Kaila Stein (ERG notetaker).

Taryn LaScola (EEA Representative) communicated a refresher on open meeting law ahead of the commencement of this subcommittee session. John conducted introductions of all subcommittee members and attendees.

The session was opened with a request for Taryn LaScola to present background information relevant to the subcommittee. Five subcommittee members; Jennifer, Brad, Richard, Priscilla, and Nicole voiced their opinion that the presentation should be given as soon as possible to give members baseline information before discussing further. Other subcommittee members did not comment on the timing. Taryn agreed to present to the subcommittee at the next meeting on October 14th. No members voiced disagreement.

Alisha and Taryn suggested that Priscilla should present during Taryn's presentation since Priscilla has expertise as an Executive Director of a mosquito control district (MCD). Brad and Bob both agreed that Priscilla would be great to help give the presentation. No members voiced disagreement with this suggestion. Priscilla agreed that she would help with the presentation.

John asked the subcommittee group about what topics members would like to see covered in Taryn's presentation. Richard asked if Taryn could present an overview of what pesticide products are available for use in Massachusetts, what products are currently used by MCDs, and how the products are chosen

or prioritized by MCDs. Multiple members requested information on pesticide registration during the presentation. Taryn said she will give a high-level overview of the registration process in her presentation. Richard suggested that Taryn educate the subcommittee about how pesticides might be selected or used in a different manner if the products are being used for nuisance mosquitoes or in an arbovirus outbreak. Jennifer asked if Taryn could include information on PFAS in pesticides. Jennifer is unsure if PFAS are present in pesticide containers or in products. Bob thought that the subcommittee should have an expert in PFAS in pesticides present to the group. Taryn said she will give a brief overview of PFAS in her presentation.

Priscilla wants Taryn to talk about “25B pesticide products” in her presentation. Priscilla mentioned that the ERG document talks about using the “safest” product and that Priscilla is worried that this could be inferred to mean 25B products, which are not regulated by EPA or the state. Priscilla thought people outside this committee thought we should use non-chemical pesticides only (such as “garlic oil”). Priscilla suggested that the subcommittee should decide whether its charge is limited to pesticides that are federally registered and approved for use within Massachusetts. She cautioned the subcommittee that if their recommendations do not mention “25B pesticide products,” people may think the subcommittee did not do its job. Taryn said she plans to explain what a “25B pesticide product” is during her presentation.

- Nuisance vs. arbovirus spraying

The dialogue pivoted to the topic of nuisance spraying versus arbovirus spraying. Brad noted that some pesticides are applied for arbovirus control while other pesticides are applied for nuisance control. Helen asked if this subcommittee is looking at pesticides for nuisance spraying, arbovirus spraying, or both? Taryn noted that the document refers to mosquito control as a whole and does not pertain to just nuisance control or arbovirus control. Bob noted agreement that it is difficult to separate nuisance vs. arbovirus spraying and that the subcommittee should potentially focus on all because MCDs spray for both nuisance and arbovirus control. Brad also agreed. Richard mentioned that nuisance versus disease spraying is a highly controversial topic. Brad said that generally aerial spraying is done for an EEE outbreak, but generally not for nuisance control (which instead relies on ground-based spraying or applications).

Richard noted that adulticides can be applied by truck or by aerial spraying, but often the same product is applied at the same application rate in both cases. The main differences are the height of the nozzle above the ground and that a plane will cover many more acres than a truck. Priscilla noted that the state surveillance and response plan is available online from MDPH. (Note: The 2021 plan is available from this website - <https://www.mass.gov/lists/arbovirus-surveillance-plan-and-historical-data>.) The plan sets out a structure based upon risk level (remote, low, moderate, high, high critical, etc.). Priscilla thought this document would be helpful to the subcommittee. Brad mentioned that different processes that exist to choose pesticides depending on what the pesticides are being used for (nuisance vs. arbovirus). Additionally, he mentioned that the degree to which MCDs do arbovirus control varies based on location in MA. He also noted that the risk-benefit analysis is very different during a EEE emergency than during routine nuisance control.

- Registration Process

Brad suggested that this subcommittee's goal is not to change the registration process, but members should understand how MCDs choose pesticides for different purposes (e.g., spraying for arbovirus vs. nuisance control). Jennifer said that it would be helpful to know how the registration process works. After understanding it better, if members determined as a group that the registration process should be changed, then the subcommittee could make a recommendation. She mentioned that if she thought water supplies were not being protected through the existing registration process, she would like to make recommendations to address that matter. Taryn noted that making recommendations about the registration process might be outside of the topic of mosquito control or pesticide selection for mosquito control. Nicole said that as a member of the pesticide board, she is well versed in which products become registered and why certain products are restricted/not restricted in MA. She thought that the registration process is a good starting point for members to understand pesticide selection.

- Is the subcommittee considering (a) the decision made by MCDs to use pesticides in the first place or (b) the decision about what pesticides to use once an MCD has decided that pesticides are needed?

Richard brought up this issue. His opinion was that this subcommittee should be more focused on which pesticides should be used and in what manner once an MCD has already decided to use pesticides. Richard thought that choosing whether to use pesticides is up to other subcommittees. Basically, once an MCD has deemed it needs to apply a pesticide, this subcommittee is considering the decision of which pesticide an MCD should use and why. The topic of whether to apply a pesticide in the first place is more under the purview of other subcommittees. Helen wanted to clarify this point. Is this subcommittee looking at whether MCDs should apply pesticides or only which ones they should apply once that decision has already been made? This question was not addressed any further because Helen brought up another topic at the end of her comment and discussion switched to that topic.

- Which directives should the subcommittee focus on first?

Pesticide Selection Subcommittee:

(vii) promoting the use of the safest or minimum risk pesticides feasible and employing methods, including product disclosures or implementation of testing protocols and procedures, to avoid the use of pesticides containing per – and polyfluoroalkyl substances.

(ix) identifying known ingredients in pesticide products used for mosquito control, analyzing the ability, or lack of ability, to identify such ingredients, and making recommendations for determining such ingredients

Jennifer noted that the second directive (ix) is easier to address and therefore the subcommittee should address the second directive first. Brad agreed with Jennifer because he thought the subcommittee should identify the ingredients in pesticides first before determining which product is the safest. Bob said that he thought the subcommittee should have more discussions before splitting up the directives and the order in which the directives are addressed. Members need to know more first. John asked if anyone else had any strong opinions and no one else raised their hand.

An inquiry was made about how to present documents to the subcommittee. Taryn replied that EEA will meet with its legal team to talk about the proper protocol for submitting and sharing information and

will update ERG once that decision is made. Jennifer mentioned that the subcommittee meeting in the week between Christmas and New Year's Day (12/28/2021) could be an issue because members may be on vacation. Jennifer, Brad, and Bob will not be available. Helen may not be available but won't know until early December. John said he will revisit this issue at a future meeting.

- **Tasks for Members Before Next Meeting:**
 - Consider the understory questions
 - Read relevant sections of the MCTF report
 - Identify any critical data gaps and any known information sources to fill those gaps
 - Assess overall strength of information
 - Read relevant sections of ERG's report
 - Brad suggested that subcommittee members should also read Section 2 of the ERG report (Existing Mosquito Control Policy) because members need to understand the policy to make recommendations.

The next subcommittee meeting will be held on 10/19. John notes he cannot attend the 10/19 meeting, but it will be facilitated by one of John's colleagues, Jan Connery. Bob entertained a motion to adjourn, the motion to adjourn was seconded by Brad. The meeting was adjourned at 1:47pm.

MCTF Pesticide Selection Subcommittee Meeting Minutes 10 19 21

Minutes for the Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century (MCTF) Task Force Meeting

Subcommittee Meeting: Pesticide Selection

October 19, 2021, 12:00 p.m. via Zoom

Bob Mann conducted roll call at 12:00 pm. A quorum was established. Subcommittee members in attendance included: Priscilla Matton, Brad Mitchell, Jennifer Pederson, Richard Pollack, Helen Poynton, and Nicole Keleher. Taryn LaScola provided a housekeeping update and added that Hotze Wijnja the chemist from MDAR will be at the meeting, given the topic of pesticide selection. Jan Connery (ERG Facilitator) reviewed the agenda for the group stating that at the last meeting, there was a clear desire to hear some important background information concerning pesticide registration and selection for Massachusetts and so Taryn and Priscilla, who have a lot of expertise in that area from different perspectives, both volunteered to give a presentation at this meeting.

Taryn reviewed the pesticide registration process and talked about FIFRA (Federal Insecticide Fungicide Rodenticide Act) enforced by the Environmental Protection Agency EPA, the Food Drug and Cosmetic Act, pesticide tolerances, residue, the Food Quality Protection Act Endangered Species Act, the Massachusetts Pesticide Control Act (MPCA MGL 132B) statute and 333 CMR state regulations. Additionally, she discussed pesticide definition and claims, federal vs. state definition, EPA, ecological risks, potential risks to human health (children and immune-suppressed individuals, endocrine disruption effect) and the environment, aggregate, cumulative and occupational risks, manufacturer labeling and confidential business ingredients under section 10 (quality control process, information disclosures on methods and testing of inert ingredients and what they are), buffers and the Food Quality Protection Act.

Taryn gave examples of enforceable language labeling and violation and types of language labeling, guidance, and classification and how that provided some extra guidance on how to use the product in the best way. Taryn mentioned that this type of language is not enforceable it's just informational, but the state has some general requirements that can be applied. Furthermore, Taryn stated that the EPA exempts products from registration if they contain specific active ingredients and inert ingredients as listed within FIFRA §152. Some examples of these ingredients are rosemary oil, garlic oil, thyme oil, calcium carbonate, beeswax. If a product contains active ingredients and inert ingredients that are on the very specific lists, then they can be exempt from the registration process. However, the active ingredient and inert ingredient must be listed on the label. Taryn discussed EPA's role in review and registration of the products on the federal and state levels and how a product gets registered in Massachusetts. Taryn noted the Pesticide Board Subcommittee (established by the Massachusetts Pesticide Control Act) consisted of five members: Designee for the Commissioner for MDAR, Department of Conservation and Recreation, Department of Public Health, Director for the Division of Food and Drug (also the Chair) and somebody representing commercial applicators.

Taryn discussed how products for aerial operations are chosen. The adulticide aerial applications are done by the State Reclamation and Mosquito Control Board (SRMCB) when there's a public health hazard determined by DPH. The product used is Anvil, used since the early 2000s. Taryn explained that the products were reviewed by multiple state agency based on their efficacy, eco-toxicity data,

ecological risk to aquatic vertebrates, fish, environment, and recommendations for which product should be used.

Additionally, Taryn mentioned PFAS and noted the PFAS Task Force in Massachusetts and that EPA indicated that PFAS compounds are not allowed as ingredients in pesticides and are considered a contaminant.

Priscilla Matton (Superintendent at Bristol County Mosquito Control Project in Southeastern Massachusetts) was tasked with discussing how mosquito control districts choose products and when, where, and why. Priscilla stated that for mosquito control within Massachusetts, all the pesticides used are registered with the federal EPA and no 25(b) products are used. They're all approved by the pesticide subcommittee. New pesticides that have come out have been reviewed through Environmental Impact Report (EIR), and there is a memorandum of understanding (MOU) with MDAR and the Natural Heritage and Endangered Species program. All MCD applicators are licensed in the state of Massachusetts, and none of the products that we currently use are listed on the groundwater protection.

Priscilla talked about nuisance control and vector control. A vector is an organism that can transmit an infectious agent from an infected animal to a human or another animal. In Massachusetts, there are 53 different mosquito species; of those 21 that are currently vectors in Massachusetts for West Nile virus, EEE, and/or Jamestown Canyon (developing virus). So, of the 53 species, 21 can transmit West Nile Virus or EEE. Priscilla referred to Bristol County's data and how the trapping surveillance program is a snapshot of what's going on in the environment, specifically looking at vectors of the diseases of which they're looking to either reduce risk from or inform the public that there is risk. Priscilla noted in the last 15 years, almost 96% have shown to be competent vectors for EEE and 98% percent for West Nile virus. Furthermore, there's buildup of population followed by sustained activity over July, August, and September, before a cooler weather results in decrease. Almost all MCDs don't start adulticiding by truck until the 1st of June and stop by the beginning to the second week of September depending on temperatures and activity.

- Review of common classes of pesticides for mosquito control.

BTI and Bacillus Sphaericus class, which is a naturally occurring bacteria. It is noted that the important part to know for BTI and Bacillus Sphaericus was that mosquito larvae must be feeding at the time the application is made. It is noted that there are also larvicide oils. It is noted that these are effective against all immature stages because the pupae also need to breathe. There is also an insect growth regulator, Methoprene. Methoprene prevents the mosquito larvae from either advancing to the next stage or developing from the pupae stage. Methoprene works on the later stages, and it can work either through absorption or through ingestion. It is noted that this is important because this is something that then can work for a longer period of time or end later stages.

The subcommittee discussed how MCDs choose larvicides. Habitat type is a significant factor. Questions include: What kind of habitat is it? Can I get in by hand? Can I get in by airplane? Do I need a helicopter? How big is the area? How much product are we going to need to use? What's our accessibility? Is it possible that some areas may not be good areas to make an aerial application, because the product will not effectively reach the ground? It is noted that time of year matters because you can't use Methoprene in the fall. The mosquito is going to overwinter, so it's not going to advance onto that next stage and that would be a waste of product. Efficacy is closely review because there are certain species

that may not react as well to certain pesticides. Also, water quality can be a factor. It is noted that there are a lot of different factors related to habitat and the sheer volume of habitat can be significant.

The subcommittee discussed how MCDs choose adulticides. The common chemical class for adulticiding are pyrethroids. It is noted that in MA, this is the only class of adulticides that are used. Applications in Massachusetts are made between dusk and dawn. Of note though, many swampy areas are not accessible for applications, and there are several different areas in which truck-based application may be difficult. It is important to consider type of species. Questions include: Is it one of the 21 species that are capable of transmitting virus? What about the population size? For example, if you only have 10 mosquitoes in your environment, the whole cycle is going to be slower. If you have a million mosquitoes in that environment, the amplification cycle will be quick. It is noted that time of year is important because the MCD must apply product that is most effective against the type of mosquito populations. This includes the age of the mosquitoes in the populations. The species of mosquito that are concerning to MCDs bridging EEE into humans is *Coquilleltidia perturbans*, a cattail mosquito. It is noted that this type of mosquito lives about three months. So, once it's very old in August, it's had an opportunity to take a lot of blood meals and can potentially be more deadly in the sense that it's had the opportunity to encounter EEE. Detection of virus is used as well. Mosquitos are collected all week, submitted the following Monday, and results are received back on Wednesday. Based on that time frame, the opportunity to control mosquitoes in a location was missed but it certainly lets the MCD know there's potential activity to determine surveillance needs. It is noted that detection tells the MCD there's a risk in the area and an adulticide could help reduce that risk.

- Questions from subcommittee members:

Jennifer Pederson commented that she knows what MCDs are doing and what the state is doing but there are also these companies that have popped up, like Mosquitos Squad, and others that are also spraying individual homes. In terms of the insecticides they use, can those applicators choose to do whatever they want, if it's approved by the federal and state? Taryn responded that the answer was yes. Taryn noted that one of the issues on the enforcement side was once you start using a product that are registered with EPA, license requirements and following our rules and regulations come into play, which includes recordkeeping and information left with the customer. Jennifer asked what the process was when using chemicals? Do you select certain applicators and go out and make sure that they're doing what they're supposed to be doing?

Taryn responded yes and that there are five pesticide inspectors with the state that go out and conduct routine inspections, follow up on complaints and conduct investigations. Taryn noted that there are about 10,000 or so licensed individuals. Jennifer noted that Priscilla stated that adulticiding by truck doesn't typically happen before June 1st, depending on what they see in surveillance but also depending on temperature. Priscilla responded that MCDs don't make adulticide applications until after sunset or before sunrise. In late May/early June they spray between 2:00 a.m. and sunrise. It is noted that it can be very difficult to get temperatures above 55 degrees that early.

Brad noted that the private companies use much more persistent products than the mosquito projects do, which is something the group should be thinking about.

Brad commented on nuisance versus public health or vector, and noted that it is important to consider intent and planning when determining how to mitigate. The subcommittee should discuss what the intent is for control, and whether is it really designed for what we would expect for vector control. Brad

also commented on Taryn's presentation related to a previous CBI issue and noted that the pesticide board subcommittee did not have the ability to protect CBI. Brad recalled during a previous review the pesticide subcommittee board wouldn't register the product if they could not obtain the information under CBI. Brad noted that the people that are most protective of CBI have the newer better products that they need to protect in the marketplace. Those newer, better products are typically the ones that are safer and more effective, which the state has an interest in.

Relative to nuisance versus vector control, Richard Pollack responded that of MGL 252, the enabling legislation was initially to control or eradicate mosquitoes. The projects were enabled to control mosquitoes because of the quality-of-life issue involved. Some of the active ingredients that are used for mosquito control are formulated as active ingredients in products that are registered by the Food and Drug Administration for use directly on human beings for treating certain parasitic infections or infestations. Those include pyrethrins, pyrethroids, malathion, spinosyns and so forth. Richard noted that these are in products that are labeled for use even directly on children, with exposure times somewhere between 10 minutes and 10 hours of direct contact with skin, depending on the product. Richard commented that he thought it was useful for everybody to keep that in mind when the same active ingredient was in something that was labeled for use directly on skin, sometimes for hours and at much greater concentrations and exposure.

Richard noted that in 2000, the state put together several working groups in response to the appearance of West Nile Virus in Massachusetts, and one of those working groups was entitled Pesticide Risk, which Richard was a part of. A report was developed from that workgroup of which he had provided to the Subcommittee. Many of the same questions that the subcommittee intends to discuss were addressed by that working group 20 years ago. Richard noted that it might be good to review what the issues were then, and what they may be today. Richard noted that Priscilla spoke at length about larvicide used against the vectors of EEE in West Nile virus. Richard asked how practical are larvicides against the main vectors of EEE and West Nile virus and is there something about the ecology of those most concerning mosquitoes that makes larviciding difficult?

Priscilla responded the two most important mosquito vectors for EEE, the amplification vector *Culiseta Melanura* lives in cryptic habitat, mostly in Hockomock Swamp, with red maple/white cedar swamp areas. They overwinter in that swamp as larvae, and it is very difficult to get the product into these crypts. Crypts are very tiny subterranean locations where water moves through. Bristol County MCD has been conducting experiments along with Plymouth County, to find a better way to get the product into the water. Priscilla noted it is very difficult and they have not had success in killing in the larval stage. The second most important mosquito for human transmission is *Coquilleltidia perturbans*, which is the cattail mosquito. It overwinters in the larval stage. However, it siphons air directly from the root of the cattails, so it lives very down deep in the muck. It is also very difficult to control in the larval stage, when an MCD would normally make a larval application. Priscilla noted the issue with West Nile Virus, is that the mosquito species overwinters as adults. The female over winters with the virus, which then can start the cycle again the following year. They have more transit water, so sometimes it's more difficult to control. Priscilla noted that there is a lot of urban habitat for the species, including catch basins along the streets, so it is much more difficult to control those vectors through larval control.

Helen Poynton asked a question about pesticides that are labeled organic and whether or not they are the same as a 25(b). Do pesticides that are certified organic type have a separate registration process or the same registration process, but somehow get that label without certification? Taryn responded that if you want to have a USDA certified organic farm, then pesticides from the OMNRI (Organic Material

Review Institute) certified list can be used. OMNRI looks to meet the National Organic Program standards, that products have been naturally derived. It is not risk based at all. They certify products that are organic. It's part of the USDA marketing service but that is not a list that is regulated or looked at by the states or by EPA. Taryn noted that there are organic products that are registered pesticides and have gone through the process just like any other sort of traditional pesticide. The term organic has always been a little bit of a tricky one for folks because there is not great oversight as to what is organic and what is not.

Helen asked about what the process included in 2020 when the SRB re-reviewed the list of products that it used for spraying. Taryn responded that five state entities were involved: MDAR, Department of Environmental Protection, Division of Fisheries and Wildlife, Division of Marine Fisheries, and Department of Public Health. Taryn noted that there are about five or six different products that were reviewed, which included Anvil. Information was provided to the group relative to the toxicity, efficacy, and effects on aquatic organisms. That information was reviewed by each agency and then a recommendation was put forward to the SRB for an SRB vote, to determine which product would be used if an aerial application to occur in that year. Helen noted that the primary non-targets at risk from pesticides are aquatic invertebrates, especially crustaceans. She raised a concern that the MCTF report's calculation of risk for some pesticides did not include the risk to all non-target species. She also mentioned that after 2020 MCD spraying, some water bodies in MA had chemical levels above lethal levels for certain aquatic life.

Jan noted before the next meeting the subcommittee should review the relevant sections of the MCTF report - sections 1, 4, 5 and some of section 2, which is the control policy that is supposed to be a foundational document. Also, the group should consider the understory questions, consider ideas for recommendations the subcommittee should develop within the assigned directives, and identify any critical data gaps and key sources to fill those gaps. Seeing no other comments from the group, Bob Mann took a motion to adjourn the meeting. Priscilla Matton made a motion. Seconded by Richard Pollack. All in favor said aye. The meeting was adjourned at 2:00 pm.

MCTF Pesticide Selection Subcommittee Meeting Minutes 11 02 21

Minutes for the Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century (MCTF) Task Force Meeting

Subcommittee Meeting: Pesticide Selection

November 2, 2021, 12:00 p.m. via Zoom

Subcommittee members in attendance include Bob Mann (Chair) Priscilla Matton, Brad Mitchell, Jennifer Pederson, Rich Pollack, Helen Poynton, and Nicole Keleher. Taryn LaScola (EEA Representative) provided standard opening comments. Bob initiated the subcommittee meeting with a welcome and roll call at 12:02 pm. All subcommittee members were in attendance for the meeting. Bob encouraged the group to participate, appreciated all the work the subcommittee has done to date. John (ERG Facilitator) shared his screen and provided an agenda review for the subcommittee group. John recommended identifying an alternate chair designated to step in if Bob was not available. Brad nominated Rich; however, Rich is already a chair for three different committees. Bob may not be available for future meetings due to travel. Nicole has offered to co-chair. There is a roll call vote conducted - motion was made for Nicole to co-chair and all subcommittee members voted aye.

John noted that this is an initial preliminary discussion amongst the subcommittee. This is all brainstorming to an extent, but John is looking for full participation for the three directives for the subcommittee.

Directive 1: Make recommendations regarding “identifying known ingredients in pesticide products used for mosquito control, analyzing the ability, or lack of ability, to identify such ingredients, and making recommendations for determining such ingredients.”

Brad expressed some concern about developing a process versus recommending product. John moved the group to identify any critical information gaps. Are there any information gaps from moving forward and identifying methods we want to utilize environmental impact for new chemical products? Bob noted that we may need to start thinking about methodology with pesticide products and referenced the genetically modified mosquitoes used in FL. Bob noted that we need to be open to ensure there is a conduit of sorts for future decision that can incorporate technologies that are experimental or have not been thought about yet

Brad noted that this conversation will rely to an extent on the policy process related to the SRB. He feels as through this needs to be meshed with the policy discussion. Whatever conversations come from this subcommittee will need to mesh with the recommendations that also come out of the policy structure subcommittee. Brad also noted that another topic which needs to be reviewed is the role that inert ingredients play. Interplay of inert ingredients and the State’s ability to protect Confidential Business Information (CBI).

Jennifer referenced looking back at the report that Rich had provided – chemicals breaking down transformation byproducts. Jennifer posed the question do any of the ingredients in the mosquito pesticides have the same effect? Also, the 25B products. Are they an issue? That is an area Jennifer noted she would like more information about. Need to know more about 25B and the process by which they are used. Brad responded regarding registration data. Pesticide registration does have a lot of information on various environmental conditions and metabolites in the human system. Brad noted that the data exists, but questions whether it is extensive enough or whether it is pertinent to the

various environments in MA. Brad is interested in the discussion on toxicology data related to the environmental impact. Jennifer noted that people were caught off guard that there were PFAS in products or concerns around PFAS in containers.

John moved the conversation to a discussion about the ingredients in 25B products. Taryn (EEA Representative) responded with information related to the EPA listing all the ingredients within 25B products and offered to distribute the applicable website to John for circulation to the subcommittee.

Rich posed a two-part question to the group. Rich agreed there are information gaps, but it does not prevent him from moving forward. We know what chemicals are in the products and he is less concerned about the inerts. Rich noted that PFAS is a good example of accidents. PFAS was not supposed to be in the pesticide but it found its way in. Rich reiterated that we have enough information to select pesticides and there shouldn't be limitation to stop us in choosing the pesticides.

Helen noted that future tech is an area that we should consider and seconded Brad's notion of including that content into policy conversations. John then listed the main action item related to EPA content and Taryn responded that the EPA content is in the Zoom chat. ERG noted that all shared information via Zoom chat will be made available to the subcommittee members. Priscilla added to the conversation to note that organized MCD in the State do not use 25B products. It would only be private companies that use 25B products as it relates to pesticide use.

Jennifer noted as a follow up related to a previous presentation that was provided to the subcommittee that EPA does not review the products that claim to be 25B. Specifically, there are requirements that EPA has but they are not policing whether or not the particular product meets EPA standards. Taryn responds regarding what EPA looks at. 25B is a bit different when it comes to registration. 25B's do not get registered by EPA if a product's active and inert ingredients all fall under the list that EPA has put forth via 152.25. There are 6 or 7 different label requirements. EPA prohibits product manufacturers and sellers from making any public health claims on their labels unless those claims have been approved by EPA. Rich noted that even when such explicit claims cannot be made, members of the public might wrongly infer that such products measurably reduce risks.

John wanted to get into preliminary thoughts on where the subcommittee group is heading towards recommendations. Start this part of the conversation by focusing on Directive 1 – Make recommendations regarding “identifying known ingredients in pesticide products used for mosquito control, analyzing the ability, or lack of ability to identify such ingredients, and making recommendations for determining such ingredients.” Rich commented on if this is known or unknown ingredients and suggests dialogue around removing the word “known”, as it is confusing. Nicole added thoughts on this and suggested to be inclusive we need to start by being restrictive. There is a need to identify specific application of products or protocols we want to discourage and leave us open to using future products and technology as.

John suggested a need for clarification for the process that is in place for identifying ingredients which stems from the registration process. John asked Taryn if there was anything, she could offer regarding what this directive is getting at. Taryn noted in the regulatory framework when there is discussion of ingredients within pesticide products, the active ingredients and inert ingredients are what make up the formulation of the product and suggested the directive calls for review of inert ingredients. Taryn's interpretation of this directive related to the subcommittee determining a process by which pesticide products for mosquito control are selected.

Brad noted that whatever group that chooses pesticides for use for mosquito control can be protected from CBI, and if we want to do this right, we need to have access to the full ingredients. State makes a

lot of recommendation about repellants and would recommend we include repellants in this subcommittee scope as well. Nicole built on the inert ingredient conversation by asking if we can come up with a list of products and ask companies if they use those products? Nicole noted that we would be looking for a yes or no answers from companies. This could get around full release but get at some information from manufacturers. Bob stated that inerts are known to EPA, so EPA has the ability to make that part of the decision-making process. Taryn included additional EPA information related to inerts. Jennifer noted there are some people that do not trust EPA is doing their job. Jennifer is not of that mindset but noted this is something to consider.

Priscilla commented that the state has a process with the pesticide board, and we should stick with using that process for products registered for use in MA. Priscilla reiterated that if we push too hard on inerts, companies will just not register pesticides in the State. Priscilla noted that in a normal year we are spending less than \$1 M on mosquito control and that is nothing in comparison to some agricultures. If we don't trust EPA who can we name as the person to say, "these are the things that we don't want". It is hard to find someone qualified to make a list and to say these are the products we don't want.

Brad added a point to the conversation that FL uses more pesticide in one day that we use in a year and we should keep that in mind when we ask for business information. Rich noted that he agreed with Priscilla. There is a process that is screened by EPA, and then MDAR, then the MCDs make the decision as to what is best to use. There are several layers of screening. Noted the issues on the unknowns: the list of inerts – there are millions of chemicals. If there are ingredients of concern, like PFAS, ask manufactures to certify they have less than the allowable amount. Rich also mentioned another thing to think about is spot testing by a third party.

Taryn noted the (school and families protection act – section 14 within CMR) products that are used outside cannot have inerts. Wanted to flag that for the subcommittee group. The URL related to this content is added to the Zoom chat for the subcommittee to review. Helen commented that the EU has banned Sumithrin. Helen noted that there are other scientists that disagree with EPA's approach. People are justified to be questioning the EPA registration process, as it is not perfect. Perhaps we can hire a chemist to test the inert products in pesticides.

John commented to the subcommittee group regarding any final thoughts or comments before moving on. Brad shared agreement with Helen's comments, thinks the State should address inert products. CBI should be accessible for this purpose. Rich noted that even if the full chemical composition of pesticide was known there would still be lingering questions about risk.

Directive 2: Make recommendations regarding "employing methods, including products disclosures or implementation of testing protocols and procedures, to avoid the use of pesticides containing per -and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS)."

John asked the subcommittee group on their initial thoughts and recommendations regarding data gaps. Helen commented that she has no data gaps for this one. Rich also has no concerns regarding gaps. Jennifer noted that this legislation was before we knew how PFAS came into pesticides. We know now the PFAS was in the containers. Jennifer commented that we need a process of QA/QC to ensure we do not have PFAS coming into the pesticides. Taryn responded that the EPA did come out with a method for oily substances to test for PFAS. The link was put in the chat that references the EPA process and it is noted that currently this is for oily substances only.

Brad commented that PFAS has most basic data gap of all. We haven't figured out what PFAS is. Brad expressed concern that we are focusing on this one class of chemical. Brad asked the question if this

directive should be specific to PFAS or more general to persistent substances. Priscilla noted that she has no gaps preventing her to move forward. Bob wanted to be able to address this issue fully. Because of the way EPA is defining PFAS, it is important to note this a wide range of chemicals. This is a rather dynamic question that we need to pay attention to. Brad provides a link to a PowerPoint presentation, specifically page 6, and noted it as illuminating. Focus here should be on the real issue, persistence of chemicals.

There was an expressed interest of the group to hear from Hotze, MDAR chemist, to present on the PFAS content. Jennifer commented and asked the question could previous mosquito control spraying have contributed to PFAS in water – 20 parts per trillion of PFAS found in water supplies across the State. Nicole noted that seeing presentation from Hotze would be valuable and commented if it would be helpful to determine where in the supply chain PFAS could happen again related to other possible contamination points. Rich commented that the PFAS issue is tangential. We should strive to minimize it, but we are going off to far from the focus of this subcommittee, which is to determine a process. Brad agreed it is tangential but does think some general recommendations are in order due to the prevalence of PFAS.

Helen noted a recommendation on a PFAS free certification process and stated that his should be on the manufacturers. Rich commented that if we are going to focus on PFAS we should all be on the same page and proposed a motion to have Hotze present to the group. Rich proposed to Helen do we focus on PFAS free or a PFAS threshold and asked, can we ever be PFAS free? This is an evolvable recommendation based on the subject matter. Jennifer noted PFAS drinking water standard, groundwater cleanup standard, and asked if the existing laws are sufficiently protective? The recommendation was made to have Hotze present at the main task force meeting versus just the subcommittee meeting.

Brad stated that our knowledge on PFAS is evolving so quickly that we need to be able to be flexible and dynamic to consider PFAS. Priscilla recommended that a line item be put into MDAR or DEP budget to pay for this – perhaps a third party approved lab would be more important. Money must be appropriated for this if we are asking for QC. Continued testing would be necessary, not just for mosquito control, but for all pesticide products registered in the State and used. Taryn confirmed MDAR and DEP involved with pesticide testing for PFAS, which was conducted. Bob noted that he had nothing more to add regarding this topic.

Nicole agreed with many of the other sentiments. Suggested as a group the need to identify resources going forward that can be used as a basis for people making decisions whether it be EPA development of a compound list or other resources as needed.

Directive 3: Make recommendations regarding “promoting the use of the safest or minimum risk pesticides available”

John opened the conversation to the group regarding thoughts and recommendations on directive three. Helen commented, what does safest and minimum risk mean – health, human, environmental/ecological risk? John asked Taryn for clarification and Taryn responds that there is an EPA resource that provides some information, based on registration number. Information can also be accessed from the manufacturer’s website. Bob noted that choosing the least toxic and most effective products is key. Efficacy is a key here regarding minimum risk maximum efficacy products. We can put together a long list of products for mosquito control, but if they do not meet the test of efficacy they should not be used. Products should not be chosen if they fail efficacy. Priscilla noted that it is hard to define safest, most effective, and minimum risk pesticide. This means different things to different

people. Hard to define specifically. Agreed with Bob's assessment. MCDs determine what they are going to use, and the formulation of that product related to mosquito control.

Brad noted the need to be consistent with terms in statute and law. Agreed safest and minimum risk is open to interpretation and there is a need to keep consistent terminology. Also, there is a need to recognize that there is some risk associated with using pesticides. We need to be consistent in our subjective terms. Jennifer commented that she is less concerned with the process the State uses in State based mosquito control. More concerned with private applicators. This is a place where perhaps more recommendation is needed for example, with private companies like mosquito guard, mosquito Mary, etc. Brad stated he has looked into these companies – they are not in the purview of subcommittee; however, making the recommendation that these companies should be looked at, is within the purview of the subcommittee.

Rich agreed with almost all the points brought up. Often challenged on IPM. With any pesticide use it is necessary to weigh the needs, benefits, and risks. To formalize that is a difficult process.

Recommended leaving it to the regulators regarding what should be used and to the MCDs as to when it should be used. It should be asked if an insecticide is efficacious when deciding to use the product. It's not, but it should be in our purview to look at or make a recommendation on private mosquito control companies. Posed the question why we can't hold the private mosquito control companies to the same standard.

Helen agreed with the sentiments on private mosquito control companies. Helen noted that she is very impressed with the process behind MCDs and would like to see the State invest more money in the ecological impacts, water concentration, sediments. Concern in the use of the synergists, they can synergize with the pesticides that are already in the environment. Helen expressed concern with PBO and their ability to synergize with pesticides in the environment and cause toxicity to certain ecological receptors.

Brad agreed with Rich's comments, should be considered and evaluated, but too premature to take PBO out of the mix. Bob would like to look at the three directives. PFAS should be looked at separately. There is a need to look at directive one, go to directive three, then tackle directive two. John suggested that we do that. Directive one will be a focus for the 11/16 meeting. John asked for volunteers to share notes for the 11/16 subcommittee meeting. The goal for the 11/16 meeting is to dive into directive one. Seeing no further comments, a motion is made to adjourn the meeting. There is a motion to adjourn from Bob. Jennifer and Rich second the motion to adjourn and Rich agrees with motion to adjourn. There were no dissents from the group regarding adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 2:01 pm.

MCTF Pesticide Selection Subcommittee Meeting Minutes 11 16 21

Minutes for the Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century (MCTF) Task Force Meeting

Subcommittee Meeting: Pesticide Selection

November 16, 2021, 12:00 p.m. via Zoom

Meeting Topics:

- Meeting opening, roll call, welcome (Chair)
- Housekeeping notes (EEA representatives)
- Agenda review and introductory remarks (Facilitator)
- Directive 1: Identifying ingredients in pesticide formulations
- Sequence of directives to address
- Proposed schedule
- Wrap Up and Next Steps (Facilitator)
- Closing Remarks and Vote to Adjourn (chair)

Bob Mann conducted roll call at 12:01 pm. A quorum was established. Subcommittee members in attendance included: Priscilla Matton, Brad Mitchell, Jennifer Pederson, Richard Pollack, Helen Poynton, and Nicole Keleher. Opening remarks and a few quick logistical details were shared with the group. It was noted that disruptions should not prevent future meetings from preceding if we have a chair and quorum. John Wilhelmi wanted to get a sense if there would be a quorum for the 12/28 meeting. John Wilhelmi commented that he would keep an eye on progress to determine if the 12/28 meeting would need to be rescheduled or canceled as there may or may not be a quorum for the scheduled meeting on 12/28.

- Directive 1: Make recommendations regarding “identifying known ingredients in pesticide products used for mosquito control, analyzing the ability, or lack of ability, to identify such ingredients, and making recommendations for determining such ingredients.”

Brad Mitchell asked if we are choosing the pesticides or are we discussing different ways to look at process? Priscilla Matton commented that she was under the impression we would look at process. Richard Pollock noted the language in directive one leaves a lot to be desired. The issue is should be to better assess what is not listed. John Wilhelmi noted that this will come up in the inert ingredient discussion. Jennifer Pederson asked if MA further evaluated pesticides that are already approved by EPA or if MA just accepts EPA’s registration. Taryn LaScola replied that based on MA Pesticide Board’s recommendations and MA laws, MA may further restrict a pesticide. Richard Pollack asked if MA only reviews active ingredients or if it reviews all ingredients (including inert ingredients). Taryn LaScola replied that if the active ingredient has never been registered in MA, then MA reviews the active ingredient. If the product is new but the active ingredient is already in other registered pesticides, then MA still reviews the product, but the review is not as extensive as that for a new active ingredient. Richard Pollack asked about what would happen if the active ingredient were in other registered products, but those products were labeled for a different use? Hotze Wijnja (MDAR) replied that MA will review the products with the new use pattern.

Brad Mitchell noted States do not have ability to change label. They can limit how they are used by MCDs but can't change the label themselves. John Wilhelmi noted that three different types of ingredients came up during last Pesticide Selection subcommittee meeting: Active, Inert, and Synergistic. Brad Mitchell noted that many of the pyrethroids available to homeowners are more persistent than products the MCDs use. Richard Pollack commented that if active ingredients and synergist are required to be listed, identified, and have concentration indicated on label then there may not need to be further discussion on this topic and the group can switch the conversation to inerts, which is the unknown and a concern to others in this area. Nicole Keleher noted 25B products and asked if the subcommittee should include a sentence in the recommendation about these products. Taryn LaScola suggested that the subcommittee consider addressing 25B products under directive two. Richard Pollack noted that the MCDs don't use 25B products, so if the discussion is restricted to state mosquito control, then 25B products do not need to be discussed.

Brad Mitchell noted the impacts of larviciding are minimal, but other subcommittee members have brought them up as a problem. Bob Mann noted that we know the regulatory scheme for bringing the products to market is identifiable and that is not going to change. We can make recommendations to our spirit but practically that is not going to change. We should bring a spotlight to what these processes are. Richard commented that he believed concentration is on label and noted that it might be worthwhile asking manufactures if they can supply additional quality control information, such as analytical data identifying/quantifying active ingredients.

Taryn LaScola added that as an FYI, under FIFRA, MA conducts "producer establishment inspections" (PEIs) to take samples and confirm the identities of active ingredients. These checks do not check for contaminants, like PFAS. Jennifer Pederson noted that this could be one area with opportunity for more oversight. Helen Poynton noted interest in adding something about the PEIs in the recommendation. Otherwise, agreed active ingredients are listed on the label; therefore, don't think we need regulation to find other ingredients. Helen also noted that she can contribute to the discussion of resistance but didn't feel that conversation belonged here. No subcommittee members objected to this recommendation. Jennifer Pederson noted that the subcommittee needs to be prepared to defend a no action recommendation to the task force because some people do not trust EPA's registration process.

Bob Mann commented regarding concentration, that if there is a particular herbicide in the state where there is more than a 20% concentration, it is automatically considered a state restricted product. It might be something we can look at with the products that are labeled for mosquito control in MA if the concern is that the concentration be harmful for the environment or people. Perhaps the group would want to limit the products availability on the store shelves. Taryn LaScola noted that if a product is restricted it means that an individual that is using that product has to have a private or commercial certification license, required to get more continuing education units (CEUs), and have to have had your core license for at least two years. Brad Mitchell commented that he doesn't have concern with application related to the MCDs; however, we may need to consider alternatives.

Jennifer Pederson commented that if there are alternatives then they have gone through the registration process, in terms of process it seems like we have an adequate process in MA to deal with those. Nicole Keleher asked if we want to have a section for 25B products that do not follow the same approval process since they are being used in our state against mosquitos and they do have labeled active ingredients? Taryn LaScola commented that the directive said minimum risk when it refers to a

safer alternative and 25B are part of that. 25B are minimum risk pesticides per EPA. They are used by private companies and homeowners for mosquito control. They are technically pesticides just not registered pesticides.

Richard Pollack noted that his understanding is the MCDs don't use 25Bs and if the discussion is about state sanctioned mosquito control then we don't need to get into the weeds with 25B, but Richard encouraged the group to broaden the scope and look at this for commercial applicators as well. Jennifer Pederson noted that she is concerned about 25B and thinks it should be part of discussion because of the proliferation of the private companies. Taryn LaScola commented on the process by which a product becomes registered. Assuming the products have gone through the proper channels in the process and they are legal to use, with the Pesticide Selection subcommittee it then becomes the question of how you select the best pesticide using those different directives. Brad Mitchell noted that we need to understand that we are not looking at registration process. 25B shouldn't come up unless we take up private company and homeowner mosquito control. Our focus is on how MCDs choose to use pesticides and perhaps whether we are going to include private mosquito control. Nicole Keleher noted that she sees communities that are not well versed in pesticides push for 25B, so having us make a recommendation to not use 25B for widespread control would be a worthwhile recommendation.

John Wilhelmi shifted the conversation to inert ingredients in pesticide products and opens this topic to the group. Priscilla Matton commented that the EPA gets this information during their registration process, so there is no recommendation. Priscilla noted that she doesn't think we are going to find a manufacturer that will provide that State with this information and commented that manufacturers might stop registering their products in MA. The state and pesticide board are doing their due diligence. Bob Mann agreed with Priscilla Matton's points and noted that these are standard that are long established. There is an effort at EPA to review this topic of inerts federally.

Taryn LaScola commented that inerts are reviewed and classified by the EPA. These inerts are reviewed as part of registration process. Priscilla Matton commented to ensure committee members understood she did not mean PFAS in her previous comments. PFAS is not an inert and was never meant to be part of the product. Priscilla noted that she is certainly concerned with contaminants but doesn't think that fits in with the inert conversation. Helen Poynton asked if the MA Pesticide Board could review the inert ingredients without Confidential Business Information (CBI) being made available to the public. Taryn LaScola noted that legally, the board may have to release this information to the public.

Brad Mitchell agreed with Priscilla Matton and noted there will be people that want to know about inert ingredients. CBI is not protected by public record. Brad suggested that whichever subcommittee looked at this there will need to be legal protection from public disclosure of CBI. Jennifer Pederson commented that part the subcommittees charge is to make legislative recommendation if needed and this topic would be one of them. Richard Pollack noted that inert ingredients are known to EPA and even if they were known to MA regulators, people would still have concerns about the review process. Priscilla Matton asked if we were to make a legislative request, who would be qualified to test concentration? Unless it is the pesticide board, or subcommittee of the MA pesticide board, Priscilla is not sure who we would designate to ensure accuracy and robustness. Helen Poynton pointed out that MA has stricter requirements for many environmental issues than the EPA. For example, MA drinking water standards against PFAS are much more stringent than EPA. Helen noted part of it would be having

another agency review what has already been reviewed to make sure that there isn't anything of issue. Recommendation would be to have the MA state pesticide board also review pesticide ingredients.

Jennifer Pederson noted that she thought the DEP Office of Research and Standard had a hand in this. A technical office within state government seemed to be the place to have this evaluation. Brad Mitchell noted concern related to putting this on the pesticide board, as they may not have bandwidth. Brad noted a need to focus on mosquito control and not registration in general. Brad asked a question: do we envision mosquito control in MA having some sort of subgroup that reviews pesticides and chooses them? Until that is determined there may be challenges answering the question.

Bob Mann recommended leaving the two contradictory recommendations for a bit and noted he came to this topic by going to the pesticide board meetings, and the more he immersed himself in the topic the more he saw the wisdom in the way things were structured. Bob noted that some of the negativity is coming from places where people don't understand the process and people. Bob noted the pesticide board meetings are necessary meetings to attend if you want to expand understanding.

John Wilhelmi asked the group about what topics are overlapping with other subcommittees. Brad Mitchell responded that he is on policy structure subcommittee and there may be a bit of overlap. Helen Poynton noted that on the secondary recommendation to add in a way to protect confidential information. Jenn Pederson noted if ORS should be part of the pesticide registration subcommittee. Hotze Wijnja clarified that MDAR currently works with ORS related to certain herbicides where MA DEP and MDAR take review the information of these herbicides and they look at inerts. Brad noted that he doesn't think the charge of this group is to change the pesticide registration process. Jennifer Pederson noted that given what Hotze just said maybe the recommendation is that the pesticide board subcommittee be more involved with ORS. If they are not part of the structure and should be than maybe that needs to be part of the recommendation. Jenn also noted that when we go back to the task force this will become a point of contention and there may be a push for some sort of recommendation. Brad responded there will be a push for inerts but needs clarification if the subcommittee has the authority to make recommendations on pesticides.

Taryn LaScola agreed with Brad. Pesticide subcommittee is established by 132B and the registration process is established within the regulation. Any sort of change to that would be changing 132B or 333 CMR. We have this existing registration process. What is the recommendation for how the MCDs are selecting a product? The group can then weave in the issues related to PFAS or inerts. One thing to keep in mind is what has been done in the past for selecting pesticide for use for the MCDs or SRB. The group should look at some of the processes that are currently existing and then trying to weave in some of the directives that the subcommittee has been tasked with looking at.

Jennifer Pederson commented that 132B sets up the pesticide board, and on the board is the Commissioner of DEP or a designee. Taryn LaScola responded that 132B sets up the pesticide board and then sets up the pesticide board subcommittee, which are two different entities.

Helen Poynton noted that she and Brad had exchanged a comment or two via the chat, after which she read the comments aloud to the entire subcommittee. John Wilhelmi reiterated that direct messages cannot happen amongst the group and all discussions need to be in a public meeting format.

Brad Mitchell asked a question if it would be appropriate for the group to reach out to the policy structure group to state we need a subcommittee of the SRB that needs to review pesticides before they are used by the MCDs. At some point, we need to determine if this includes private mosquito control as well. It is noted that this may be a topic for recommendation to the policy structure group. Both Brad Mitchell and Richard Pollack are members of this subcommittee and would support this. Richard Pollack agreed that it would be good for the Policy Structure subcommittee to consider and vote on. Also felt that it is a good idea to look at the dichotomy between MCDs and other non-MCD applicators.

Priscilla Matton wanted to make sure that subcommittee members were all on the same page regarding products that are approved for use, but not which products are chosen for a specific situation. For example, an adulticide is a product that is registered by the EPA, registered in MA and is reviewed by the SRB subcommittee, but it's not making a determination whether or not the product should be used. Jennifer Pederson confirmed with Priscilla that we are concerned with the safety of using the product not how it is used.

John Wilhelmi asked the group if there were any further comments regarding where the members may be headed for further recommendations on identifying inert ingredients and the actions that will need to be taken. Jennifer Pederson commented interesting putting forward a first recommendation of no action necessary, and keep the other two as back up if there is pressure to do something different. Bob Mann pointed out there are certain points of view that will not be satisfied based on what we say and would rather be bold in how we put forth our recommendation then structure our arguments of how to defend that. Brad Mitchell noted that he still wants to focus on and address inerts. Brad also noted the only way to get inerts is to require them through legislation and protect CBI through legislation.

John Wilhelmi asked if there were any other comments about identifying inerts and there were none. John noted that a prudent path forward was to have draft recommendations or rationale for recommendations. John asked for volunteers that will agree to work off-line to come up with a first draft that everyone could see at the next subcommittee meeting. Helen Poynton asked if it should be two people doing this? Brad Mitchell noted that he has other commitments on another subcommittee but would be willing to assist if someone could give a brief synopsis of what the subcommittee is looking for.

John Wilhelmi noted that the group would need to come back to inert ingredients in the next subcommittee since there was limited time to discuss other topics before wrapping up. It is noted that other subcommittees have expressed interest in written questions being submitted to the MCDs and the group has the option to submit questions. Brad Mitchell noted to ask the why and how MCDs come to a decision. For example, adulticiding. Richard Pollack commented that he didn't think it was relevant to the subcommittee and was not sure what we would be asking MCDs about pesticides. Richard noted the MCDs have a listing of pesticides that are available for use and they pick which one to use. Helen Poynton asked if the group is drafting questions to one MCD or to all of them? John Wilhelmi noted that it could be either or and to be mindful of the number of questions being asked.

Next steps are reviewed with the group, which includes the submission of questions to the MCDs, the 11/30 subcommittee meeting will spend time coming up with Brad Mitchell's recommendation document, and to address directive two, if time permits.

There were no questions in the Q&A function for review. Bob Mann noted that the meeting was a good discussion making progress through the first directive. Seeing no other comments, Bob Mann took a

motion to adjourn the meeting. Richard Pollock made the motion and Brad Mitchell seconded. All in favor said aye and the meeting was adjourned at 1:49 pm.

MCTF Pesticide Selection Subcommittee Meeting Minutes 11 30 21

Subcommittee Meeting: Pesticide Selection

November 30, 2021, 12:00 p.m. via Zoom

Meeting Topics:

- Opening (EEA representative)
- Welcome and Roll Call (chair)
- Housekeeping Notes (EEA representative)
- Agenda Review (facilitator)
- Introductory Remarks (facilitator)
- Directive 1: Identifying Ingredients in Pesticide Formulations (facilitator)
- Directive 2: Promoting Use of Safest or Minimum Risk Pesticides (facilitator)
- Homework for Next Meeting (facilitator)
- Public Input via Zoom Q&A, Closing Remarks, and Vote to Adjourn (chair)

Bob Mann opened the meeting and conducted roll call at 12:02 and a quorum was established. Meeting attendees included Priscilla Matton, Brad Mitchell, Jennifer Pederson, Richard Pollack, Helen Poynton, and Nicole Keleher. Taryn LaScola read the standard opening and housekeeping items. John Wilhelmi provided a logistical update regarding approving meeting minutes. John provided a display of the meeting minutes. Jennifer Pederson had pointed out a correction at the end of the meeting minutes related to meeting adjournment. The correction was noted in track changes on the meeting minutes document and would be updated. A motion was made by Richard Pollack to approve the presented meeting minutes which was seconded by Priscilla Matton. A roll call was conducted to approve 10/5 meeting minutes. Nicole Keleher (aye), Bob Mann (aye), Priscilla Matton (aye), Brad Mitchell (abstain), Richard Pollack (aye), Helen Poynton (aye).

John Wilhelmi reviewed the agenda with the group and noted that this is the fifth meeting of the Pesticide Selection subcommittee. Reviewed the first directive and confirmed that Bob Mann will report out to the full Task Force on 12/14. Reviewed the second directive. It was noted the initial brainstorming for the meeting will be to get thoughts out on the table and spur further discussion for subcommittee meeting on 12/13. It was noted that due to scheduling there may not be a meeting on 12/28. Directive three may not be addressed until January due to MDAR presentation in December. John asked if there were any questions regarding where the subcommittee is heading and there were no comments or questions

John moved the conversation to directive two – *Make recommendations regarding promoting the use of the safest or minimum risk pesticides available.*

Brad Mann noted that the group needed to think about efficacy versus feasibility and identified a need to have someone who had a background in mosquito management when it comes to picking a pesticide. Richard Pollack noted efficacy was the critical element and it was critical the group formalize these so others understand as well. The first thing in picking a pesticide is that it be efficacious. Second, a combination that it is appropriate to use for the application and environment, that it is effective, and passes a risk benefit assessment. Richard Pollack noted that this already occurs with the EPA, the State, and MCDs take all of this under advisement, but that it's not clear the public understands this.

John asked the group to identify who selects the pesticides? Richard Pollack responded: the EPA, State Pesticide Board, and then the MCDs. Priscilla Matton noted that there was also the SRB, in consultation with other agencies. Brad noted that the subcommittee was focused on pesticide selection for mosquito control and the state can only chose a pesticide that was already registered. Priscilla also added in the Generic Environmental Impact Report (GEIR)

to the list and noted that someone was hired to write that report and review pesticides. Jennifer Pederson asked if the EIR happened every year and the answer was it did not. Priscilla stated that products are also reviewed by the Natural Heritage and Endangered Species Program which sits within the Division of Fisheries and Wildlife. Alisha Bouchard shared the EIR as a link. Brad added to the conversation and noted that there was an expectation that we formalize the process of how pesticides are chosen for mosquito management.

John asked about the Division of Fisheries and Wildlife and if they were consulted by SRB regarding selecting a pesticide for aerial application. Priscilla answered, yes, but separately than the aerial adulticide process. General mosquito practices are reviewed also separately from aerial adulticiding. Taryn LaScola added a clarification point regarding the SRB during aerial applications - the SRB does have documents and a formalized process on choosing pesticides and we could provide that information to the subcommittee. John asked if the group was interested in the resource that Taryn spoke of and they were.

Bob noted that he liked the concept of providing something more formalized and he wondered if something like that already existed. For example, was there a flow chart to show the selection of pesticide? John asked Taryn about formalized SRB process documents and what they look like. Taryn noted the plan happened in 2020 and 2021 and she believed it would be part of the SRB response plan going forward. Brad noted that there was an expectation that this subcommittee formalize this process and Jennifer agreed that formalizing a flow chart would be good. John asked the group for any additional feedback regarding documented processes they are aware of in the MCD. Priscilla noted that the EIR was a good place to start and keeping in mind that the active ingredients are not changing. Priscilla noted that we don't see a lot of new active ingredients in mosquito control.

Bob noted that he had no intention of changing what the MCDs are doing now through this process but wants to be able to document and formalize process to address any competing thoughts/ideas. Brad noted that the MCDs are choosing their own pesticide and that he never had an issue with the products that are chosen by MCDs; however, having a formalized process of how MCD's choose products would be beneficial. Helen Poynton asked Priscilla about active ingredients that are available and where to find a list of active ingredients? Priscilla noted the MCDs mostly choose minimal risk, and that MCDs know organophosphates are not welcomed in MA. Helen followed up asking if not using organophosphates was an informal decision or a result of a formal process. Priscilla noted that it was more informal. Richard Pollack added that we know that, for example, malathion works well, it was highly efficacious, but it is rarely used because we have other products available that are efficacious that are acceptable to more people. Richard noted this as an example of how the pesticide selection process works well – the product, in this case, was the most appropriate to use while also providing the least risk. Richard commented that it would be good to formalize a statement on how that process works, at some point it will be necessary to apply pesticide but by choosing one that was efficacious and acceptable on many levels.

John asked the group if it needed to know more about the SRB and MCDs selection process. Jennifer commented that if DPH were on the SRB, it might offer the public a higher level of comfort. Taryn added that although DPH was not on the SRB, that DPH was one of the state agencies heavily involved in mosquito control. Jennifer noted that was helpful, but the formalization of that would reduce the ambiguity that DPH may not be consulted. Richard noted that these were all good points; however, if we remain focused on pesticide selection, the group does not need to delve into this. Richard commented that this may be better for the policy structure subcommittee and Brad agreed. Richard added, that from his perspective, if one was going to apply a pesticide it should be chosen with the highest efficacy toward the intended target. Brad noted that this was not a two-dimensional discussion, what may be lowest risk to human health may be a higher impact towards aquatic organisms. We need a consensus of people with different end points in mind. Consensus and balance are key. John asked the group if there were any other comments on safest/minimum risk. Bob asked if there was a way to quantify this? Bob mentioned that Cornell uses an environmental impact quotient. Brad noted that if we can identify one or two for consideration then we can add them in for consideration, but they may be too limited to get the nuances of certain situations.

John opened the meeting to individual comments and/or a listing of items of concern and consideration for recommendation. Helen noted there was no formalized statement for selection and commented that the public does not know how this happens. Helen noted that maybe this should be its own separate issue with a separate recommendation. Richard noted a similar point to Helen. Richard thought perception was the issue. The recommendation would be that we would benefit from having a formalized road map of how pesticides are selected. Jennifer noted that the persistence piece was concerning. Jennifer called into question that any new pesticide that was selected that the SRB ensure that it not negatively impact drinking water, both public systems and private wells. Jennifer noted the cost benefit piece was important here as well as there are different opinions of that.

Brad noted concern on MCD process and consistency in choosing pesticides. We don't have ecotoxicologist in every MCD. However, if we put it to the State, we may not get the most efficacious pesticide selection. It is important to have balance between consistency across MCDs in selection, and flexibility in meeting individual MCD needs. For example, some MCDs have entomologists and some don't, there needs to be a balanced and broader state review while also meeting MCD needs. Richard built on what Brad said and noted the largest MCDs have expertise in house, smaller projects may not. This overlaps with pesticide selection, best practices, policy structure subcommittees. The first time a new product was proposed for use in an MCD, it is reviewed at the State level and approved/denied. Brad commented that we are talking about lowest risk situations where one may be better than other. Priscilla noted that she liked the formalization of process or review, just need to add in "in a timely manner". Priscilla commented if it was being reviewed, these things need to be done relatively quickly. Priscilla commented that she understands formulation is important, but it may be best to look at active ingredients versus formulation. Brad noted that Priscilla brought up an excellent point that most of the new products are better for the environment and we do need to consider that. Sometimes persistence is warranted, but we need guidance around that. Priscilla commented that a lot of that can be understood based on factors and environment. John documented a separate issue of concern that MCDs have varying degrees of expertise and capacity. John added this to the listing of information being compiled.

Bob noted that even if individuals don't think pesticides should be used at all, building an easily discoverable and transparent process via the State would be beneficial and important but also noted that he would want to be cautious so that MCD's have a degree of flexibility for applicable use of mosquito management practices. Priscilla noted that her hope would be that a new subcommittee would review products and makes decisions by a certain time with labels being reviewed on an as needed basis. Richard added that he was not suggesting every new product be reviewed but a new active ingredient or a profoundly different way to apply product would necessitate a review. Richard commented if it was important enough it should be a process to approve a new product. Richard also noted, a lot of comments heard in other subcommittee are focused on how we limit MCD activity. There are worthwhile discussions, but it should be within each subcommittees purview on how we can further enhance activities. Richard noted that the group should not just limit what is done, but look at what can be done more efficiently. As a result, perhaps the group should make recommendations to that end. Nicole brought up mosquito resistance and where in our recommendation can we identify a mechanism in place to characterize mosquito resistance to active ingredients and how this information was folded into the selection process. Nicole noted if we are moving towards a decision tree on what pesticides are right to use, including resistance would be important.

Jennifer noted the public perception component, in which a subset of the public that has strong feelings about mosquito control. Jennifer understood the concern, but she was not sure how much effort the state should put into educating the public versus educating a small subsection of the public. Jennifer noted that she liked the formalized roadmap but doesn't want to waste time. Priscilla added that she would welcome more scrutiny on the product in a timely manner. Brad noted that it made sense to make it easier for the public to access. Helen agreed and commented that the information needed to be on the internet and easily discoverable for people to access if they want it. Priscilla added, issue of concern was the pesticide selection process be easily discoverable and was exactly what the recommendations should be.

Bob noted that the group should consider legislators. This should be part of our audience as we write and make recommendations, so legislators don't make mosquito control more difficult than is warranted. Helen had a question for the policy structure subcommittee members: is there concern about how MCDs are funded, and is this being discussed? Brad noted that has been discussed within the other subcommittees and there may be some general agreement to rewrite the enabling legislation from the start which would also include the funding mechanism. Richard noted that all of this was under discussion and included another recommendation, adding in a centralized body to use their collective expertise to assist across MCDs.

Alisha noted that the MCDs should be responding back by 12/3 on the specific questions that were distributed. Brad commented that perhaps when a centralized body was created, they can establish subcommittees to address certain issues that arise. Brad noted that we don't have to solve all the problems, we just need to create a mechanism by which they can be solved. Jennifer asked Priscilla if the exchange of information and ideas happened informally and Priscilla responded yes, there are a number of cross agency and cross-MCD touchpoints. Richard noted that he made the suggestion of having a subcommittee at a higher level that was more formal and it may be worth discussing more at the next meeting to determine if we need to act. Brad commented that this was more of a policy discussion, but it may be worthwhile to have discussions related to cross pollination with other subcommittees.

- Final remarks and homework assignments for next meeting:

Bob Mann noted the overarching problem in this consideration was to empower MCD decisions to impact public health, and that he doesn't wish to create a process that is burdensome. Brad agreed that we do not want to create an overarching bureaucracy and noted that when you look at inerts and resistance it does not seem to be an issue. Jennifer commented that she wants to continue discussion on the potential for DPH membership on the SRB. Brad noted that we need to think about who we want and at what level, and to consider layers of bureaucracy. Brad thought that it would be better if it was broken out into smaller subcommittees to maximize output. Alisha Bouchard mentioned that the MCDs do discuss with state agencies and even though the DPH was not an official member of the SRB there was consistent interaction between MDAR, MCDs and DPH. John noted that the table list of notes would be refined and asked Taryn if she could share the SRB document about selection process. There was nothing in the chat or Q&A screen. Bob Mann entertained a motion to adjourn from Richard Pollack, seconded by Brad Mitchell. All in favor voted aye. The subcommittee meeting was adjourned at 1:54 pm.

MCTF Pesticide Selection Subcommittee Meeting Minutes 12 13 21

Minutes for the Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century (MCTF) Task Force Meeting

Subcommittee Meeting: Pesticide Selection

December 13, 2021, 12:00 p.m. via Zoom

Meeting Topics:

- Agenda Review (facilitator)
- Introductory Remarks (facilitator)
- Directive 1: Identifying Ingredients in Pesticide Formulations (facilitator)
- Directive 2: Promoting Use of Safest or Minimum Risk Pesticides (facilitator)
- Announcements (facilitator)
- Public Input via Zoom Q&A, Closing Remarks, and Vote to Adjourn (chair)

Agenda Review and Introductory Remarks:

The meeting was called to order at 12:01 pm by Bob Mann. A roll call was conducted, and a quorum was established. All subcommittee members were in attendance. John Wilhelmi opened to logistical items, which included the approval of two sets of meeting minutes for 11/2 and 11/16. Bob took a motion to approve the 11/2 meeting minutes from Jennifer Pederson, seconded from Priscilla Matton. Richard Pollack noted the need for a slight revision to the 11/2 meeting minutes. Richard noted the correction on the second page in the next to last paragraph. Richard Pollack sent the corrected language to John Wilhelmi. No other revisions were cited for the 11/2 meeting minutes. A roll call was conducted to accept the revised 11/2 meeting minutes. Priscilla Matton (aye), Brad Mitchel (aye), Jennifer Pederson (aye), Richard Pollack (aye), Helen Poynton (aye), Nicole Keleher (aye), Bob Mann (aye). The group moved to motion for the approval of the 11/16 meeting minutes. Jennifer Pederson made a motion, seconded by Richard Pollack. There were no revisions needed and roll call was conducted. Priscilla Matton (aye), Brad Mitchel (aye), Jennifer Pederson (aye), Richard Pollack (aye), Helen Poynton (aye), Nicole Keleher (aye), Bob Mann (aye).

Directive 1 – Identifying ingredients in pesticide formulations

Brad noted that the content may require more conversation. John commented that the focus would be on active ingredient for discussion amongst the subcommittee. Jennifer Pederson thought the document could use some wordsmithing but had no other revisions. Jennifer added some language in line 32 and 34 and commented that it would be good to note what the program and processes are to show due diligence. Brad noted if we cover that we should put it in the background.

John moved the group conversation to inert ingredients. Brad noted that he tried to address the dissenting opinions in the document for those who thought we needed some additional information related to inert ingredients. Jennifer asked Helen if she wouldn't vote for that language unless it made mention that additional review was necessary and noted that if Helen's answer was yes then the group would need to expound on what that additional review is. Helen answered Jennifer's question that she would not support the recommendation for no recommendation. John asked Helen if she would expand on her position. Helen noted her rationale was that the State of MA regulates chemicals more stringently than the federal government does. Helen noted that some of the checks and balances may be written in the CBI piece. Bob noted the point was well taken and would be comfortable with the EPA becoming more forthcoming with inerts.

Jennifer commented rather than the second bullet being a dissenting opinion, could it be changed to reflect that the committee acknowledged that this was a longstanding issue. Brad noted that was his opinion and he does

consider it a dissenting opinion and he would vote that inerts need to be addressed. Brad added that whoever does the review of chemicals, such as the pesticide board subcommittee or a separate mosquito control task force, should be reviewing inerts as far as mosquito control goes and they should have CBI. John noted that he thought there was also an office within MA DEP that was mentioned in previous meetings, MA DEP Office of Research and Standards (ORS). Brad responded that they could be part of the review group. Jennifer noted a wordsmith change related to MA having more stringent testing standards. Helen noted that all states must at minimum follow the federal government and in certain cases the states test more than the federal government. Brad noted that MA has a more cautionary approach to chemicals than the federal government. Helen asked John if he could add something related to what Brad said regarding MA taking a more precautionary approach with chemicals. Taryn noted that ORS is not looking at inert ingredients in pesticides on a regular basis. Brad commented that his previous takeaway is that everyone wanted to protect CBI and wanted to be sure others shared the same opinion.

Brad noted that if the group does go forward with the review of inerts then there will be unanimity in CBI protection from public disclosure. Bob noted the willingness to look at inerts in a confidential way under a non-disclosure, specifically trying to protect information and look at it at the same time. The subcommittee agreed that CBI needed to be protected regardless of whatever recommendation moved forward. Priscilla asked a question on procedure related to dissenting opinions. Taryn noted it is up to the subcommittee and minority opinions could be addressed as things to think about. Bob felt that it was important that the subcommittee document the dissenting opinions to make sure both the recommended majority opinion is articulated as well as the minority opinion.

Richard noted from his standpoint he has no concerns about inerts and knows that the EPA is looking at them and would encourage the manufacturer to disclose that information, although the committee cannot force their hand in this. Richard mentioned a larger issue was a vocal minority that has long said that these unknown components are by their very nature dangerous. Richard noted that we will continue to hear that regardless of the recommendation. Richard asked the group if anyone thought we needed to address the controversy? Brad responded that he did not think we needed to address the controversy, as the subcommittee group are not trying to control the vocal minority but rather trying to provide some assurances to the vast majority of people.

Directive 2 – Promoting the use of the safest or minimum risk pesticides feasible.

John moved to the MCD answers that were gathered related to the distributed questionnaire. Helen commented that the answers were great regarding resistance testing and noted that not all the MCDs do this testing, which seemed to be due to a funding constraint. Helen noted that it would be good if all the MCDs were doing these tests and if they were testing every other year that would be a benefit. Helen commented that the frequency of resistance would lead to decreased efficacy. Brad recommended that if we find resistance it is up to this group to come up with a backup of different chemistry. Jennifer noted that there were figures provided and Jennifer asked if they would be distributed at some point. Alisha responded that she would look to see if she had the figures and would forward to John so he could forward to the subcommittee.

Richard pointed out that resistance is not a black and white issue and noted there are several methods of detecting resistance, but the products may still work. Richard commented on the need to be on guard and have alternative chemistry as a backup. Richard noted that you can have a strong resistance to some pyrethroids and less with others, and we do not need to jump to the malathion conversation but should have some backup. John noted that it seemed as though this was a topic that needed to be looked at more broadly to determine a process and who handles it.

Issues of concern and considerations for recommendation

Brad commented that in private mosquito control they are reportedly using a product he has never seen before. Bob mentioned that he added the pesticide label information into the chat. Brad also commented that he sent John an Amazon link with the pesticide label in the chat. John asked if it made sense to have one recommendation

speak to the selection that is done by the SRB separate from the selection that is done by MCDs? Brad agreed and noted that the MCDs use larvicide more than anything else and the SRB is more reactive using adulticide and Brad thought we needed to address both. Brad also commented that typically the SRB is doing adulticide aerially where the MCD's are not. There is a need to look at the differences because they are significant.

Via the Zoom chat Richard sent John verbiage that he felt better encompassed lines two, three, and four. John updated the documentation with Richard's suggested edits. Priscilla noted that that the newly recommended language in lines two, three, and four could create a cumbersome process and place a burden on the MCDs. Richard clarified that it would be a one- or two-page document of the process and what is considered. Richard noted the intent would be a high-level general document that is illustrative of all things that are considered. Priscilla noted that this would be for every time an event happened. For example, seasonal, nuisance, vector, disease, not disease.

Jennifer noted that she remained concerned about private applicators and though that this needed to be ironed out sooner rather than later. Jennifer noted that what Brad had mentioned was concerning regarding private applicators using a product that is approved but not the safest. John noted the focus should be on the primary charge and that some of these parking lot items may be addressed towards the end. Brad noted on the private applicators that perhaps it belonged to another subcommittee. Priscilla commented that she thought the charge was related to the process and purpose of application between the state and MCDs. Priscilla thought process should be the same so that groups that think there is no consistency across MCDs know that there is.

Nicole noted that it is important to keep in mind that there are differences in budgets and background and that would play into decision making. Nicole commented that there should be flexibility for the MCDs, and a recommendation should be made to the state to provide resources to the MCDs that cannot meet minimum standards. Brad noted that consistency amongst MCDs is important.

John noted the second directive and was hoping someone from the subcommittee would volunteer to draft additional content and build upon what had been developed. Helen was willing to draft recommendations for the first point – synergists. Richard noted that he would need to think more about what his recommendation would look like. Priscilla agreed to work on a formalized process. Jennifer noted that the existing regulations that protected water supply needed to be called out. John asked Jennifer if she thought a recommendation was needed. Jennifer noted that she was happy to look at that and draft a recommendation if necessary.

Brad noted a reminder that this subcommittee is not reviewing all the pesticides, but the group needed to make sure the right parties are at the table and that the subcommittee would be doing the general framework. John asked if the varying degree of expertise, capacity, and resources across the MCDs was an area that needed to be addressed. Priscilla noted that she was concerned if structure and funding is not changed it would be challenging to address. John noted the topic of resistance and asked Helen if this area warranted additional conversation. Helen commented on the conversation about having a contingency plan if resistance is found but doesn't think there is enough information to address that via recommendations yet.

John noted that he would clean up and distribute the subcommittee meeting documentation, so Bob could have it available for the full task force meeting on 12/14. The cancelation of the 12/28 subcommittee meeting was confirmed with no objections from the group. Seeing no other comments from the group, John handed it over to Bob to close the meeting. Bob noted that there were no questions in the Q&A or chat. Bob Mann took a motion to adjourn the meeting. A motion was made by Jennifer Pederson and seconded by Brad Mitchell. All subcommittee members voted aye. The meeting was adjourned at 1:54 p.m.

MCTF Pesticide Selection Subcommittee Meeting Minutes 01 11 22

Minutes for the Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century (MCTF) Task Force Meeting

Subcommittee Meeting: Pesticide Selection

January 11, 2022, 12:00 p.m. via Zoom

Meeting Topics:

- Meeting Opening
- Agenda Review
- Introductory Remarks
- Directive 1: Identifying Ingredients in Pesticide Formulations
- Directive 2: Promoting Use of Safest or Minimum Risk Pesticides
- Directive 3: Avoiding Use of Pesticides Containing PFAS
- Homework for Next Meeting
- Public Input via Zoom Q&A, Closing Remarks, and Vote to Adjourn

Meeting Opening:

The subcommittee meeting was initiated and roll call was conducted by Bob Mann at 12:01 p.m. Subcommittee members in attendance included Richard Pollack, Brad Mitchell, Jennifer Pederson, Nicole Keleher, Priscilla Matton, and Helen Poynton. Taryn LaScola provided an overview of housekeeping items.

Agenda Review:

John Wilhelmi presented the agenda and reviewed the content with the subcommittee group.

Introductory Remarks:

The subcommittee moved to approve the 12/13 meeting minutes. Bob Mann entertained a motion to approve the meeting minutes. There were no comments related to meeting minute corrections. Brad Mitchell made a motion. Seconded by Richard Pollack. A roll call vote was conducted. Richard Pollack (aye), Priscilla Matton (aye), Brad Mitchell (aye), Bob Mann (aye), Jennifer Pederson (aye), Nicole Keleher (aye) Helen Poynton (aye).

John discussed the proposed timeline with the subcommittee group, and it was noted that there would be up to two additional meetings set up for the subcommittee. Alisha Bouchard commented that there would be an announcement at the task force meeting regarding when the listening session will take place. John noted that there was time set aside time on the agenda for all three directives; however, if time was running short, the subcommittee could skip Directive II so time could be spent on Directive III, avoiding use of pesticides containing PFAS.

Jennifer Pederson suggested inviting a speaker that had an opposing opinion on EPA process based on public comments from the last task force meeting. Richard Pollack asked if Jennifer had someone in mind that could provide objective data-based feedback. Jennifer noted that she was thinking about Kyla Bennett. Brad Mitchell commented that given the time constraint he would recommend it be considered for the larger task force. Subcommittee members discussed the public listening session and if it was the format to address opposing opinions related to EPA process. It was noted that the public comment time frame and listening session was intended to capture all public comments. Caroline Higley also reinforced that the public comment portal was open, and she noted the public listening session was meant to be a bit more targeted to focus on the subcommittee recommendations that had been drafted. Hearing the information that was provided, Jennifer Pederson withdrew her suggestion.

Directive 1: Identifying Ingredients in Pesticide Formulations:

The first recommendation on active ingredients was reviewed by the group. A question was raised by Richard related to producer establishment inspections and Taryn provided an overview of the process to address Richard's question. Richard was satisfied with the response and asked John to delete the comment. Brad also suggested that it made sense for that sentence to be removed unless additional information was needed. Priscilla commented that on the Best Practices subcommittee they are looking to establish a QA/QC process for all products that come into the state. Brad added that this was something that the other subcommittee could explore, and Priscilla noted that she was fine with striking the language in the recommendation.

The group moved to the second recommendation on inert ingredients. Comments in the draft recommendation language were discussed related to the recommendation of no action for identifying inert ingredients based on the belief that EPA's review of inert ingredients was accurate. Richard raised a comment related to EPA process and the opinions of some that feel that they don't trust or know. John noted that initially five of seven subcommittee members agreed on no action for the recommendation. Brad asked to see the dissenting opinions before the group took a vote on the recommendation.

John shared recommendation 2b that was drafted by Helen Poynton. Helen noted that there were a lot of concerns about CBI and pesticide manufacturers not registering products in MA. That information was taken into consideration to ensure CBI was protected. Helen discussed that EPA had a list of all of chemicals separated by food use and non-food use which she compared to the list of chemicals in IRIS that reviewed chemicals for carcinogenicity. It was noted that MA regulated chemicals more stringently than the EPA. Helen added that part of the challenge of putting this together was who would conduct the review. Helen looked into the MA pesticide regulatory language and the presentation that Taryn provided related to the disclosure of ingredients and the review process. Helen opened it up to the group to hear what other people thought.

Taryn noted that she reached out to DEP regarding some previous open questions and commented that MDAR could receive CBI if they were allowed to regulatory, but MDAR could not make it public, and if someone asked for it the information would need to be redacted. Brad noted that it was a mistake to make the Pesticide Board Subcommittee handle the review. There was a discussion about the understanding of executive session and what could be shared or redacted and there was a question on whether or not inert ingredients could be excluded. If there was a desire to move forward, Brad suggested a need to determine who does the review, what are their resources, and how does CBI get protected. It was noted that legislation would need to be created to clarify that. Helen added that the recommendation would be to amend the existing legislation to cover all the above. There was group discussion related to what legislation would need to be amended. Taryn noted that MDAR legal could review the recommendation if that was what the subcommittee wanted.

Jennifer noted that she liked the part of including DEP on the Pesticide Board Subcommittee. if the issue was that the board did not have the available resource then part of the recommendation to the legislature was to provide the Board with the right resources. Jennifer commented on some of the language regarding DEP setting the standard and she noted that there was a level of rigor in the EPA process that does not exist in the state. A question was asked if the recommendation specified review for mosquito pesticides or all products. Helen commented that she would like this to be all pesticide products. Subcommittee members discussed the benefit of streamlining the recommendation language to get legislation passed and that the review process may be better suited through a subcommittee of the newly reconstituted SRB versus the Pesticide Board Subcommittee. Nicole suggested a broader legislative change to review more than just mosquito-based products. Brad noted that he was supportive of a review and supportive of a review of inerts but thought this was best placed on a subcommittee of the newly reconstituted SRB.

Bob asked if the DEP had ever expressed a desire to be part of the Pesticide Board Subcommittee or has the Pesticide Board asked for DEP involvement? Bob added that it was important to stay within the scope of the

subcommittee charge. Brad added that DEP was involved with the Pesticide Board Subcommittee and the pesticide registration process. Priscilla commented on MA regulating pesticides more stringently than the EPA and noted that currently none of the active ingredients in products the MCDs use fall under drinking water safety regulations. Priscilla added that if the subcommittee could not fully address inerts due to CBI then that may not satisfy the people that question the EPA process. Helen discussed the listing of 4,500 chemicals in the context of trying to decide which people may be concerned about or not. Helen noted that some people will never be satisfied as they don't want pesticides being used and it was noted that the recommendation was written because there was a concern that there was no state level review. Jennifer commented that she liked the suggestion that DEP be included formally so the state had a say. Jennifer added that it was incumbent upon the group to make the recommendation that was most appropriate and to ensure that resources were suggested in the recommendation.

Bob commented that he was not persuaded to move forward with the recommendation but was willing to entertain having DEP formally be on the Pesticide Board Subcommittee and noted that the state level review was essentially duplicating what the EPA was already doing. Helen noted that she would rather see this recommendation included with modifications rather than not included at all. Helen discussed options for review, protection of CBI, and the synergizing of the recommendation with the Policy Structure subcommittee related to how this would fit in a newly reconstituted board.

Directive 2: Promoting Use of Safest or Minimum Risk Pesticides:

Due to meeting time constraints, it was determined this topic would be discussed at the 1/25 meeting. Priscilla provided an overview and background on her draft recommendation. John noted that initial review of the recommendation would be part of the groups' homework.

Directive 3: Avoiding Use of Pesticides Containing PFAS:

It was referenced that PFAS was detected in Anvil and the concern abated once it was determined to be a container issue and not a product issue. Priscilla noted that this was a one-time test as it was not an active or inert ingredient in the product, and it was an unexpected find in the product. Brad discussed points related to how the state can stay ahead of this. Bob noted that there were extensive reviews across state and federal entities that were also reviewing if this could happen in other types of containers and ways to prevent contaminations like this in the future. The subcommittee discussed that the PFAS issue was taken seriously and there was continued work being conducted. Priscilla posed the question of what type of recommendation the subcommittee could make and how many resources could be put towards the issue?

Brad discussed the need to anticipate and prevent persistent chemicals and to not just focus on PFAS. Jennifer agreed and added that the issue was the persistence and the unknowns. Jennifer asked if it was outside of scope if the subcommittee made a more robust recommendation. John provided an overview of the directive language and subcommittee members discussed the evolving EPA method of review in relation to thinking about a potential recommendation. Nicole discussed that the Pesticide Board Subcommittee was also looking at PFAS and noted that conversations were moving towards the EPA definition of PFAS.

John asked for feedback from subcommittee members in terms of recommendation on this directive. Helen noted that she was not sure yet but would like to be proactive in identifying contaminants with thought about how this could be feasible. Richard noted that he was torn on this and the question was what was practical. Richard suggested to advise the task force that the subcommittee was exploring options but not ready to make recommendations yet. Jennifer commented that what was known about PFAS should compel the group to take some sort of action. There were added conversations on producer testing and new analytical methods becoming available. Jennifer noted that she did not feel comfortable based on her membership not making a recommendation, and noted that a lot was evolving and that the group needed to make sure a recommendation captured that. Brad discussed the need to learn from this versus acting on it and the necessity for a proactive versus reactive approach.

Brad referenced BPA as a useful past experience. Priscilla agreed with Jennifer that a strong statement was needed and added that this was a costly issue for pesticide manufacturer and did not think it would happen again. Helen noted that BPA/PFAS are endocrine disruptor and endocrine disruption testing could pick up emerging contaminants and could be explored as a potential option. Richard suggested agreeing on a definition of persistence and referenced the CDC definition. Jennifer and Helen discussed a product testing approach. Brad noted that all were good ideas but recommended a broader approach and suggested leaving it as general as possible.

Bob pointed out that PFAS continued to evolve and there was a need to make sure focus was on the subcommittees task and purpose. Nicole commented that MCDs were not purposefully or knowingly using products with PFAS and she suggested considering testing of mosquito control products on an annual basis. John noted that he would massage the discussed content into a framework that could be presented at the task force. Jennifer suggested that content for discussion at the task force meeting be summarized rather than provided in the full text. John asked for clarification from EEA regarding what needed to be provided at the full task force meeting. Caroline Higley provided an overview of what would be presented so the public could begin to weigh in and assess the subcommittee recommendations. Jennifer recommended that the current information be prioritized and presented as a brainstorm session.

Homework for Next Meeting:

John noted that he would have some specific instructions for the group related to the draft recommendation language and specifically for the second directive.

Public Input via Zoom Q&A, Closing Remarks, and Vote to Adjourn:

Bob noted that he would be working with John to prepare material for the full task force meeting. Seeing no other questions or comments, Bob Mann entertained a motion to adjourn from Richard Pollack. Seconded by Brad Mitchell. All voted aye. The meeting was adjourned at 1:54 p.m.

MCTF Pesticide Selection Subcommittee Meeting Minutes 01 25 22

Minutes for the Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century (MCTF) Task Force Meeting

Subcommittee Meeting: Pesticide Selection

January 25, 2022, 12:00 p.m. via Zoom

Meeting Topics:

- Meeting Opening
- Agenda Review (facilitator)
- Introductory Remarks (facilitator)
- Directive 1: Identifying Ingredients in Pesticide Formulations (facilitator)
 - Recommendation on active ingredients
 - Recommendations on inert ingredients
- Directive 2: Promoting Use of Safest or Minimum Risk Pesticides (facilitator)
 - Recommendation on transparency in the review/selection process
 - Recommendation on protection of surface water and groundwater
 - Recommendation on synergists
 - Other recommendations to develop
- Homework for Next Meeting (facilitator)
- Public Input via Zoom Q&A, Closing Remarks, and Vote to Adjourn (chair)

Meeting Opening:

The subcommittee meeting was called to order at 12:05 p.m. by Bob Mann. A roll call was conducted and subcommittee members in attendance included Nicole Keleher, Priscilla Matton, Brad Mitchell, Jennifer Pederson, Richard Pollack, and Helen Poynton. Taryn LaScola provided a housekeeping update.

Agenda Review and Introductory Remarks:

The agenda, timeline table, and focus of the meeting were addressed with the subcommittee members. A clarification was provided regarding subcommittee meeting dates and Taryn LaScola offered to follow up with EEA to ensure meeting invites were distributed to the group. It was noted that the public listening session had been scheduled for February 10th.

Directive 1: Identifying Ingredients in Pesticide Formulations:

There were no further comments from subcommittee members for the recommendation language on active ingredients. Draft language was shared with the group regarding the no action recommendation on inert ingredients. John Wilhelmi followed up with Taryn LaScola regarding the ability of ORS to handle CBI. Taryn LaScola provided an overview on MDAR authority related to CBI. Jennifer Pederson added that if ORS didn't have the ability to handle CBI then the subcommittee needed to be forceful with the legislative fix. Subcommittee members discussed the public disclosure law, and it was noted that in some cases agencies have been exempted from public disclosure law and MA Fish and Game was cited as a previous example of one of the state entities that had been exempted in the statute language.

John Wilhelmi noted the no action recommendation rationale and asked the group if any text needed to be modified. Bob Mann clarified that what the subcommittee was saying was that they had critically evaluated the status quo and they were agreeing with that process. Brad Mitchell agreed with Bob Mann and noted that the recommendation was no further action be taken because the current process was adequate.

The group moved to the next recommendation on inert ingredients that was drafted by Helen Poynton. Helen Poynton provided an overview of the recommendation in relation to pesticide review during the registration process. It was noted that the legislation that created the MCTF tasked the task force to make recommendations on inert ingredients. Helen Poynton commented on the state of CA requiring inert ingredients when they register pesticides and how CA was able to figure out a process to keep the information confidential. It was noted that costs were addressed through the pesticide registration fees. Helen Poynton discussed the potential review process through MDAR or DEP and noted that she did not think it was the subcommittees job to figure out the specifics related to the protection of CBI.

Richard Pollack commented that he did not have an issue with a state agency receiving and maintaining the information confidentially and asked if the recommendation was looking to the manufacturer to disclose the information or would a state agency be doing the analytical work. In addition, there was an inquiry if the focus was specific to products just for mosquito control or all pesticides use in the state. Helen Poynton noted that she included an introduction section on why MA should be looking for inert ingredients and that there were reasons to believe that there could be a problem. Helen Poynton addressed the inquiries and clarified that she would like to focus on all pesticides that were registered in the state of MA and to have the process look more like the process in CA.

Brad Mitchell commented that he did not have a problem with the overall intent of the recommendation but noted that there may be too much detail. Brad Mitchell discussed the collection of funds based on the pesticide registration fees going to the general fund and noted the difficulty in redesigning 132B. It was added that the subcommittee would be better of setting goals than specifying items. Taryn LaScola flagged the pesticide registration fees going to the general fund and not directly to the state agency that collected the fees and the resources and the level of detail of what would be needed regarding inert ingredient collection. It was also mentioned that CA did not have a pesticide board selection subcommittee operate as a public body and suggested the regulations that would need to be amended. Priscilla Matton added that the Best Practices subcommittee was recommending a QA/QC process with random testing of products, especially related to concerns with water systems and water quality.

John Wilhelmi asked the subcommittee group if there were any additional comments. Bob Mann commented that in general he agreed with and appreciated the points that Helen Poynton made but given the scope of the subcommittee and the timeline, he did not think the recommendation was the right path to follow. Jennifer Pederson noted that she was uncomfortable with some of the language in the recommendation and suggested that some content could be generalized. In addition, it was suggested that if the recommendation was made for an additional review there would need to be a flag for resources and the legislature would need to devote time to figuring out how resources were allocated.

Helen Poynton asked Jennifer Pederson for her suggestions on revised wording within the recommendation draft. Jennifer Pederson noted that there were differing opinions if the state should be following a different process than the EPA. Jennifer Pederson commented that if the recommendation language remained there should be a distinction that there was some disagreement that the state should have a different process than the federal level. Helen Poynton pointed out that every state had the ability to regulate pesticides at a lower level than the EPA. John Wilhelmi noted potential action items for Jennifer Pederson to provide some edits based on the discussion that could be merged into the recommendation draft.

Directive 2: Promoting Use of Safest or Minimum Risk Pesticides:

Priscilla Matton discussed issues of concern and described what a review process would look like. It was noted that the SRB looked at the pesticide process for aerial spraying. Priscilla Matton commented that the idea was that people did not know about the process and Priscilla discussed publicizing the information by posting it to a website to formalize a statement related to how the registration process was handled at the federal and state level. The

overview of the idea was to disseminate information to convey that there was a process on why we chose specific products for the mosquito control process.

Brad Mitchell agreed with the draft language but suggested a little more detail to make it clear that efficacy was part of it. Priscilla Matton noted that the recommendation of a guidance document came out of a concern related to location of information for the public. It was an idea that informing the public was important, but technically not part of pesticide selection. It was noted that other resources may be used to communicate efficacy, such as the Mosquito Management Plan, GEIR, and the State Surveillance and Response Plan. Subcommittee members thought a guidance document was a good idea and suggested a subcommittee of the SRB be responsible for developing the guidance as they would look at all the mosquito products to determine how and when they were used. Helen Poynton commented that the State Surveillance Response Plan may already have guidance language.

Members of the subcommittee discussed the addition of a narrative on how safest and minimum risk pesticides were selected to determine which pesticide could be used with the best efficacy and the least harm. Alisha Bouchard commented that there was some language in the MDAR Response Plan on how aerial use pesticides were selected and that could be expanded on if needed. Brad Mitchell noted he could draw up a clarifying paragraph to address the subcommittee charge related to the language of safest and minimum risk. Jennifer Pederson asked about MCD product selection and Priscilla Matton commented that all the MCDs use the same pesticides and discussed pesticide option flexibility versus source management. Richard Pollack also had an issue with the term safest and minimal risk and noted that he sent some language in the chat that the group may want to consider. Subcommittee members discussed not micromanaging the MCDs as there were a limited number of products for mosquito control that were registered by the EPA and flexibility for the MCDs was important to allow them to make decisions based on the situation.

The group moved towards discussing the next recommendation under Directive 2, formalizing the annual review of pesticide products. It was clarified that the focus should be on adulticides and be inclusive of aerial spraying by the SRB and truck/backpack spraying by the MCDs for mosquito control. The subcommittee discussed additional modifications to the language. Richard Pollack noted that without the synergist the amount of active ingredient to apply would increase considerably and the use of the synergist greatly reduces the application rate of active ingredients. Brad Mitchell commented that the mosquito industry wasn't the only industry that puts these synergists into the environment and suggested when the pesticides are reviewed there will be a need to review the potential impacts of synergists in various mediums as well. Helen Poynton noted that she was not saying to stop using PBO, but in areas where there were high levels of pyrethroids, adding the synergist might be harmful to the aquatic community.

Jennifer Pederson questioned having DEP assemble the existing sediment data and thought it may be a better research project for a university. The comment was made that if this recommendation language did not change, it may make sense for DFG to be doing sediment collection versus DEP. Priscilla Matton asked questions related to review timeline and baseline data. Helen Poynton noted that the USGS had been doing surveys but was not sure when the last one was conducted. Helen Poynton commented that recommendation language could be changed to reflect that the appropriate state agencies would be directed to conduct analysis. Subcommittee members discussed evaluating synergists and how to not assume that it was only coming from MCDs. Helen Poynton commented that you could tell from the products and the two most prevalent insecticides found were not products that were used by MCDs. Jennifer Pederson suggested to include language in the recommendation that the legislature must provide applicable resources for the collection, sampling, and synthesizing of the data.

Jennifer Pederson provided an overview of her draft recommendation language. Priscilla Matton noted that on another subcommittee, Kim LeBeau was suggesting that there be conversations between water officials and applicators when pesticide applications took place so operational needs could be addressed. Priscilla Matton also commented that she had asked DEP for information that the MCDs could incorporate into MA GIS to avoid using pesticides around specific water sources; however, some locations may be considered restricted information.

Jennifer Pederson discussed a previous situation with a water plant that did not know spraying was taking place and commented on the need for improved communication. Helen Poynton inquired about the potential for inert ingredients to be on the groundwater protection list. It was noted that list was focused on active ingredients and use patterns. Subcommittee members discussed if it would be reasonable to put this language into the first recommendation and Priscilla Matton provided a recap of the suggested language that would be incorporated into the draft.

Homework for Next Meeting, Public Input via Zoom Q&A, Closing Remarks, and Vote to Adjourn:

There were no public comments or questions in the chat. John Wilhelmi provided an overview of next step action items and homework and informed the group that he would be distributing the detailed information via e-mail. The next meeting was scheduled for 2/2 and it was noted that the subcommittee would need to address some of the ideas on PFAS. Jennifer Pederson volunteered to draft language for the PFAS recommendation. Bob Mann commented on the two items that he put in the chat for subcommittee member review. Seeing no other comments, Bob Mann entertained a motion to adjourn from Brad Mitchell. Seconded by Jennifer Pederson. All in favor voted aye. The subcommittee meeting was adjourned at 1:58 p.m.

MCTF Pesticide Selection Subcommittee Meeting Minutes 02 02 22

Minutes for the Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century (MCTF) Task Force Meeting

Subcommittee Meeting: Pesticide Selection

February 02, 2022, 12:00 p.m. via Zoom

Meeting Topics:

- Meeting Opening
- Introductory Remarks
- Meeting Minutes – 10/19 and 11/30
- Directive 1: Identifying Ingredients in Pesticide Formulations
- Directive 2: Promoting Use of Safest or Minimum Risk Pesticides
- Directive 3: Avoiding Use of Pesticides Containing PFAS
- Homework for Next Meeting
- Public Input via Zoom Q&A, Closing Remarks, and Vote to Adjourn

Meeting Opening and Introductory Remarks:

Bob Mann called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m. A roll call was conducted, and a quorum was met. Subcommittee members in attendance included Brad Mitchell, Jennifer Pederson, Priscilla Matton, Richard Pollack, and Helen Poynton (arrived at 1:00 pm). A housekeeping update was provided by Taryn LaScola. John Wilhelmi shared the proposed timeline and status of recommendations by directives with the group.

Meeting Minutes – 10/19 and 11/30:

Bob Mann entertained a motion to approve meeting minutes for 10/19/21 as amended by Priscilla Matton. The motion was entertained by Brad Mitchell and seconded by Jennifer Pederson. A roll call was conducted. Brad Mitchell (aye), Jennifer Pederson (aye), Priscilla Matton (aye), Richard Pollack (aye), Bob Mann (aye).

Bob Mann entertained a motion to approve meeting minutes for 11/30/21 as amended by Priscilla Matton. The motion was entertained by Brad Mitchell and seconded by Jennifer Pederson. A roll call was conducted. Brad Mitchell (aye), Jennifer Pederson (aye), Priscilla Matton (aye), Richard Pollack (aye), Bob Mann (aye).

Directive 1: Identifying Ingredients in Pesticide Formulations:

The active and inert ingredient recommendation language was shared with the group. Brad Mitchell noted a change in the language under inert ingredients related to CBI. John Wilhelmi commented that he would share the alternate text provided by Jennifer Pederson and it would also be shared with Helen Poynton since she was not currently in the meeting. Jennifer Pederson wanted it noted that she had some concerns with the recommendation language that was drafted by Helen Poynton.

Directive 2: Promoting Use of Safest or Minimum Risk Pesticides:

The first recommendation was reviewed with the subcommittee group and the subcommittee discussed the changes that were made to the draft language. Brad Mitchell noted there were some clarifications and suggestions on language related to “posing more benefit than risk to human health and the environment”. Richard Pollack commented that Brad’s changes looked good and suggested a bit of wordsmithing which was updated directly by John Wilhelmi in the draft language. Taryn LaScola noted a flag that the term minimum risk was used by FIFRA. Jennifer Pederson provided feedback on the alternate language related to “Poses the most favorable risk/benefit ratio of these products already registered by the EPA and the Pesticide Board Subcommittee”. Brad

Mitchell commented that whoever the evaluator was would ultimately be making the decision. Subcommittee members continued discussing wordsmithing and language changes.

Priscilla Matton provided an overview of her draft recommendation language on the review process and referred to the items that had been noted as areas of concern, such as water systems and aquatic species. Priscilla Matton discussed the timeline for review and noted she incorporated in language as to why there was a review and what the benefit was. There was a reference to the statewide mosquito management plan which was being drafted by the Best Practices subcommittee. Priscilla Matton mentioned that she removed the entire section on outreach because of the comments from the previous subcommittee meeting suggesting that part of the recommendation may be better suited in the Local Engagement subcommittee. Brad Mitchell noted a few language changes related to stakeholders and suggested adding in something related to public input. Priscilla Matton asked about the review subcommittee and if it would be considered a public body. Subcommittee members discussed the public input process, and it was noted that there should be an acknowledgement that there was an opportunity for the public to comment on the process.

Bob Mann discussed potential language changes and commented on public engagement. Bob Mann noted that he would not want to see a situation where mosquito control activities were prevented from acting quickly in the interest of public health. Priscilla Matton discussed her perspective on public engagement and noted that there were opportunities for people to comment. Bob Mann reiterated that he would not want to see things become so overbearing that MCDs would not be able to do their job. Priscilla Matton closed by noting that she wanted to make sure her draft recommendation reflected the points from Jennifer Pederson and Helen Poynton. Jennifer Pederson noted that generally the information was captured but there may be a need to tighten some of the language on groundwater.

Jennifer Pederson commented on the creation of a centralized site for mosquito control information. It was noted if multiple entities needed to post information, it would make sense to have a centralized location. Richard Pollack discussed standards, policies, public engagement, and noted that there would always be challenges related to information/misinformation, but thought the draft was moving along well. Jennifer Pederson reiterated her suggestion that an edit be added to ensure the document was clear that it was proposing to create one central website for mosquito control. Brad Mitchell suggested adding in language related to the public comment process to ensure that it did not interfere with the overall mission. Priscilla Matton discussed explaining the role an MCD representative would play on the review subcommittee. Both Bob Mann and Brad Mitchell agreed that representation from an individual like this was important and essential to voice concerns in a group like this.

John Wilhelmi moved into the recommendation and rationale to address the potential ecological concerns of synergist in pesticide formulation and provided an overview of the draft language that was compiled based on the feedback from the last subcommittee meeting. Brad Mitchell noted that he did not disagree with the intent of the recommendation but added that there was too much detail and focus on soil sediments. Brad Mitchell noted that he thought the language needed to be a more general statement on environmental impacts, with aquatic sediments as a potential example. Richard Pollack agreed with Brad Mitchell and noted that the recommendation seemed like it was more of a research endeavor. Richard Pollack asked about the practicality of a state agency, like MDAR or DPH, implementing this type of recommendation. Taryn LaScola commented that a state agency would more than likely need to contract with an organization for the research aspects of the recommendation. It was added that resources were stretched amongst most state agencies at this point and that would need to be factored into the recommendation. Jennifer Pederson commented that she was not fully onboard with the recommendation at this point and noted that it did not seem like a state-led effort. Priscilla Matton discussed products that do not have synergists, for example organophosphates, and mentioned the Local Engagement subcommittee request for funding related to research with university and NGO's and noted she could make the request to add synergists into that recommendation.

Helen Poynton joined the meeting at 1:00 p.m. Helen discussed the draft recommendation language and noted that it was targeted towards mosquito control. It was noted that urban and residential suburban areas had become hot spots for pesticides and pesticides used by homeowners and private applicators were much more persistent. Helen Poynton discussed the consideration of insecticides and when and where they should be used. Helen Poynton also commented on the state of CA example of insecticide impacts on sediment ecosystem. Priscilla Matton mentioned the Local Engagement research recommendation and Helen responded that this was monitoring work and you cannot get funds for monitoring work. Brad Mitchell discussed what he could support related to synergists in the recommendation but also suggested that other parts of the recommendation were too broad. John Wilhelmi commented on the detailed assessment language and asked for alternatives that would move the recommendation forward. Jennifer Pederson suggested rolling synergists into the Local Engagement subcommittee recommendation.

Helen Poynton discussed the proposal joining the use of the synergist with the reality of what was already present in the ecosystem and thought it needed funding to get at the data. Helen Poynton commented that she did not think that this would get done if it was moved to the Local Engagement subcommittee and thought this was being overlooked and could be responsible for the decline in some species that were seen today. John Wilhelmi discussed potential options for the recommendation language. Jennifer Pederson suggested a more general recommendation looking at synergists but noted the way it was written went too far. Helen Poynton clarified that the language was put there as an example. Brad Mitchell offered to draft a version of the recommendation that had a different vision on the use of synergists and the affects they can have.

Directive 3: Avoiding Use of Pesticides Containing PFAS:

Jennifer Pederson provided an overview of the draft recommendation and noted that she tried to capture what she heard during the brainstorm sessions. Bob Mann discussed the first bullet point and commented on the discovery of PFAS. Bob Mann also noted that he would like to see the language more constrained and structured versus what was in the current draft. Helen Poynton commented that she liked the language and discussed looking at the universe of TOXCAST assays, an EPA screening program. Brad Mitchell added that overall, the recommendation was a good approach and discussed risk assessment and toxicological assessment as nuanced. Richard Pollack added that there was agreement that we do not want unintended chemicals applied for any reason but noted some concern with wording in the second bullet. Richard Pollack suggested that there should be a meaningful quantity listed.

Taryn LaScola asked the subcommittee group if this was for all pesticides or just for mosquito control pesticides. Taryn LaScola noted 132B and 333 CMR related to the regulations that would apply. Jennifer Pederson discussed scope and commented that she remained concerned about the application of pesticides by private mosquito control companies. Taryn LaScola discussed Pesticide Selection Subcommittee process in relation to pulling a pesticide from the registration process. Brad Mitchell commented on the stop sale process for a pesticide as an option as well. Jennifer Pederson responded to Richard Pollack's previous point regarding quantity and noted the current systems and in which the Commonwealth taking a very aggressive approach on the drinking water side. Helen Poynton emphasized Jennifer Pederson's point and commented on the regulatory standards running up against the detection limits for PFAS. It was added that detection could be bumping up against regulatory limits. Priscilla Matton discussed the container PFAS issue with Anvil and that the pesticide was the medium in which PFAS was discovered. It was noted that some pesticides come in different types of containers and there was a lot of testing that was done, which was very costly.

Homework for Next Meeting:

John Wilhelmi discussed the homework items for subcommittee members related to the recommendations under directive one and directive two. It was noted that Brad Mitchell would be drafting language on an alternate

synergist recommendation. Helen Poynton noted that she would make some changes to her draft recommendation and commented that she hoped the subcommittee could come to a consensus between the two synergist draft recommendations.

Public Input via Zoom Q&A, Closing Remarks, and Vote to Adjourn:

There were no questions or comments in the Q&A function. Seeing no other comments from the group, Bob Mann entertained a motion to adjourn from Richard Pollack. Seconded by Jennifer Pederson. All subcommittee members voted aye. The meeting was adjourned at 1:57 p.m.

MCTF Pesticide Selection Subcommittee Meeting Minutes 02 08 22

Minutes for the Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century (MCTF) Task Force Meeting

Subcommittee Meeting: Pesticide Selection

February 08, 2022, 12:00 p.m. via Zoom

Meeting Topics:

- Meeting Open
- Introductory Remarks
- Directive 3: Avoiding the Use of Pesticides Containing PFAS
- Directive 2: Promoting the Use of Safest or Minimum Risk Pesticides
- Directive 1: Identifying Ingredients in Pesticide Formulation
- Goal for Mosquito Control in Massachusetts
- Homework for Next Meeting
- Public Input via Zoom Q&A, Closing Remarks, and Vote to Adjourn

Meeting Open:

The subcommittee meeting was called to order at 12:01 p.m. by Bob Mann. A roll call was conducted and subcommittee members in attendance included Nicole Keleher, Priscilla Matton, Brad Mitchell, Jennifer Pederson, Richard Pollack, and Helen Poynton. Taryn LaScola provided a housekeeping update.

Introductory Remarks:

John Wilhelmi discussed the agenda, timeline, and reminded the group of the public listening session on 2/10 and the draft recommendation vote on 2/22. In addition, John Wilhelmi addressed the Zoom chat function and the sharing the information during the subcommittee meeting in accordance with OML requirements.

Directive 3 Avoiding the Use of Pesticides Containing PFAS:

Jennifer Pederson provided introductory remarks and an overview of the draft language. Jennifer Pederson discussed the background information related to manufacturer and EPA responsiveness and incorporated feedback from the group into the draft recommendation. Subcommittee members reviewed the draft language and provided their feedback. Bob Mann suggested adding in language in the area that discussed persistence and noted that wording could be added in the EPA language area that specified that the EPA was continuing to work on the issue to evaluate what universe of chemicals were considered PFAS as it related to pesticides. Brad Mitchell noted the definition of pesticides impacting ground water and suggested leaving it to the EPA to make the appropriate registration decision based on the presence of PFAS. Jennifer Pederson commented on the groundwater protection list and noted the negative impacts of PFAS. Additional subcommittee conversations continued with draft language modifications.

Taryn LaScola flagged product registration on active ingredient review. Priscilla Matton discussed PFAS that was found and not part of the product. Priscilla Matton added commentary related to who was going to be doing the gathering and testing. John Wilhelmi added that funding would be required for whatever extent of testing was recommended. Priscilla Matton commented on where we draw the line on too much, not enough, and what was just background noise. Brad Mitchell noted overall he agreed with the draft and commented that it was inappropriate to be placing the responsibility on the Pesticide Board Subcommittee. Brad Mitchell added that he was increasingly uncomfortable with this subcommittee fundamentally changing the charge of the Pesticide Board Subcommittee and wanted to be noted as a dissenter as this was a much broader discussion beyond the MCTF. Jennifer Pederson commented that the recommendation was not bound to who reviews it as long as it gets reviewed and was fine to say an appropriate entity as determined by the task force. Richard Pollack noted that he

did not have any problems with the entire concept and liked the idea of the appropriate entity language in the recommendation. Priscilla Matton suggested using a subcommittee of the SRB in the review selection process and commented on funding and testing.

Subcommittee members discussed adding introductory language about the various parties that could be charged with implementing the recommendation. Bob Mann commented on the process the state of ME instituted to put the onus on the registrants to attest that there was no PFAS located in pesticide products. Jennifer Pederson discussed the EPA strategic roadmap as an evolving issue. Helen Poynton was happy with the draft and commented on the EPA ToxCast testing and noted that there were commercial companies that can run the assays and they will give you a report that would require a toxicologist to interpret. Helen Poynton also commented on the potential of merging a best practice subcommittee recommendation with this recommendation. Brad Mitchell added that there could be a PFAS free packaging program coming out of the industry at some point and it might be worth mentioning that the subcommittee may want to defer to that if a credible program was established.

Directive 2: Promoting the Use of Safest or Minimum Risk Pesticides:

Recommendation on Synergists: Helen Poynton noted that she took out language that was previously identified as a concern for the group. Nicole Kelleher had a question on existing data and if there was enough for MCDs. Helen Poynton clarified that the draft noted that additional data would be collected if there were areas that did not have enough data and the recommendation was written in a way that accounted for that possibility. Jennifer Pederson noted that the revised draft language addressed her concerns. Bob Mann discussed funding, staffing, and the feasibility of the draft recommendation and asked if this could be achieved through some other means. Bob Mann added that there was a need to anticipate use restrictions on pyrethroids coming from the EPA and he saw a lot of overlap. Priscilla Matton noted that she understood the concept but could not support the recommendation as feasibility was a concern for her.

Jennifer Pederson noted that there was a corollary to what MDAR did with the ban on phosphorous containing products. Jessica Burgess clarified that stemmed from a legislative act and MDAR was identified as the regulatory and implementing agency for that legislative mandate. Helen Poynton referenced the charge of the subcommittee and commented on trying to minimize the amount of risk that mosquito control was having. Helen Poynton added that based on the research it did not seem that pyrethroids were adversely affecting the ecology but there were findings that the synergists found in these formulations could have an impact, and the draft recommendation was trying to address a problem that mosquito control may be having on the environment. Helen Poynton commented on trying to find ways to protect public health with the least amount of risk to the environment and suggested the draft recommendation as the proposed solution. John Wilhelmi discussed the process for recommendations that had a minority/alternate opinion and how they could get elevated to the task force. Priscilla Matton commented on PBO and asked if anyone new of other synergists used with mosquito products. Priscilla Matton also discussed mosquito control products that do not use PBO.

Richard Pollack posed the question of how much PBO, pyrethroids, and arsenic were in the environment and noted that PBO was present in a lot of other pesticide formulations that were used in other non-mosquito control products. Richard Pollack discussed feasibility and sampling in a representative manner and noted that he did not know how extensive this type of sampling had to be in order to make a cogent argument of what was present in the environment. John Wilhelmi provided a recap related to concerns on feasibility and the practicality of implementation. Helen Poynton suggested doing a pilot study to determine if a problem existed and that could be a recommendation to the legislature, and it could be capped at a certain dollar amount. Subcommittee members thought that was a great idea and recommended to include research as part of a future mosquito management program. Brad Mitchell noted that synergists were a real issue but thought the proposal was far too detailed and not in the subcommittee's charge. Brad Mitchell added that the subcommittee needed to create a recommendation for a system for evaluation.

Recommendation on transparency in the review/selection process: Draft language was presented to the subcommittee group and Brad Mitchell provided context and noted his perspective that synergists should be treated separately. It was noted that it was beyond the charge of the subcommittee group since the subcommittee didn't have the scientific expertise. Helen Poynton commented that she liked the spirit of the draft but was not ready to take the synergist recommendation out and was interested in more detail and funding. Helen Poynton suggested the creation of a task force to think about specificity and development of a process. Richard Pollack liked the draft and thought it was inclusive. Jennifer Pederson commented that she thought it was open ended and not specific enough and asked about the synergist piece. Brad Mitchell discussed the concept and noted that he would not want to limit it to just synergists.

Priscilla Matton commented on the recommendation list of topics to cover in the review process and noted that adding synergists to her recommendation would not be an issue. Subcommittee members discussed looking at synergists as part of the registration process. Brad Mitchell noted that he preferred that whichever group was ultimately responsible for evaluating pesticides for mosquito control would be tasked with creating a process to review and determine what was valid and what required more data collection. Brad Mitchell added that he could attempt to make the recommendation language more specific if that was what the subcommittee wanted. Helen Poynton added that she would think about a pilot study option approach or folding this into another recommendation being developed by other subcommittees. Brad Mitchell noted that pilot studies may be the best way to address this, but pilot studies required a lot of resources.

Subcommittee members discussed draft recommendation language that was put forth by Priscilla Matton. Brad Mitchell discussed private wells and Jennifer Pederson noted that private wells were getting a stronger look because of PFAS and there were mounting concerns expressed by private well owners. Jennifer Pederson noted that she felt strongly that if people were drinking water it should be considered. Priscilla Matton added commentary on the draft language related to specificity. John Wilhelmi was editing commentary to capture the opinions of subcommittee members that were providing real time suggestions on the review and consideration process. Jennifer Pederson commented that she needed to look at the language again on what needed to be included and evaluated related to drawing attention to the drinking water piece.

Goal for Mosquito Control in Massachusetts:

Richard Pollack noted that the best practices and policy structure subcommittees were further ahead, but there was a component that the subcommittee may want to address related to language that focused on the pesticides selected and applied should provide more benefit than risk to human and environmental health. Brad Mitchell commented on goal creation due to nuisance and vector control. Helen Poynton supported Richard Pollack's contribution related to a goal statement. Jennifer Pederson, Priscilla Matton, and Bob Mann commented that they voted no on creating goals based on the time constraints, but they all agreed with Richard Pollack's recommended goal language.

Homework for Next Meeting:

John Wilhelmi noted that he would share all the latest files and specific subcommittee member assignments. Priscilla Matton commented on her homework and discussed recommendation language inclusion with Helen Poynton related to synergists interaction with the environment.

Public Input via Zoon Q&A, Closing Remarks, and Vote to Adjourn:

Bob Mann noted that there was nothing listed in the Zoom Q&A. Hearing no other questions or comments from the group Bob Mann entertained a motion to adjourn the meeting from Richard Pollack. Seconded by Helen Poynton. All in favor voted aye. The meeting was adjourned at 1:59 p.m.

MCTF Pesticide Selection Subcommittee Meeting Minutes 02 22 22

Minutes for the Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century (MCTF) Task Force Meeting

Subcommittee Meeting: Pesticide Selection

February 22, 2022, 12:00 p.m. via Zoom

Meeting Topics:

- Meeting Open
- Introductory Remarks
- Subcommittee Recommendations: Final Review and Voting
 - *For each recommendation:*
 - Display latest draft
 - Open floor for additional changes based on input from public comment
 - Incorporate further revisions, as necessary
 - Accept all tracked changes
 - Vote

Meeting Open:

The subcommittee meeting was called to order at 12:01 pm by Bob Mann. A roll call was conducted and subcommittee members in attendance included Nicole Keleher, Priscilla Matton, Brad Mitchell, Jennifer Pederson, Richard Pollack, and Helen Poynton. Taryn LaScola provided a housekeeping update.

Introductory Remarks:

John Wilhelmi shared the display file with the subcommittee group. The voting process for January and February meeting minutes was discussed and updates were provided related to the recommendation drafts and recommendation voting process. Priscilla Matton asked a question on recommendation voting process. Jessica Burgess provided a clarification on voting yes, no, or abstaining based on the recommendation content. There was added discussion on the documentation of minority opinions and documentation of subcommittee member concerns or viewpoints.

Subcommittee Recommendations: Final Review and Voting:

Recommendation one - Active Ingredients: Richard Pollack commented that there was still a comment in the recommendation language from him related to mosquito control products and asked if it had been resolved. The comment concern was addressed, and John Wilhelmi accepted the track changes in the recommendation language. Hearing no other comments from the group Bob Mann entertained a motion to accept recommendation one on Active Ingredients. A motion was made from Richard Pollack. Seconded from Priscilla Matton. A roll call vote was conducted. Nicole Keleher (aye), Priscilla Matton (aye), Brad Mitchell (aye), Jennifer Pederson (aye), Richard Pollack (aye), Helen Poynton (aye), Bob Mann (aye).

Recommendation two – Inert Ingredients (option 1): Richard Pollack noted that the recommendation as written did not indicate that this was specific to product application by the MCDs. Richard Pollack added that he had no problem with the recommendation being wide in interpretation but noted a need to be clear. John Wilhelmi asked the group if there were any specific changes to clarify the language. Brad Mitchell commented that 95% of discussion had been on MCDs and the SRB. Nicole Kelleher noted that for this recommendation there does not need to be a distinction and leaving it broad on all potential products would be ok. Brad Mitchell added that Fish and Game had an exemption from public records law due to rare and endangered species. John Wilhelmi accepted the track changes in the recommendation language. Brad Mitchell asked a question regarding dissenting opinions

on the recommendation. Jessica Burgess clarified the motion process to address Brad Mitchell's question. John Wilhelmi noted that the dissenting statements were included in the draft recommendation language.

Hearing no other comments from the group Bob Mann entertained a motion to accept recommendation two on Inert Ingredients (option 1) from Priscilla Matton. Seconded from Jennifer Pederson. A roll call vote was conducted. Nicole Keleher (aye), Priscilla Matton (aye), Brad Mitchell (aye), Jennifer Pederson (aye), Richard Pollack (aye), Helen Poynton (no), Bob Mann (aye). Helen Poynton commented on her reasoning for voting no and discussed her dissenting opinion on the language regarding the EPA review process. Jessica Burgess provided a clarification on the voting process and noted if there was a disagreement with any part of the motion or language in the recommendation subcommittee members should vote no. Jessica Burgess added when a motion and a second was made information was captured in the meeting minutes and group member votes should be reflective of the motion being made.

Richard Pollack suggested taking out the dissenting opinions and voting without the dissenting opinions written into the recommendation language. Brad Mitchell noted that the recommendation language reflected his thoughts very well and suggested approving the recommendation statement, which included the discussion on inerts. Jennifer Pederson agreed with Richard Pollack's suggestion and noted that it would be cleaner to remove the dissenting opinions. Helen Poynton added her opinion that if there was a statement that you could not live with you do not support it. Brad Mitchell noted that he did not agree with the approach that was being proposed but would defer to the majority opinion on the matter. Due to the changes discussed by the subcommittee members Bob Mann entertained a motion to reconsider the vote on recommendation two – Inert Ingredients (option 1). Jennifer Pederson made a motion to reconsider the vote on recommendation two - Inert Ingredients (option 1) as amended to remove the dissenting opinions. The motion was seconded by Richard Pollack. A roll call was conducted. Nicole Kelleher (aye), Priscilla Matton (aye), Brad Mitchell (no), Jennifer Pederson (aye), Richard Pollack (aye), Helen Poynton (no), Bob Mann (aye).

Recommendation three – Inert Ingredients (option 2): Priscilla Matton discussed the collection of CBI and communication of CBI related to who would provide the information. Brad Mitchell commented that it was uncharted territory and would need to be scoped out and was more of a discussion with the task force as a whole. Jessica Burgess flagged that federal law may prevent some of this from happening and that there could be a federal preemption issue that could make this legally impossible. Helen Poynton commented that this was discussed a lot and would not be reviewed by the Pesticide Board Subcommittee and would be conducted through MDAR. Jessica Burgess noted that may be legally impossible – it may contradict with FIFRA and federal law given the way federal law was written, and may be impossible to implement given how state laws and OML laws were written.

Hearing no other comments from the group Bob Mann entertained a motion on recommendation three – Inert Ingredients (option 2). Helen Poynton made a motion. Seconded by Nicole Keleher. A roll call vote was conducted. Before the roll call vote was completed, Jennifer Pederson added that she did support the notion of including DEP on the Pesticide Board Subcommittee. Nicole Keleher (aye), Priscilla Matton (no), Brad Mitchell (no), Jennifer Pederson (no), Richard Pollack (no), Helen Poynton (yes), Bob Mann (no). Brad Mitchell commented that the reason for his objection was due to the recommendation being beyond the scope of the subcommittee and that the recommendation needed to be better designed and laid out than it was here. Richard Pollack noted that he had no objection to DEP being on an oversight committee, but the recommendation seemed more like a process to find problems and did not think that the recommendation provided an appreciable benefit to the Commonwealth.

Recommendation four - Selecting Pesticides and Ensuring a Transparent Selection Process: Richard Pollack suggested the deletion of a sentence from the background section of the recommendation language. Priscilla Matton discussed the use or non-use of pesticides in different habitats. Brad Mitchell commented on the review timeline language and suggested that it be updated to say when deemed necessary versus annually. Priscilla Matton noted that there may be a risk of losing support if the language on review timeline was not more precise. Bob Mann entertained a motion on recommendation four - Selecting Pesticides and Ensuring a Transparent Selection Process. Jennifer Pederson made a motion. Seconded by Brad Mitchell. Before the roll call vote was

conducted, Richard Pollack noted his concern about the recommendation. Priscilla Matton added that she wrote the recommendation and was struggling with it since she believed the review process was already conducted and was preempting with the fact that even though she wrote the recommendation she still may vote no. A roll call vote was conducted. Bob Mann (aye), Helen Poynton (abstain), Richard Pollack (no), Jennifer Pederson (aye), Brad Mitchell (aye), Nicole Keleher (aye), Priscilla Matton (no). Priscilla Matton noted that the EPA and the state does a complete review of pesticide products to be used; therefore, a tertiary review was not necessary. Richard Pollack commented that it was more of a perception issue and was not sure that this recommendation would get us to where we would want to go. Helen Poynton noted that she agreed with most of the recommendation but was a bit uncomfortable with the language.

Recommendation six - Consideration of Novel Risk/Exposure Scenarios: Richard Pollack commented that it was not clear to him which body would be charged with implementing this recommendation. Brad Mitchell noted that whoever was tasked with reviewing mosquito pesticides would make this something that they review. Jennifer Pederson added that part of this was the thought that another subcommittee was talking about the creation of a separate body. Brad Mitchell noted that the language was left general because it would be whoever gets charged with reviewing mosquito pesticides. John Wilhelmi commented that a new paragraph was added into the recommendation language. Helen Poynton discussed the paragraph content and wanted to add a process for conducting preliminary research. Helen Poynton added that it would be a great proposal if there was a funding mechanism to flush out some of the studies to answer questions. Brad Mitchell commented that this was in line with what he was saying and noted he would like to see language and line-items for funding to address this. Jennifer Pederson suggested being more specific regarding line-item funding information, so the legislature creates a line-item in the budget specific to creating pilot studies.

Hearing no further comments from the group Bob Mann entertained a motion to vote on recommendation six - Consideration of Novel Risk/Exposure Scenarios. Helen Poynton made a motion. Seconded by Jennifer Pederson. A roll call vote was conducted. Nicole Keleher (aye), Priscilla Matton (no), Brad Mitchell (aye), Jennifer Pederson (aye), Richard Pollack (aye), Helen Poynton (aye), Bob Mann (no). Priscilla Matton noted that she thought the recommendation was a good idea but if it was important research, money would be available from other sources versus requesting line-item funding from the legislature. Bob Mann agreed with Priscilla Matton's rationale for voting no. Helen Poynton noted that she was willing to drop recommendation five - Consideration of Synergists, since it did not have support from the subcommittee.

Recommendation seven - Avoiding Use of Pesticides Containing PFAS and Other Contaminants: Nicole Keleher commented on a wordsmithing change related to "define" and "categorize". Brad Mitchell discussed emerging contaminants and noted the challenges. Helen Poynton commented that emerging contaminants were defined by the EPA and USGS and noted that emerging contaminants of concern as defined by EPA and USGS were added into the recommendation language. John Wilhelmi accepted the track changes into the document. Hearing no other comments from the group Bob Mann entertained a motion to accept recommendation seven. Jennifer Pederson made a motion. Seconded by Helen Poynton. Priscilla Matton added that the recommendation was worthwhile but there were things that she could support and things she could not support. Priscilla Matton noted that there was agreement that we do not want PFAS in our environment or in the pesticides that are being applied but the testing and where all this would fall would be extremely complicated.

Jennifer Pederson noted that the first paragraph was added to the recommendation language so the Pesticide Board Subcommittee would not have to be the reviewing body. Brad Mitchell noted that that he objected to the responsibility falling on the Pesticide Board Subcommittee and suggested that this be directed to whatever body reviews the use of mosquito pesticides. Brad Mitchell added that it was beyond the subcommittees scope and there were implications that the group did not have time to consider. Priscilla Matton discussed the individuals that would have the expertise to conduct this type of review and Brad Mitchell noted that there was an assumption that the body that was created would have qualified people to conduct these reviews. Brad Mitchell asked if the Pesticide Board Subcommittee language was going to be included and it was determined it was being left in the recommendation language. Hearing no further discussion, a roll call vote was conducted. Nicole Keleher

(aye), Priscilla Matton (no), Brad Mitchell (no), Jennifer Pederson (aye), Richard Pollack (no), Helen Poynton (aye), Bob Mann (aye).

Public Input via Zoom Q&A, Closing Remarks, and Vote to Adjourn:

It was noted that there were no questions or comments in the Zoom Q&A. Subcommittee members offered gratitude and appreciation to Bob Mann and John Wilhelmi for facilitating and keeping the subcommittee group on task. Priscilla Matton asked a question related to how things would move forward in the next full task force meeting. Jessica Burgess commented that guidance on the process was still being determined. It was added that all recommendations would go to the full task force, and the full task force would decide what moves forward to the legislature for consideration. Priscilla Matton commented on the amount of information that needed to be discussed within six hours of task force meetings. Jessica Burgess responded by discussing timing and what MDAR and EEA was doing to assist and facilitate the process. Priscilla Matton and Jessica Burgess discussed majority and minority opinion recommendations and how the legislature would process all the information. Jessica Burgess noted that it was hard to say what the finished product was going to look like and that there were a lot of people working diligently to reflect all the work that the subcommittees had done. Brad Mitchell discussed the legislative process and noted that there would be differing bills related to mosquito control coming out in January 2023. Jennifer Pederson added that some of those bills were moving right now and this was something for individuals to pay attention to. Seeing no other comments from the group Bob Mann entertained a motion to adjourn from Jennifer Pederson. Seconded by Brad Mitchell. All in favor voted aye. The subcommittee meeting was adjourned at 1:48 p.m.