

Best Practices Subcommittee DRAFT Recommendation Outlines

The Best Practices Subcommittee is sharing this living document of recommendation outlines for preliminary review by the Mosquito Control for the 21st Century Task Force. These topics represent an early snapshot of the subject of recommendations from the subcommittee. It is to be expected that topics will continue to be added and eliminated from this living document. Please note that the recommendation text presented here is still under development by the subcommittee and may not represent the ultimate majority opinion of the subcommittee.

Directive: (i) Facilitating the use of integrated pest management

1. State-Wide Mosquito Surveillance
2. Improving Consistency in the Implementation of Integrated Pest Management
3. Limiting Truck-Based Applications of Adulticides

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 system illnesses, drinking water supplies, pollinators and aquatic life

4. Protect vulnerable populations and non-target species
5. Online reporting for private applicators

Directive: (iv) Protecting organic agriculture from pesticide use

6. Agriculture Opt-out
7. Protected status of certified organic farms

Directive: (i) Facilitating the use of integrated pest management
1. State-Wide Mosquito Surveillance
Recommendation The state should conduct state-wide mosquito surveillance with a focus on the species of primary concern for disease transmission, which would increase the ability to conduct evidence-based mosquito control.
Recommendation Components Still Under Consideration Is there a minimum acceptable amount of surveillance that should be conducted in municipalities that aren't part of an MCD, municipalities that have never had EEE cases, etc.? Should this be specified more precisely in the recommendation since there is already state-wide surveillance in place, albeit perhaps less uniform/consistent than desired?
Background and Rationale In progress

Directive: (i) *Facilitating the use of integrated pest management*

2. Improving Consistency in the Implementation of Integrated Pest Management

Recommendation

To promote more consistent approaches to IPM across the state and reduce the need for reliance on chemical pesticides, the implementation of IPM should follow the framework and guidelines established in the EIR. In the next EIR update, the report should be expanded to include recommendations for action thresholds (like those in the MA Arbovirus Surveillance and Response Plan) that, once met, allow for the initiation of control measures. The EIR should be updated every five years with public input to reflect lessons learned and new developments in mosquito control.

- As defined in Chapter 132b, the implementation of IPM should involve a combination of “multiple pest control measures to reduce the need for reliance on chemical pesticides.” In other words, activities including but not limited to surveillance, public outreach and education, and source reduction should be prioritized over the usage of chemical pesticides.
- Information should be regularly collected and made publicly available on how IPM is being implemented in practice and the efficacy of each IPM strategy. Research should also be conducted to stay abreast of new developments in mosquito control.

Recommendation Components Still Under Consideration

Are there more concrete metrics that should be used for evaluating the implementation of IPM across MA? Is the goal of this recommendation to promote consistency or does the subcommittee want the recommendation to go further than that, e.g., by regularly evaluating implementation and doing something with the evaluations?

Background and Rationale

In progress

Directive: (i) *Facilitating the use of integrated pest management*

3. Limiting Truck-Based Applications of Adulticides

Recommendation

MCDs should conduct truck-based adulticiding applications only when clear thresholds for spraying are met. These thresholds should be determined by objective data, including but not limited to mosquito surveillance data that demonstrate elevated disease risk as well as the aggregation of complaints.

Recommendation Components Still Under Consideration

What kinds of data should feed into the decision-making for spraying? Responding to complaints implies spraying for nuisance control.

Background and Rationale

In progress

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 system illnesses, drinking water supplies, pollinators and aquatic life

4. Protect vulnerable populations and non-target species

Recommendation

Determine procedures for protecting vulnerable populations and non-target species even when pesticide application is warranted.

Recommendation Components Still Under Consideration

The SC is considering separating this into two separate recommendations, one covering vulnerable populations and one on non-target species. Further SC discussion is needed, especially regarding non-target species.

Background and Rationale

In progress

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 system illnesses, drinking water supplies, pollinators and aquatic life

5. Online reporting for private applicators

Recommendation

Develop an online reporting system so that pesticide application records from private applicators can be analyzed to understand the situation and develop possible recommendation for limiting use.

Recommendation Components Still Under Consideration

The information is currently collected on paper and is difficult to access for review or analysis. Online reporting could be easier for applicators than reporting on paper. Is this recommendation practical? Could a pilot program be developed to see how practical it is? Could an existing state reporting system be modified to include this? Is this in our SC's scope? How would implementation of this recommendation be funded?

Background and Rationale

In progress

Directive: <i>(iv) Protecting organic agriculture from pesticide use</i>
6. Agriculture Opt-out
Recommendation Offer the current opt-out option to commercial farms.
Recommendation Components Still Under Consideration Who should this cover? (Perhaps “commercial farms” isn’t the best category.) A clear definition/determination is needed to make this recommendation feasible since having a patchwork of opt-out zones is a problem for spray efficacy. Currently there is no SC consensus on whether or how to implement this recommendation.
Background and Rationale In progress

Directive: <i>(iv) Protecting organic agriculture from pesticide use</i>
7. Protected status of certified organic farms
Recommendation Codify the current protected status for certified farms in legislation, not just in policy.
Recommendation Components Still Under Consideration This recommendation has only been briefly discussed and is still under discussion by the subcommittee.
Background and Rationale In progress