

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 cancellation 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.