



Mosquito Control for the Twenty-First Century Task Force

Calendar, Goals, Draft Recommendations

February 7, 2022



Mosquito Control Task Force: Working Calendar

Date	Phase	Meetings	Action Items	Deliverable
Early January	Subcommittees outline recs	-Subcommittees: 1 meeting each -MCTF: Jan 13	Subcommittees create preliminary outline of recs; present to full task force for discussion and feedback	Outline of recs — for task force discussion
Late January	Subcommittees draft recs	-Subcommittees: 2 meetings each	Subcommittees incorporate feedback from full task force; formalize written work to develop draft recs	Draft recs — for task force discussion and public review and feedback
February	Task force and public input on draft recs Subcommittees finalize recs	-MCTF: Feb 7 -Public Listening Session: Feb 10 (4-6pm) -Subcommittees: ~3 meetings each	Subcommittees present draft recs to full task force for feedback; MCTF hosts public listening session for public feedback on recs Subcommittees incorporate feedback and input to finalize recs. Subcommittee vote to advance to full task force	Final recs – for task force discussion
March	Task force finalize recs	-MCTF: Mar 3, Mar 21, Mar 29	Task force discusses full suite of recs. MCTF vote to advance recs to Legislature	MCTF advances recommendations to Legislature



Goals for Mosquito Control

- **Question: Does the task force wish to undergo a process to define goals for mosquito control, in order to effectively advance recommendations to the Legislature?**
- **Discussion**
- **Roll Call Vote**



Draft Recommendations: Background and Discussion Questions

- Purpose of meeting: Subcommittee chairs present draft recommendations
- Important reminders:
 - Draft recommendation documents have been posted online for review
 - Documents are still under development by subcommittees. Individual recommendations are under varying degrees of discussion and may not represent subcommittee majority opinion
 - Recommendations will continue to be refined and may be eliminated from consideration by each subcommittee ahead of advancement to the full task force
 - Members of the public are strongly encouraged to submit feedback and responses to the draft recommendations via the online public comment portal and at the public listening session (Thursday 2/10; 4-6pm)
- Discussion Questions
 - 1) Overall: Is the subcommittee on the right trajectory with each recommendation? If not, why or what do you wish to adjust?
 - 2) Do you have concerns about the direction of the recommendation?
 - 3) Are there components of the recommendation as drafted that you do not support? If so, what are those components, and what about the recommendation should change?
 - 4) Is the subcommittee overlooking any critical considerations with regard to the recommendation?
 - 5) Within your area of expertise, do you have any feasibility concerns?

Draft Recommendations: Policy Structure (1/2)



- **Directive: (v) assessing the need to update the composition of the state reclamation and mosquito control board**
 - 1. Repeal and replace OR revise MGL C. 252 and enabling MCD/MCP legislations:
A revised C. 252 and enabling legislations would:
 - Restructure the existing SRB to create a modified oversight board
 - Establish modified funding mechanisms for mosquito control services and MCD/MCP membership
 - Restructure the existing centralized mosquito control program to allow for more centralized oversight and guidance
 - Allow for public input and accountability in the system
 - Outline clear guidelines to see what is in the purview of state, municipality, individual, so that respective roles and responsibilities are clear
 - Create systems to continue administrative functions needed to support system
 - Identify actions needed to transition from the current to the new structure to ensure continuity of mosquito control services
 - 2. Amend the Massachusetts Stormwater Handbook (and relevant local land use and stormwater regulations): Amend the Massachusetts Stormwater Handbook (and relevant building codes) to ensure that newly created stormwater retention and detention basins avoid becoming mosquito habitat

Draft Recommendations: Policy Structure (2/2)



- **Directive (x) identifying the challenges, including but not limited to financial barriers, facing municipalities in joining a regional mosquito control project or district;**
 - 3. Revise the structure, function, and funding of 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:
 - A framework would provide for two levels of services, Basic Services and Additional Service
 - Would support a cohesive mosquito control program with all MCDs as part of one system with centralized data systems
 - 4. Establish baseline mosquito control services such as education, surveillance, source reduction and allow people/member towns to add additional services such as larviciding, adulticiding, and local stormwater management as they wish/as needed

Draft Recommendations: Local Engagement (1/3)



- **Directive: (ii) promoting public participation in mosquito management decisions**

- 1. Online system for requesting property exclusions and property opt-outs: The online opt out form should be amended to include an option for renewal that eliminates the need to reenter data annually and by town
- 2. Marking methods for property exclusions and property opt-outs: The landowner opt out/exclusion process (333 CMR 13.03) should be amended to remove the physical marking requirement (req. under 333 CMR 13.032) and physical marking should be optional given GPS/GIS technology is used by all MCD and is readily available to private property owners

- 3. Public Engagement: Improve outreach to the public and input from the public. Outreach activities will include, at a minimum:

- DPH will create and maintain public engagement resources
- Surveying municipal government and the public to understand municipal and public understanding of and desires for the mosquito control process
- Information from mosquito control agencies including planned activities and summaries of control efforts and effectiveness of activities

Public input activities will include, at a minimum:

- Providing opportunities for public comment during mosquito management or mosquito-borne disease management plan development

Draft Recommendations: Local Engagement (2/3)



- **Directive: (iii) providing for local options regarding the use of pesticides.**
 - 4. Menu-based approach:
 - Funding and resources shall be provided by the Commonwealth to perform surveillance and education in all municipalities (via MCDs and DPH)
 - Municipalities may opt in to additional services including larviciding and adulticiding
 - Assuming revisions to MGL Chp 252 via Policy Structure Subcommittee, create menu-based approach to allow municipalities to pick and choose which services they will receive (in addition to standard surveillance, education, and source reduction)
 - Municipalities will only pay for services received
 - Municipalities must select services at least one year in advance
 - Component of recommendation require further consideration by subcommittee

Draft Recommendations: Local Engagement

(3/3)



- **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.**
 - 5. Pilot evaluation of environmental impacts: Establish a program to conduct research to evaluate mosquito control. Provide funding to independent organizations to study impacts of mosquito control and innovative mosquito control techniques in MA
 - 6. Increase sharing of pesticide application locations: Require MCDs to share map files of each pesticide application from the prior season with MDAR and require this information to be presented by MDAR to the public through MassGIS along with maps of the Commonwealth's pesticide spray events. The data should include what areas were treated and how many times each area was treated
 - 7. Increase transparency on sensitive habitat/rare species exclusion: The subcommittee is considering a process to increase transparency regarding areas that are excluded from mosquito control pesticide applications due to the presence of rare species



Draft Recommendations: Best Practices (1/3)

- **Directive: (i) Facilitating use of integrated pest management (IPM)**
 - 1. Improving consistency in the implementation of IPM: The implementation of IPM should follow the science-based guidelines and protocols established in a new statewide Mosquito Management Plan to promote more consistent use of all components of IPM across the state
 - 2. Limiting ground-based applications of adulticides: MCDs should conduct ground-based adulticiding applications only when alternative methods (e.g., source reduction, water management, or larviciding) are not feasible or have been insufficiently effective, and when clear thresholds for spraying are met
 - 3. State-wide mosquito surveillance: The legislature is encouraged to authorize and fund an enhanced monitoring network to include areas of the Commonwealth that are not currently served by a regional MCD
 - 4. Improving consistency in MCD staffing: Each MCD should employ an entomologist to identify mosquitoes, and a wetland biologist/permit specialist to evaluate/oversee habitat modification efforts
 - 5. Statewide education on mosquito management: The state should be principally responsible for statewide education on mosquito management
 - 6. Prohibit aerial applications of adulticides: The aerial application of adulticides should be prohibited



Draft Recommendations: Best Practices

(2/3)

- **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**
 - 7. Online reporting for private applicators: Develop an online reporting system so that pesticide application records from private applicators can be analyzed to understand the situation and develop possible recommendations for limiting use
 - 8. Communication with public water systems: Establish a system where SRBs, MCDs and private applicators execute clear and active communication practices with public water systems throughout the adulticiding season so that the water systems can incorporate best management practices
 - 9. QA/QC testing of chemicals used in mosquito control: Develop a statewide QA/QC testing program that incorporates testing for chemicals used for aerial spraying events and MCD applications
 - 10. Protection of receptor areas from pesticide run-Off: Develop procedures to protect receptor areas (e.g., lakes and streams) that might be receiving run-off from pesticide applications
 - 11. Reduce pesticide applications for nuisance control: In consultation with MCDs, consider ways to reduce or restrict the number of individual requests for nuisance controls
 - 12. Monitoring and evaluations after spraying: MCDs should do monitoring and evaluations after spraying, and if there are more refined standards for evaluating human health and ecological impacts from mosquito spraying, those should be used
 - 13. Protect vulnerable populations and non-target species: Determine procedures for protecting vulnerable populations and non-target species even when pesticide application is warranted
 - ? . Criteria for declaring a public health emergency: The declaration of a public health emergency re. EEE and WNV should be based on published, research-based, quantifiable criteria established by a board set up to advise the DPH in this regard

Draft Recommendations: Best Practices (3/3)



- **Directive: (iv) Protecting organic agriculture from pesticide use**
 - 14. Agriculture Opt-out: Offer the current opt-out option to commercial farms
 - 15. Protected status of certified organic farms: Codify the current protected status for certified farms in legislation, not just in policy



Draft Recommendations: Pesticide Selection (1/3)

- **Directive: (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**
 - 1. Selecting pesticides and ensuring a transparent selection process: Noting concerns by stakeholders that existing pesticide product review is not sufficient, the SRB should further review pesticide products used in mosquito control
 - 2. Consideration of synergists: To address the potential ecological concerns of synergists in pesticide formulations, subcommittee recommends:
 - Directing an appropriate state agency to conduct periodic assessments of insecticide levels throughout the Commonwealth
 - Following the completion of the insecticide assessment, the SRB shall review the assembled data and evaluate whether synergism of insecticides already present in aquatic sediments or other environmental media is possible following application of additional mosquito control insecticides containing synergists
 - The periodic assessments and the SRB synergism evaluations are to be public documents



Draft Recommendations: Pesticide Selection (2/3)

- **Directive: (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 (cont.)**
 - 3. Avoiding use of PFAS-containing pesticides:
 - As analytical capabilities evolve, the Pesticide Board Subcommittee should have methods available to ensure pesticide products registered in Massachusetts are not contaminated with PFAS or emerging contaminants of concern
 - Pesticides registered for use in Massachusetts could be required to have bioassay screening which can pick up on emerging contaminants or undesirable compounds, without requiring manufacturers to disclose inert ingredients which could compromise Confidential Business Information
 - The Pesticide Board Subcommittee should prevent the use, through a “stop sale” or “stop use” order, of any pesticides where PFAS or emerging contaminants of concern have been detected in the product
 - The Pesticide Board Subcommittee should define “persistence”; have a process to evaluate where persistence might be a concern and they should take appropriate action to restrict use of such products in Massachusetts
 - If EPA determines that any pesticides have active ingredients that fall into a current or revised PFAS definition, Massachusetts must add those to the Groundwater Protection List



Draft Recommendations: Pesticide Selection (3/3)

- **Directive: (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**
 - 4. No recommended action relative to active ingredient disclosure
 - 5. No recommended action relative to inert ingredient disclosure
 - 6. Update/amend the Massachusetts Pesticide Control Act to address the following inert ingredient review:
 - Include MassDEP on the Pesticide Board Subcommittee as MassDEP is the agency responsible for setting regulatory standards for surface and drinking waters and regulating toxic substances
 - Require that pesticide registrants include information about inert ingredients and their percentages in their product registration applications, to be confidentially reviewed by MDAR and MassDEP; overall hazard assessments of inert ingredients to be presented only generally during an open meeting
 - All information that is protected as confidential business information under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) should also be protected during the MA product registration process