East Middlesex Mosquito Control Commission, Executive Committee
Suffolk County Mosquito Control Commission
Meeting Minutes

April 11, 2022
Zoom Video Conferencing Platform

In attendance:
Brian Farless, Superintendent for East Middlesex Mosquito Control Project (EMMCP) and Suffolk County Mosquito Control Project (SCMCP). David Henley, Administrative Coordinator for EMMCP and SCMCP. Representing the East Middlesex Mosquito Control Commission (EMMCC) is Lenny Izzo, chair, Wellesley; Heidi Porter, Bedford; Wesley Chin, Belmont; Roland Lankah, Brookline; Christine Mathis, Burlington. Representing the Suffolk County Mosquito Control Commission is Chris Busch, Julien Farland, Leslie Karnes and Sam Lipson.

1. Call to order

Brian Farless called the meeting to order at 1:05 P.M.

2. EMMCC and SCMCC to review and approve minutes from the March 2, 2022 meeting

For EMMCC, Heidi made a motion to approve the minutes. Lenny seconded, all were in favor.

For SCMCC, Sam made a motion to approve the minutes. Chris seconded, all were in favor.

3. Review of the FY23 budgets.

After reviewing and discussing the budgets, the commissions voted to approve the budgets. The EMMCP has 26 cities/towns, and each city or town individually funds their account through voluntary contributions. The amount of $840,038 is an estimate, and the actual number will depend on the voluntary contributions which have yet to be determined.

SCMCP – Julien made a motion to approve the FY23 budget in the amount of $289,860.16, Sam seconded, all were in favor.

EMMCP – Christine made a motion to approve the FY23 budget in the amount of $840,038.00; Wesley seconded, all were in favor.

4. Discuss process for municipalities joining the EMMCP

The following policy was approved by the EMMCC Exec. Committee on July 13, 2021

> *Admitting a new member community*
>
> *If a city or town requests admittance to the EMMCP following approval by a town meeting or other legally established municipal mechanism and that community has provided written notification of their approval to the SRMCB and to the EMMCP, then*

the EMMCC/ Executive Committee may consider whether to approve admitting the petitioning community to the EMMCP.

The factors that should be considered by the EMMCC/ Executive Committee include:

1. *Allowing admittance will be mutually beneficial to the EMMCP communities and the petitioning community.*
2. *The petitioning community has indicated that it intends to be a long term stable member of the EMMCP.*

After reading through the meeting minutes, legal reached out to say that EMMCC has no authority to approve or to not approve a potential member community.

After discussing, the commission agreed to rescind the July 13, 2021 vote and discuss the subject again at a future meeting.

Heidi made a motion to rescind the July 13, 2021 vote, Lenny seconded, all were in favor.

5. Mosquito Control Task Force update

The Mosquito Control for the 21st Century task force has concluded. Between the Task Force and the subcommittee meetings, there were 78 meetings. The recommendations were submitted to Legislature at the end of March and now they can do with them as they wish. If something were to happen this year, an action could be tacked onto something this legislative session, but starting a bill from scratch won't happen until the next legislative session in the new year. Below is a summary of each of items that the Task Force voted to approve.

1) Repeal and replace chapter 252

Protecting public health and the environment by using the best available social and environmental science; encouraging funding and research aimed at evaluating risks and benefits of mosquito management efforts; relying on approaches such as integrated pest management (IPM); and emphasizing transparency in approaches and decision-making.

-restructure existing SRB to create a modified oversight board

Ensure scientific consensus in mosquito management approaches, as well as consistency and transparency in decision-making processes at the state and district levels.

Include representatives from the appropriate state agencies (i.e., Commissioners or their designees) and universities, including representatives from these entities and various groups within the agencies with appropriate expertise: a) Department of Agricultural Resources b) Department of Environmental Protection c) Department of Public Health d) Department of Fish and Game e) University of Massachusetts

-changes to the funding structure – would ensure mosquito management services are provided across MA; potentially include a base fee for municipalities to fund services such as monitoring, education, research and quality management

-statewide educational outreach and support to local BOHs

-develop mosquito management plan that includes IPM with standardized metrics, an evaluation protocol to determine efficacy of management, and thresholds for action

2) Amend the MA Stormwater Handbook to ensure that newly created stormwater retention and detention basins, including (but not limited to) catch basins, sediment forebays, vegetated filter strips, and bioretention swales:

Drain or otherwise percolate to a state of no standing water within three days.

If designed to retain water for longer than three days, allow this to happen, but in a way that does not allow for mosquito breeding (e.g., if the water retention area becomes a more permanent water body, have aquatic organisms present that will eat mosquito larvae). Alternatively, the site can be treated to prevent development and emergence of mosquitoes.

Use low-impact development techniques that are designed to require minimal maintenance.

Be maintained with sufficient frequency to preclude these features from producing mosquitoes.

Be listed with the regional MCD and municipal BOH so that the structures may be monitored and treated, as appropriate.

3) Revise the structure, function, and funding of MCDs to ensure cohesive and comprehensive mosquito management services across Massachusetts that includes baseline services such as education, surveillance, and source reduction. Revised structure, function, and funding for MCDs would allow municipalities to join MCDs at lower costs and allow member municipalities to add additional services such as local stormwater management, larviciding, and adulticiding as they wish or as needed.

A framework would:

• Provide for two levels of services:

Basic state-funded services (such as, education; disease [in nonhuman species], pathogen, and mosquito population surveillance; and source reduction) would be performed by the state and supported by tax dollars. All municipalities on a regional basis would receive these services, regardless of MCD membership.

Additional services (such as larviciding, adulticiding, and local storm water management) would be municipally funded either through cherry sheet deductions or direct appropriation through opting into those services, with 20 municipalities being required to opt-in for a three-year minimum. Only municipalities that indicate a desire to receive these services would receive them.

Support a cohesive mosquito management program with all MCDs as part of one system with centralized data systems to keep track of operations and standardized policies that all districts abide by. Data reporting will be overseen by the new oversight board.

Provide support for the basic and administrative costs of the MCDs, as well as capital improvement and capital equipment costs needed for mosquito management actions.

If disease risk is identified, pathogen-carrying mosquitoes would be managed with the appropriate response as determined by the new SRB.

4) 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. The board overseeing mosquito control in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts (the Board) should direct the preparation of the Plan. The Plan should provide operational guidance and best practices for state agencies and MCDs including:

A. Implementation guidance on each IPM component

B. Rationale and thresholds for each IPM component

C. Guidance for flexibility in implementing IPM

D. A summary of actions taken, lessons learned, and program data analysis since the prior report

E. Evaluation of effectiveness and non-target impacts (e.g., human health and ecological impacts) of each IPM component as deemed appropriate and practical by the Board

F. A summary of new developments in all aspects of IPM for mosquito control using best available information and new data

5) State-Wide Mosquito Surveillance

Providing trapping and testing to all 351 municipalities in MA. 227 municipalities are currently part of an MCD. The goals would be to increase the spatial coverage of monitoring mosquitoes that are particularly relevant as vectors of disease agents, and to perform surveillance for those vector-borne agents.

6) Improving Consistency in MCD staffing

Each MCD should employ or consult with an entomologist to identify mosquitoes and a wetland biologist/permit specialist to evaluate/oversee habitat modification efforts.

7) Statewide Education on Mosquito Management

Background

Educational outreach regarding mosquito management is currently fragmented and uncoordinated in the Commonwealth. Further, no MCD has access to the platform that is available to state officials, in order to issue messages of concern.

Recommendation

A state agency should be principally responsible for statewide education on mosquito management.

8) Online Reporting for Commercial Applicators

The Commonwealth should develop an online reporting system for mosquito control-related pesticide application records from commercial applicators working in the private sector. This system would replace the current paper-based reporting and expand the current reporting requirements to identify the location of the application. The information reported to this online system should include product name, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) registration number, application method, location of application by town, and total amount of product applied, as well as identify the application target as for mosquito control. Reporting would be required at least annually. Funding should be allocated for developing and maintaining this system.

9) Communication with Public Water Systems

The Commonwealth should develop an electronic Geographic Information System (GIS) based system where pesticide applicators communicate spray application plans for aerial and MCD truck-based spray applications. The Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP) will assist in this endeavor to ensure the MCD and aerial spray applicators can easily view the location of surface water supplies as well as 500-foot aerial application and 300-foot truck-spray buffer zones on all statewide mapping while still maintaining the security of PWS source locations.

10) Protection of Receptor Areas from Pesticide Run-Off

The Legislature shall fund and the Board shall implement additional research to investigate potential impacts from mosquito-related pesticide run-off on private well sources, wetlands, PWS groundwater source supplies, apiaries, fisheries, streams, farms, recreational water bodies, or any other sensitive receptor as defined by the Board.

11) Monitoring and Evaluations After Spraying

To determine if adulticide spray events are causing impacts to non-target receptors, the Commonwealth should design an ecological monitoring program.

12) Research the Impacts of Pesticides on Vulnerable Populations

The Commonwealth should fund research into the impacts of pesticide applications for mosquito control on vulnerable populations (e.g., persons with respiratory or immune system illnesses, persons with multiple chemical sensitivities). Findings from the research should inform the future development of procedures to protect human health.

13) Protected Status of Certified Organic Farms

Background

Currently, the protection from aerial spraying afforded to certified farms is a DPH policy, but not a law, and as such is revocable by executive action. Should the Legislature deem

it necessary to reverse that protection for a specific arbovirus outbreak, they could vote to do so.

Recommendation

Codify the protection from aerial spray for certified organic farms in legislation, not just in policy.

14) Enhancing and Updating Wetlands Management within Integrated Pest Management

The new program structure should facilitate increased cooperation and collaboration among MCDs, the Division of Ecological Restoration, other government agencies, nonprofit organizations, wetland scientists, and municipalities to integrate coastal and inlands restoration and stewardship with mosquito management.

15) Notification

The state response plan for mosquito-borne illness should be amended such that any individual may request to receive at least 48 hours' notice of an impending aerial spray event. In the event that a planned event must be delayed after notice has been given, updates should be issued to keep individuals informed of the new schedule.

16) Online system for requesting and tracking property exclusions and property opt-outs

Ability to renew exclusion rather than filling out new exclusion from year to year. Will be helpful for organizations with multiple properties.

17) Marking methods for property exclusions and property opt-outs.

Currently, property owners have to mark property with aluminum pie plates every 50 ft. This recommendation gives people the option to instead provide GIS data.

18) Public Engagement

Improve outreach to the public and input from the public.

19) Increased sharing of pesticide application locations.

Prior to the end of each calendar year, MCDs should be required to share map files of each pesticide application from the prior season with the 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.

20) Active Ingredients – No recommendation relative to additional active ingredient disclosure beyond what is currently required.

21) Inert Ingredients – The majority of the MCTF Pesticide Selection Subcommittee felt that EPA's review is adequate and recommended that no further action is necessary.

22) Selecting Pesticides and Ensuring a Transparent Selection Process

All pesticides used by the Commonwealth's organized MCDs and the SRB are reviewed by EPA and are federally registered. The pesticides are approved for use by the Commonwealth's Pesticide Board Subcommittee as outlined in M.G.L. c. 132B and 333 CMR 8.00. In keeping with best practices and acknowledging concerns by some stakeholders that these reviews are not sufficient, the SRB or a new subcommittee established by the SRB should further review 46 pesticide products used in the management of mosquito populations. This new subcommittee should include DPH, MassWildlife-NHESP Division, DEP, MDAR, DMF, and a representative from an MCD.

23) Avoiding Use of Pesticides Containing PFAS and Other Contaminants

Testing pesticides for contaminants. Details need to be worked out. Who's testing? Who's paying for testing? How often? What is being tested, each lot number, each delivery? If a contaminant is found, a committee should prevent the use through a "stop sale" or "stop use" order.

6. New business - none

7. Public Comment - none

8. Adjournment

SCMCC – Sam made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Leslie seconded, all were in favor.

EMMCC – Lenny made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Wesley seconded, all were in favor.

The meeting adjourned at 2:14 P.M.