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SUMMARY REPORT OF THE FLORIDA COORDINATING COUNCIL ON MOSQUITO CONTROL’S FEBRUARY 14, 2006 MEETING

OVERVIEW OF COUNCIL’S KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 2006

Opening and Meeting Attendance
After determining a quorum was present, Chair Steve Dwinell opened the meeting at 10:10 AM. Listed below are the Council members who participated in the meeting:
E. John Beidler, Carina Blackmore, Dana Bryan, Steve Dwinell (chair), Christine Fortuin, Edsel Fussell, Mark Latham, Lenore McCullagh, John Milio, Ed Moyer, John P. Smith, and Walter Tabachnick.

DACS Staff in Attendance
Steve Dwinell and James Clauson.

Facilitation
The meeting was facilitated by Jeff Blair from the Florida Conflict Resolution Consortium at Florida State University. Information at: http://consensus.fsu.edu/

Project Webpage
Information on the project, including agenda packets, meeting reports, and related documents may be found at the project webpage below:
http://consensus.fsu.edu/MC/index.html

Agenda Review and Approval
The Council voted unanimously, 11 - 0 in favor, to approve the agenda as presented including the following objectives.

- To Approve Regular Procedural Topics
- To Review and Approve Updated Workplan and Meeting Schedule
- To Hear a Report from the Subcommittee on Managed Marshes
- To Hear a Report from the Subcommittee on Aerial Spraying
- To Hear a Report on Any Relevant Legislative Issues
- To Hear a Report on the Dibrom Exposure Study Data Results
- To Hear a Report from Lab Directorson Research Data Gaps/Needs
- To Hear a Report from the Research Priority Selection Subcommittee
To Discuss Research Priorities for Funding RFP’s
To Consider Public Comment
To Identify Needed Next Steps, Assignments, and Agenda Items For Next Meeting

Approval of November 29, 2005 Facilitator’s Meeting Summary Report
The Council voted unanimously, 11 - 0 in favor, to approve the November 29, 2005 Facilitator’s Report as amended.

Amendments:
John Milio was present at the November 29, 2005 meeting.

Review and Approval of Council’s Updated Workplan
Following a review of the Workplan, included as pages 4 and 5 of the agenda packet, and an invitation to propose any updates, the Council took the following actions.

Council Action:
Motion—The Council voted unanimously, 11 - 0 in favor, to approve the updated Council’s Workplan and meeting schedule as presented.
(Attachment 3—Workplan)

Council Meeting Schedule for the Next 12 Months
Following are the Council meeting dates for the next 12 months (2006):

February 14, 2006 Gainesville, Florida
June 20, 2006 Alachua, Florida
October 24, 2006 Alachua, Florida

Report from the Subcommittee on Managed Marshes
Doug Carlson provided the Council with a report and answered member’s questions.

Overview of Report
• The Subcommittee provided comments on a brine discharge facility.
• The Subcommittee will be reviewing hydroblasting of spoil piles.
• The next Subcommittee meeting will be held on April 11 – 12, 2006 in Pinellas County.

Council Action:
Motion—The Council voted unanimously, 12 - 0 in favor, to accept the Subcommittee on Managed Marshes report.
Report from the Subcommittee on Aerial Spraying
Jane Barber provided the Council with a report and answered member’s questions.

Overview of Report
• Committee continues their work of developing BMP’s and reviewing efficacy studies.
• Contact made with efficacy validation group at AMCA and committee will assist with this group.
• A national survey is being finalized, and AMCA will assist in distribution.
• Record keeping standards article is being prepared.
• Label language for aerially applied material is being developed.
• Research needs were discussed. The following needs were identified: Comparative data, efficacy validation, and residue samples from treated areas.
• Aerial application drift position paper is being developed.
• A Symposium on comparative data/efficacy validation has been organized, draft BMP’s will be presented at the AMCA meeting in Detroit on February 28, 2006.
• The Subcommittee will report to the Council at the June 20, 2006 meeting.

Council Action:
Motion—The Council voted unanimously, 12 - 0 in favor, to accept the Subcommittee on Aerial Spraying report.

Report on Upcoming Relevant Legislative Issues
Steve Dwinell reported on relevant legislative issues and answered member’s questions.

Overview of Report
• An amendment to the Ch. 482 exemption allowing area mosquito control is being proposed. The revised statute would clarify the exemption applies to organized mosquito control programs (those organized per Chapter 388) and their contractors.
• Budget request for 340 K to restore funding to assist local government efforts for mosquito control efforts. This has not been included in the Governor’s proposed budget.
• A budget request for replacement aircraft (DC3) is being requested. This has not been included in the Governor’s proposed budget.

Council Action:
Motion—The Council voted unanimously, 12 - 0 in favor, to accept the report on relevant legislative issues.

Report on Results of Dibrom Exposure Study Data Results
Carina Blackmore provided the Council with a presentation summarizing the Dibrom Exposure Study’s results, and answered member’s questions. The PowerPoint Presentation is available for review at the webpage.
Reports on Research Data Gaps/Needs
John Smith and Walter Tabachnick, Council members and PHEREC and FMEL lab directors respectively, reported on research data gaps from their respective perspectives. In general, John and Walter agreed that the key research topics and data gaps identified during the 2005 reports to the Council, remained the same.

John Smith, Director PHEREC, stated that there is a need to support a wide variety of research topics/areas, and that the current method of funding, focuses on only a few “popular” areas of research. John noted that there are 17 FTE research positions between the two labs, and identified 17 areas of research (subcategories) he recommended be funded on a rotating basis. The concept is to create four main categories, each containing 4 or 5 subcategories, that would each be funded on a rotating basis (once every four years). For the category selected for funding, at least one quality project could be selected from each subcategory, and each category would be funded on a four-year rotation. John stated, that this method would allow all of the researchers to receive support to research projects in their area of interest and expertise. Following are the 17 subcategories divided into arbitrary categories (for funding purposes):

Category I
• Aerial Adulticiding/Larviciding
• Surveillance
• Biocontrol
• Public Education

Category II
• Ground Adulticiding/Larviciding
• Resistance
• Personal Protection
• Worker Pesticide Safety

Category III
• Disease Ecology, Surveillance, Control
• Mosquito Systematics & Genetics
• Source Reduction
• Domestic Mosquito Control
• Waste & Storm Water Management

Category IV
• Nontargets
• Pesticide Residue Monitoring
• Mosquito Biology/Ecology/Behavior
• Other Public Health + Arthropods
Walter Tabachnick, Director FMEL, recommended that research priorities should continue to be selected from broad categories/topics based on need and urgency, as determined by the “market”. He advocated that researchers should respond to the market’s research needs. Walter reviewed last year’s priorities, and provided recommendations for 2006. Following are Walter’s recommendations:

**RESEARCH PROJECTS 2006**

- **Improve West Nile Surveillance**
- **Risk assessment to Humans for Mosquito Borne Disease**
  - Real-time arboviral transmission animations forecast West Nile risk.
  - Establishing real-time water table data to forecast arboviral epidemic risk in Florida in advance.
  - Improving surveillance to forecast vector borne diseases in Florida.
  - The *Culex nigripalpus* species complex: Geographic differences in arboviral transmission in Florida.
  - Survival of gravid *Culex nigripalpus* and the impact on arbovirus transmission in Florida.
- **Vector Control and Diseases**
  - Effective control of EEE through focal mosquito control.

**HIGH PRIORITIES FOR MOSQUITO CONTROL RESEARCH**

- **Improved Mosquito Control Products**
  - Efficient, Effective, Environmentally Proper
  - New Products
  - Improved Effectiveness
  - Resistance
  - Operations
- **Improved Vector/Disease Control**
  - Improved Surveillance For True Forecasting
  - Improved Targeted Effective Mosquito Control Methods For Vector Species

**Report/Update from the Research Priority Selection Subcommittee**

James Clauson, Environmental Manager, Bureau of Entomology and Pest Control, reported that the Research Priority Selection Subcommittee has been selected for 2006. Following are the members:

Dr. Dan Kline, Dr. Ken Linthicum (will not serve when appointed to FCCMCC), Dr. Doria Bowers, Dr. Eric Schreiber, Dr. Fran Van Essen, Dr. Jeff Stivers, Dr. Jonathon Hornby, Dr. Gary Clark, and Zack Prusak.

In addition, James provided the Council with a document detailing the status of the awarded research contracts for 2004 and 2005.
Facilitated Discussion on Research Priorities

After the presentations from John Smith, Walter Tabachnick, and James Clauson, the Council discussed whether to continue utilizing the current prioritization methodology of general categories, or to use John’s concept of annually funding one of four categories comprised of 4 – 5 subcategories.

The Council discussed the pros and cons of John’s proposed methodology, agreeing that they supported the intent behind proposing a fair method for ensuring that a wide variety of research topics are supported, and that additional funding is also needed.

Following are members’ comments on John’s proposal:

- This method is too restrictive.
- There will be funding problems with the subcategories method.
- Not flexible enough for funding topics.
- The subcategories may change in the future, don’t want to get locked in.
- Admirable concept, but not workable as proposed.
- This is worth exploring in the future, but not for 2006.
- Research does not function on four-year cycles.
- This method provides more time to conduct the research, which is needed.
- We end up selecting the topics that received the majority of the funding from previous years with the current methodology.

The Council members were then asked to vote in support of the method they preferred to use for 2006.

2 members voted in favor of the rotating category with subcategories strategy, and 8 members voted in favor of the current methodology of identifying and prioritizing broad-based research topics.

Council Research Priority Prioritization Exercise

After discussing methodology for assessing research priorities, the Council agreed to continue utilizing broad general categories and ranking each based on members’ evaluation of the topic’s relative level of priority. The topics were determined based on the research priorities identified by John Smith and Walter Tabachnick at the August 2, 2005 meeting, with revisions proposed by Council members during the discussion. It was agreed, that in general the data gaps (general areas/categories of needed research) had not changed since they were identified at the August 2005 Council meeting.

The prioritization ranking exercise was conducted in order to provide the Research Priority Selection Subcommittee with a sense of the Council’s collective views regarding a relative sense of priorities related to research topics. The rankings are not intended to be considered as an absolute ranking, rather they reflect a general sense of priorities to be used as one of the criteria for considering proposals by the Subcommittee.
Members were asked to evaluate the relative level of priority for each topic on a five point continuum/scale where a 5 equals the highest level of priority and a 1 equals the lowest level of priority. Members were asked to rank the priority of each topic independently and not in relation to the other topics. Following are the results of the Council’s ranked research topic priorities:

**Ranking Scale:** 5—Highest level of priority, urgent; 4—High priority; 3—Moderate level of priority; 2—Low level of priority; 1—Lowest possible priority, group should not pursue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>RANK</th>
<th>AVERAGE SCORE {Out of a possible high of 5}</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pesticide—Efficacy/Resistance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disease—Surveillance/Control/Risk Prediction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.63</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pesticide—Non-target Effects: Chronic or Acute</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pesticide—New Products</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application—Aerial Techniques/Ground Techniques—Adulticides</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Mosquito Control/Storm Water</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Residue Monitoring</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosquito Surveillance/Trapping Systems</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application — Larvicides</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Education/Risk Communication</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application — Vegetative Barriers</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attractants/Repellants</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public Comment
Steve Dwinell invited members of the public to address the Council.

One member of the public offered the following comment:
• Regarding the duration of competitive grants, the Council needs to consider 24 month duration for grants, instead of 12 months.

Agenda Items for the February 14, 2006 Meeting
- To Approve Regular Procedural Topics
- To Review and Approve Updated Workplan and Meeting Schedule
- To Hear a Report from the Subcommittee on Managed Marshes
- To Hear a Report from the Subcommittee on Aerial Spraying
- To Hear a Report on Relevant Legislative Issues
- To Hear a Report from the Miami Blue Butterfly Subcommittee
- To Hear a Status Report and Discuss Mosquito Misting Systems

Next Meeting Location and Date
June 20, 2006. Starting at 10:00 AM.
Alachua Regional Service Center, East Building, 14101 Northwest Highway 441, Alachua, FL 32615—Phone: 1.386.418.5500

Future Meeting Dates and Locations
October 24, 2006 Alachua, Florida
February 13, 2007 Gainesville, Florida
June 19, 2007 Gainesville, Florida
October 23, 2007 Gainesville, Florida

Adjourn
The Council voted unanimously, 11 – 0 in favor, to adjourn at approximately 1:00 PM.
ATTACHMENT 1

MEETING EVALUATION RESULTS

February 14, 2006—Gainesville, Florida

0 – 10 Scale where a 0 means totally disagree and a 10 means totally agree.

1. Please assess the overall meeting.

9.1 The background information was very useful.
9.1 The agenda packet was very useful.
9.4 The objectives for the meeting were stated at the outset.
9.6 Overall, the objectives of the meeting were fully achieved.
8.0 Subcommittee on Managed Marshes report.
8.2 Subcommittee on Aerial Spraying report.
8.2 Report on Dibrom Exposure Study Data Results.
9.3 Reports on Research Data Gaps.
9.1 Council Discussion/Prioritization of Research Priorities for Funding RFP’s.
8.7 Consideration of Public Comment.

2. Please tell us how well the Facilitator helped Council members engage in the meeting.

9.7 The participants followed the direction of the Facilitator.
9.7 The Facilitator made sure the concerns of all participants were heard.
9.6 The Facilitator helped us arrange our time well.
9.4 Participant input was documented accurately.

3. What is your level of satisfaction with the meeting?

9.5 Overall, I am very satisfied with the meeting.
9.6 I was very satisfied with the services provided by the Facilitator.
9.5 I am satisfied with the outcome of the meeting.

4. What progress did you make?

9.2 I know what the next steps following this meeting will be.
9.0 I know who is responsible for the next steps.

5. Members written evaluation comments.

- Well done as usual!
- Everything moved along smoothly!
- Well done!
- Facilitator needs to get a less boring tie.
ATTACHMENT 2

MEETING ATTENDANCE

Wayne Gale
Jeff Stivers
Rudy Xue
Doug Carlson
Kellie Etherson
Jeff Ball
Nancy Page
David Dame
Jane Barber
James Clauson
Jessica N.
Dana Bryan
Christine Cairns
Ken Linthicum
Ed Fussel
John Beidler
Carina Blackmore
Walter Tabachnick
Mark Latham
Lenore McCullagh
Ed Moyer
John Smith
John Milio
ATTACHMENT 3

COUNCIL’S UPDATED WORKPLAN
(Updated Unanimously on February 14, 2006)

A. Mosquito Control Strategies and Methodologies/Applications

1. Review and make recommendations as issues arise.
2. Recommendations on Permethrin aerial use under consideration, pending pilot test research data (from July 2004 meeting).
3. Recommendations on Agnique use to control pupae on environmentally sensitive lands were considered at the April 2004 meeting.
4. Reviewed DOH’s guidelines for submission of mosquitoes for virus isolation at the July 2004 meeting.
5. Council’s recommendations on arbovirus response plan guidelines were approved at the March 8, 2005 meeting.
6. Council reviewed emergency response assistance protocols scorecard and criteria at the August 2, 2005 meeting.
7. Council reviewed an update on Agnique and Permethrin research at the November 29, 2005 meeting.
8. Council reviewed an inventory and status update of arthropod control plans for State managed lands at the November 29, 2005 meeting.


1. Schedule meetings annually at the July meeting.
2. Conduct Council Effectiveness Assessment Survey annually at the July meeting.
3. Council refined meeting process protocols at the October 2004 meeting.
4. Council decided on 2006 meetings schedule at the August 2, 2005 meeting.
5. Council Effectiveness Assessment Survey and Workplan Prioritization exercise was conducted at the August 2, 2005 meeting.
6. Council adopted absentee member comments proposal at the August 2, 2005 meeting.
7. Council adopted proposals to revise the Organizational and Procedural Guidelines related to the meeting frequency and attendance policies.
8. The FCCMC shall meet three times per year starting with February of each year. Regularly scheduled meetings will held in February, June, and October of each year.

C. Environmental and Health Strategies

1. Review and make recommendations as issues arise.
2. Council reviewed malaria control efforts at January 2004 meeting.
3. Council heard results of the Dibrom exposure study, at the August 2, 2005 meeting.
4. Council will review Dibrom Study Data Results at the February 14, 2006 Meeting.
D. Research and Funding Priorities and Strategies

1. The Council will review and make recommendations on the Research Committee’s identified priorities for research proposals, and provide Council recommendations prior to the DACS solicitation of RFP’s, annually at each February meeting.
2. DACS will report the research results from funded studies to the Council, on a regular basis.
3. Lab directors will report on research data gaps annually at the February meeting.
5. Lab directors reported on research gaps at the August 2, 2005 meeting.
6. Assigned Subcommittee on Aerial Spraying to developing recommendations for priorities on research proposals.
7. Lab directors and DACS reported on research gaps at the July 2004 meeting.
8. Council reviewed and made recommendations on research priorities at the July 2004 meeting.
9. Council will review and make recommendations on research priorities at the February 2006 meeting.

E. Roles, Communication, and Cooperation Between and Among Responsible Agencies and Affected Interests

1. Review and make recommendations as issues arise.
2. Recommendations on Coordinating/Refining the Arbovirus Response Plan were developed by the Arbovirus Response Plan Subcommittee, and approved by the Council at the March 2005 meeting.

F. Labeling and Efficacy Issues

1. Review and make recommendations as issues arise.
2. Council made recommendations on USEPA’s Mosquito Control Labeling at the July 2004 meeting.

G. Establish and Implement Conflict Resolution Protocols

1. Council will respond to any disputes or conflicts as they arise utilizing their adopted decision-making and participation procedures and protocols as well as adopted guiding principles.