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SUMMARY REPORT OF THE FLORIDA COORDINATING COUNCIL ON MOSQUITO CONTROL’S MARCH 8, 2005 MEETING

OVERVIEW OF COUNCIL’S KEY RECOMMENDATIONS

TUESDAY, MARCH 8, 2005

Opening and Meeting Attendance
After determining a quorum was present, Chair Tom Loyless opened the meeting at 10:00 AM. Listed below are the Council members who participated in the meeting:
E. John Beidler (by phone), Carina Blackmore, Christine Cairns, Edsel Fussell, Mark Latham, Tom Loyless (chair), John Milio, John Mulrennan, Jr., John P. Smith, and Walter Tabachnick (by phone).

Ed Moyer is the new Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission representative to the Council.

DACS Staff in Attendance
Steve Rutz, Mike Page, and Jennifer Simpson.

Facilitation
The meeting was facilitated by Jeff Blair.

Agenda Review and Approval
The Council voted unanimously, 11 - 0 in favor, to approve the agenda as amended 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 an Overview of Legislative Issues for the 04/05 Session
- To Hear a Report on the Status of USEPA’s Mosquito Control Labeling
- To Hear a Report on DACS Funding of Research Proposals
- To Hear an Update on Dibrom Exposure Study Results
- To Hear a Report from the Arbovirus Response Plan Subcommittee
- To Hear an Overview on Emergency Mosquito Control Response Related to 2004 Hurricanes in Florida
- To Consider and Develop Recommendations for Emergency Response Assistance Protocols
- To Consider Public Comment
- To Identify Needed Next Steps and Agenda Items For Next Meeting
Approval of October 27, 2004 Minutes
The Council voted unanimously, 11 - 0 in favor, to approve the October 27, 2004 minutes as presented.

Review and Approval of Council’s Updated Workplan
The Council was asked to review the updated workplan and propose modifications. Jeff Blair handed out a “Council Effectiveness Assessment Survey” for Council members to complete and return to Jeff for compilation. The survey results will be discussed at the July 12, 2005 meeting. The survey was also e-mailed to the members.

Council Action:
Motion—The Council voted unanimously, 12 - 0 in favor, to approve the updated Council’s Workplan as presented.

Council Meeting Schedule for Next 12 Months
Following are the Council meeting dates for the next 12 months:
- July 12, 2005 Gainesville
- October 25, 2005 Gainesville
- February 14, 2005 Gainesville

Report from the Subcommittee on Managed Marshes
Doug Carlson provided the Council with a report and answered member’s questions. Doug reported that the 5th Workshop on Salt Marsh Management and Research and 4th Biennial Mosquito Lagoon Conference was a success and well attended.

Council Action:
Motion—The Council voted unanimously, 12 - 0 in favor, to accept the Subcommittee on Managed Marshes report.
Motion—The Council voted unanimously, 12 - 0 in favor, to appoint Steve Lau to replace Brian Barnett on the Subcommittee.

Report from the Subcommittee on Aerial Spraying
Jane Barber provided the Council with a report and answered member’s questions. Jane noted that the Subcommittee has identified four key priorities for further evaluation and requested feedback from the Council regarding the identified priorities. There were no opinions expressed contrary to the Subcommittee’s priorities and the Council expressed support for the Subcommittee’s progress.

Following are the four priorities:
- Collation of aircraft and application system types for an FDACS technical memoranda.
- Research into nozzle wear/erosion.
- Development of a standard record keeping form for aerial applications.
- Best management practices for aerial applications considering new research and efforts within Florida.

Council Action:
Motion—The Council voted unanimously, 11 - 0 in favor, to accept the Subcommittee on Aerial Spraying report.
**Report on Upcoming Legislative Issues**
Steve Rutz reported that there was no legislation related to Chapter 388 pending in the Legislature at this time. DACS is attempting to secure a return to historic funding levels, an additional ~$340,000 is required to return to historic levels after recent legislative cuts. DACS is hoping to use some of the FEMA reimbursement money and apply it to the purchase of the aircraft, not purchased last year, as part of the current legislative budget package.

**Status Report on USEPA’s Mosquito Control Labeling**
Christine Cairns from the USEPA reported the final sign-off has occurred on the USEPA’s mosquito control label, but the PR notice would go out soon. The final label was largely the same as the original proposal.

**Report on DACS Funding of Research Proposals**
Tom Loyless reported that 19 research proposals were ranked and then awarded based on the ability to fund them and meet the identified research priorities/needs. In the end four proposals were funded:
- Characterization of the optimum field droplet size for aerial application of Permethrin (ranked 1 by reviewers)
- Impact of Agnique MMF application to population abundance of non-target species inhabiting brackish water. (ranked 10 by reviewers)
- Assessing the impact of permethrin on non-target aquatic species following ULV aerial application. (ranked 3 by reviewers)
- Improving mosquito control capabilities to identify Florida mosquito species in the field: mosquito identification card decks. (ranked 8 by reviewers)

Following a discussion on the selection and funding process, a Subcommittee was formed to develop recommendations regarding how the process should be conducted in the future. Subcommittee on Research Priorities Members:
Mike Page, John Mulrennen, Ed Fussell, John Smith, Tom Loyless, and Walter Tabachnik.
The Subcommittee will meet on June 7th, 2005, in Tallahassee.
DACS will prepare a proposal to submit to the Subcommittee with recommendations for identifying research priorities and the selecting of research proposals.

**Comments and Discussion on DACS Funding of Research Proposals**
DACS used the priorities from the FCCMC, feedback from the “advising” group, and DACS agency needs. DACS has the authority to make the funding decisions. No specifications for a selection committee were in the proviso language regarding how to undertake the selection process, so could not use the same committee from the past, as a formal body. This is a concern to Council members.
(Fussell) The new method leaves FMCA out of the input process.
(Loyless) FMCA does still have make an impact, they made a priorities presentation to the Council. And the Council recommended the priorities to DACS, which were used.
(Fussell) MMF’s are not used much in mosquito control and wouldn’t have made a #2 priority selection. There is also not a big market for MMF’s either.
(Carlson) DEP has discontinued use of Aerosurf on state lands.

(Loyless) DEP felt the study on MMF’s was very important, DACS had to take this into consideration in selecting proposals.

(Fussell) The Council needs to discuss in detail how to handle selections so everyone knows they have a part, and what there part is in the selection process.

(Loyless) Proviso language prevents the use of the “Selection Committee”.

(Rutz) The proviso language in the appropriations bill, says how the Legislature wants the money spent. The Council needs to make a proposal on how we can improve the process to assure that people’s input is taken into consideration.

Appropriations committee determines the proviso language.

This issue should be put on agenda for the July meeting.

(Smith) people bring their needs to the Council and council determines the priorities.

(Carlson) some recommendation for a mechanism/protocol needs to be ready by July. Don’t wait until July to discuss this, it will be too late.

(Blair) DACS could bring a process proposal and a Subcommittee could meet and develop recommendations prior to the Council’s July meeting.

**Report on Results of Dibrom Exposure Study**

Carina Blackmore reported that the study was complete but DOH had not yet scheduled a time to meet with the CDC in Atlanta to review the results. Carrina indicated that she would have a report for the Council at the July meeting.

**Arbovirus Response Plan Subcommittee Report**

Walter Tabachnick submitted a proposal for Council consideration with a Power Point presentation. Following a discussion of Walter’s proposal the Council took the following actions:

**Council Action:**

**Motion**—The Council voted unanimously, 11 - 0 in favor, to adopt the proposal on FMCARP-WN as amended.

**Motion**—The Council voted unanimously, 11 - 0 in favor, that after the amendments were added to the proposal, Walter would submit the document to DACS for their review and distribution to MCD’s as an operational guidelines document.

**Amendments:**

Under “Level 4 Mosquito Alert” for Arbovirus response levels and responses at response plan levels: change Mosquito Warning and Mosquito Danger to Mosquito Alert A and Mosquito Alert B.

Clarify that a Mosquito Alert at Level 4 is triggered by greater than or equal to 3 human cases.

At Level 4 Mosquito Alert for responses at response plan levels: replace as Level 3 with Same response level as a Level 3 advisory.

Under Level 5 for responses at response plan levels, indicate mosquito control advises the appropriate agencies (i.e., DACS and DOH).

Add: … approval from DACS, DEP, and other public land owners.
Notes:
The guidelines are advisory in nature and for the voluntary use by MCD’s. In addition, the guidelines are only to be used for West Nile applications and are designed to be an operational document for MCD’s internal use.

Comment and Discussion
(Blackmore) The plan is needed; however, before publication we need to modify some of the terminology that may confuse health advisory from mosquito advisory, so we need to work this out. Also, are there step-down criteria (when to reduce control efforts)?
(Tabachnick) We used historical information to determine the levels they would be at. Used surveillance information to determine step-down. These are guidelines, not constraints. MCD’s still maintain their own authority to make their control decisions.
(Blackmore) More concerned about the terminology that breaks away from other alert terminology (warning and danger terminology) and concerned about having recommendations to curb evening outdoor activities (this is moving into the public health communication arena).
(Tabachnick) The triggers are very conservative at higher levels. If we get to a level 5, this wouldn’t be done unilaterally. MCD’s have the responsibility to make that recommendation to curb activities if they know there is such a mosquito danger.
(Blair) clarify the verbiage that recommendations goes to DOH and DACS, and this is not a public announcement.
(Latham) If there is a good relationship with health PIO’s. then that’s who MCD’s would go to first to make recommendations. Make sure the health department and MCD’s are in agreement.
(Carlson) agree. (Gale and Fussell) agree.
(Blair) Need to clarify the verbiage to accomplish this.
(Blackmore) take out Level 4 “warning” and “danger.” Ok to keep “Alert”.
(Tabachnick) call it A and B. Send Tabachnik suggestions for minor changes. Plan can change and evolve as needed.
(Rutz) How do we ensure consistency in how the data is acquired and used?
(Tabachnick) They can only use what information is available.
(Gale) this is a BMP for MCD’s.
(Blair) recommend that FCCMC makes FMCARP recommendation to DACS, and then DACS disseminates.

Lessons Learned Related to Emergency Mosquito Control Response
Jennifer Simpson provided the Council with an overview on Emergency Mosquito Control Response Activities resulting from the hurricanes of 2004.

Emergency Response Assistance Protocols Criteria
Tom Loyless reported that DACS is in the process of reviewing the protocols and will report back the July meeting.
Tom agreed to utilize the MCIRT counties and use the score card to determine how well it works. Tom will report back at the next meeting.
Comments and Discussion
Caution to use the score as a tool, not as a rule.
Not all the info is there to quantify all the data all the time.
More data review and case studies are needed.
(Blackmore) FEMA coming up with protocols for when FEMA will consider giving emergency funding for reimbursement, so this may be something to look out for.
We should work our protocols around FEMA’s.
Some counties are getting reimbursed and some haven’t yet been reimbursed by FEMA.

Public Comment
There were no members of the public who addressed the Council.

Assignments and Agenda Items for Next 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 from the 04/05 Session
- Council Effectiveness Assessment Survey Results and Discussion
- To Hear an Update on Dibrom Exposure Study Results
- Report on Trust Fund Policies Related to Emergency Mosquito Control Response
- To Discuss Lessons Learned Related to Emergency Mosquito Control Response (case studies)
- To Discuss Recommendations for Emergency Response Assistance Protocols (using scorecard from the arbovirus guidelines)
- To Hear a Report from Lab Directors, DACS, and the FMCA Research Advisory Council on Research Data Gaps/Needs
- To Hear Recommendations from the Research Priority Selection Subcommittee
- To Discuss DACS Proposal for Funding of Research Proposals
- To Discuss Research Priorities for Funding RFP’s
- To Consider Public Comment
- To Identify Needed Next Steps and Agenda Items For Next Meeting

Next Meeting Location and Date
July 12, 2005. Starting at 10:00 AM.
DACS, Division of Plant Industry’s Conference Room, 1911 SW 34th Street,
Gainesville, Florida 32614—Phone: 352-372-3505
Future Meeting Dates and Locations
October 25, 2005  Gainesville
February 14, 2005  Gainesville

Notes
- Communications to Council members should go through Jeff Blair.
- Send all reports and proposals to Jeff Blair prior to the meetings, for inclusion in reports and use with LCD projector display during meetings.
- Reports and agendas are available at http://consensus.fsu.edu

Adjourn
The Council voted unanimously, 12 – 0 in favor, to adjourn at approximately 1:02 PM.
ATTACHMENT 1

MEETING EVALUATION RESULTS
March 8, 2005—Tallahassee, Florida

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

1. Please assess the overall meeting.

   9.00  The background information was very useful.
   9.28  The agenda packet was very useful.
   9.57  The objectives for the meeting were stated at the outset.
   9.57  Overall, the objectives of the meeting were fully achieved.
   9.28  Subcommittee on Managed Marshes report.
   9.28  Subcommittee on Aerial Spraying report.
   9.28  Legislative Issues update.
   8.00  Report on DACS Funding of Research Proposals.
   8.00  Update on Dibron Exposure Study Results.
   9.14  Lessons Learned Related to Emergency Mosquito Control Response.
   8.16  Emergency Response Assistance Protocols Criteria.

2. Please tell us how well the facilitator helped the participants engage in the meeting.

   9.14  The participants followed the direction of the facilitator.
   9.57  The facilitator made sure the concerns of all participants were heard.
   9.71  The facilitator helped us arrange our time well.
   9.71  Participant input was documented accurately.

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

   9.42  Overall, I am very satisfied with the meeting.
   9.57  I was very satisfied with the services provided by the facilitator.
   9.28  I am satisfied with the outcome of the meeting.

4. What progress did you make?

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

5. Comments

No comments were provided.