

**Suffolk County Vector Control and Wetlands Management Long-Term Plan and
Generic Environmental Impact Statement
Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)**

July 25, 2003 Meeting Summary

The meeting opened as everyone present introduced themselves and their respective organizations.

Agenda Items 1: Review and Approval of June 16th Meeting Summary

The minutes from the May 6th TAC meeting were approved without discussion.

Agenda Item 2: Program Overview/ Funding Update from Suffolk County Department of Health Services

Vito Minei reported that the total budget for the Suffolk County Vector Control and Wetlands Management Long-Term Plan and Generic Environmental Impact Statement was estimated at \$4.6 billion. The legislature passed funding for the program at \$3.6 million from the ¼% tax. SCDHS has successfully obtained \$150,000 in supplemental funding to support OMWM projects and is still trying secure additional monies to support other ecological studies that are not included in the ¼% appropriation.

Cashin Associates has not yet signed their contract, but the contract should be finalized within the next few weeks.

Walter Dawydiak gave a power point presentation reviewing the process that has thus far been taken to develop this program. The reasons why the study was undertaken, cost development, and the additional items and detail that resulted from the scoping process were presented. A brief overview of tasks and studies to be performed under the program was made, and the role of the TAC was revisited.

Some discussion on the Fate & Transport study followed the presentation. The TAC requested the opportunity for early evaluation of study methods. A simplified/conceptual framework of the technical components of the entire study was also requested, as it would be helpful as the TAC evaluates different components/studies of the program (*A task overview and timeline was presented to the TAC later in the meeting by Cashin Associates.*)

A question also arose on the longevity of the TAC. The TAC will continue to meet over the 2 ½ year lifetime of the project. Once the project is completed, input from the TAC may still be needed. The Steering Committee and, likely, the advisory committees will still meet periodically after the Long-Term Plan is adopted.

Agenda Item 3: Mosquito Monitoring

Dominick Ninivaggi explained that the purpose of the mosquito-monitoring program is to find areas of high levels of human health risk before there is an imminent public health risk and transmission to humans occurs. The Department of Public Works manages the vector control program, while the Health Department's Division of Public Health monitors mosquito

larvae, adults, WNV virus, birds, and evaluates health records to determine human incidences. Scott Campbell demonstrated the use of traps to collect mosquitoes for virus testing.

Dominick explained that when deciding to use adulticides, Public Works takes into consideration the severity of infestations and the health risk from the mosquito population as estimated from the monitoring data, complaints from the public, and the weather. The spraying of adulticides is designed to kill mosquitoes in flight. Non-target impacts are minimized because it is necessary for an insect to encounter an aerosols droplet in flight, and droplet size is determined for mosquitoes specifically. Preliminary monitoring indicates that adulticide chemicals reach surfaces and water bodies at very low levels, and that they volatilize quickly and/or degrade rapidly in the environment.

There are permitting requirements to use pesticides in and adjacent to freshwater wetlands, and adulticides are used only in response to public health threats in these areas. Adulticides are not applied within 100 ft from open water except in response to a public health threat.

Jack Mattice commented that the high volatilization rate of the adulticides has implications on monitoring schemes. If chemicals do not appear on surfaces, it should be considered whether water samples or organisms are tested.

George Proios asked about the evaluation of impacts on non-target organisms. It is hoped that the literature review will provide some answers to this question.

Fran Siems asked about numbers available to report mosquito problems or dead birds. Public Health can be contacted at 853-8405 to report dead/ill birds. Public Works can be contacted at 852-4270 to report mosquito problems and at 852-4939 to obtain spraying information.

Agenda Item #3: TAC Administration

TAC Chair Mattice asked any members who were previously listed as alternates, but who will be the regularly attending representative of their organization to inform the Office of Ecology so that membership lists can be updated.

Kevin McAllister requested to be included in the membership of the TAC as a representative from the Peconic Baykeeper. He is presently serving as the CAC representative. If his request is granted, then Kelley Tucker, the current alternate, will represent the CAC. Robert Nuzzi stated that there is a potential conflict-of-interest with the membership request of the Peconic Baykeeper because of the lawsuit that the organization has filed against the County over the extended 2002 Vector Control Workplan. Walt Dawydiak suggested that it may not be appropriate for advocacy groups to be represented on the TAC. Advocacy groups are those with a pre-determined and primary mission to effect, or change, a policy or program, where the TAC role is to objectively review the technical elements related to the policy or program..

Dawydiak further noted that, under the conflict of interest rules under considerations, it would be inappropriate for SCDHS or SCDPW to participate on the TAC as voting members.

After some discussion over the appropriateness of the Baykeeper's membership on the TAC (including the possibility of allowing the Steering Committee to determine all memberships),

the group decided to first review the conflict-of-interest policy. Members were concerned that a case could be made that a conflict-of-interest existed with anyone present. Jack Mattice and Bill Wise volunteered to work on composing a simpler, more general policy. The Office of Ecology will also contribute.

Mattice then explained the submitted changes to the by-laws. George Proios suggested some additional minor modifications and removing the language concerning conflict-of-interest. The by-laws were then adopted as amended by a consensus. The conflict-of-interest policy will be considered separately, and Kevin McAllister's request will be further discussed once a policy is adopted.

Agenda Item #5: Monitoring Update

Steve Terracciano gave a presentation on the USGS monitoring program. Thus far, 7 spray events have been monitored. Bays, lakes and streams within or adjacent to areas treated with larvicides have also been selected for sampling. Methoprene has been detected following the application of the larvicide at Wertheim. USGS will continue to implement the 2003-monitoring program.

After Terracciano's presentation the TAC discussed the methods used by the USGS monitoring program and the parameters tested. Terracciano promised to provide additional documentation on the methods of the Kansas lab, as contrasted with the methods used by the SCDHS lab.

Robert Waters then gave a brief update on the SCDHS 2003 Vector Control Deposition Monitoring Activities. The Bureau of Marine Resources has been collecting samples in near shore areas near truck adulticide spraying events. Waters gave a demonstration of the equipment used to collect samples of surface deposits of vector control chemicals. The samples are analyzed by the SCDHS Public and Environmental Health Laboratory.

The Bureau of Marine Resources has also begun surface water quality sampling at Wertheim in support of OMWM activities. Sampling should be coordinated with USGS.

Agenda Item #6: Consultant Task Timeframe and Early Priorities

Dave Tonjes from Cashin Associates gave an overview of the consultant and sub-consultants' work program and an estimation of the time line. Tonjes asked the TAC to consider any gaps or omissions they may see in the workplan. TAC input on all tasks is requested, particularly in selecting project sites, planning long term monitoring programs, and early action projects. Tonjes finished his presentation by asking CAC members to consider which sub-consultants and experts they would be interested in having available to discuss task activities.

Agenda Item 6: Next Meeting Date and Agenda Items

The next meeting of the TAC will be September 8th in the Riverhead Legislative Auditorium.

