

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

PPDC Pollinator Protection Plan Metrics WG - Meeting Minutes

8/10/2017

Attendees:

(in person) Mike Goodis, Lead, Meredith Laws, Tom Steeger, Dee Colby, Caydee Savinelli;
(call-in) Stephanie Binns (for Aaron Hobbs), Ray Brinkmeyer, Michele Colopy, Richard Crespin, Mark Dykes, Jim Fredericks, Nichelle Harriot, Don Parker, Peg Perrault, Robin Shepard, Al Summers, Andy Whittington, Tony Cofer (invited guest), Liza Fleeson Trossbach (invited guest), Cary Giguere (invited guest)

Agenda (attached)

Welcome, Introductions, Agenda Review – Mike/Dee

Mike started the meeting by reiterating the importance of states' acceptance of the proposed metric to the success of the Workgroup's efforts. During the past few meetings, states have voiced their concerns about a point system metric and have provided options in lieu of a point system. The Workgroup should try to integrate ideas put forth by the states and work out an approach for a national metric that is agreeable to all so that the Workgroup can move forward and meet their objectives.

Review of Meeting Minutes from June 22 and July 27, 2017 - Dee

Meeting minutes were finalized from the June and July meetings and will be posted on the PPDC website.

Discussion: Next Steps – Ray Brinkmeyer, Workgroup members, and invited guests

The Workgroup (WG) expressed their intention to work with the state lead agencies (SLA) to develop a metric that works for the states and EPA. Rose Kachadoorian (PPDC Pollinator Protection Plan Metrics Workgroup member, President-Elect of AAPCO, and Co-chair of AAPCO's Pollinator Protection Workgroup) and representatives from other state lead agencies, Tony Cofer (President of AAPCO), Cary Giguere (Chair of SFIREG), and Liza Fleeson Trossbach (PPDC Committee Member and President of ASPCRO) compiled a draft survey instrument for the Workgroup to consider as a possible template including various categories of questions (see attached).

WG - Early on, the WG decided against a survey because since a survey would be burdensome to the states; however, it appears [based on input from SLAs] that a survey would be the preferred format for a national metric. How do states feel about additional questions, such as "Does your state have a managed pollinator protection plan?"

SLA - An MP3 may not be relevant in all states. The survey could possibly be conducted via SFIREG or ASPCRO.

WG – The survey is a good idea; perhaps the WG could provide options for other questions; however, it was noted that asking the number of brochures printed is not informative about the success (efficacy) of state plans.

SLA – The WG needs to provide flexibility for states by providing categories for states to answer that will fit with their state. SLA suggested that the WG provide types of questions from which states could pick. It was noted though that it is important to remember that the purpose of plans was reducing exposure of bees to pesticides and not all of the other "stuff" that may have been included in some plans. Because plans were not funded, many states did not include efforts to measure the efficacy of their plans. The EPA

can compile the data provided by the states in a way that is manageable to them. States are sympathetic to the need to measure success but the goal of plans was not specifically articulated by EPA. The EPA may need other data from outside the plans to address “success” in terms of improved pollinator health. The EPA and Workgroup need to define success first then develop survey questions.

WG – There are no data from plans for us to work with, so the concept of success of plans is a grey area (*i.e.*, undefined). The point of plans was to involve as many stakeholders as possible for community buy-in to make the intent of the MP3 work, money or no money. We are aware though that other issues can consume the attention and resources of states and that MP3s and a national metric are unfunded.

SLA – Plans that were not developed by state lead agencies will need to be measured via SFIREG. If not, SLAs would need to mine information from plans that were developed by another organization within the state and do so without any funding. Bottom line, don’t make reporting mandatory. States have put a great deal of effort into their plans at the expense of other programs; therefore, reporting for this national metric needs to be achievable.

WG – Would states be opposed to scoring in the background?

SLA – We’re flexible, but don’t want the document to be unmanageable and burdensome. We need to be able to easily obtain the information that is requested in the metric. Keep in mind though that states do not like scores. If the points are combined and presented as a national total alone, that might work. The first year would just be an arbitrary number and be used to set an initial baseline, but then each year after, the score would be compared to the initial baseline.

WG – We agree; the intent is not to single out any one state. Maybe we can merge the two proposed ideas. The goal is to get cohesion between the two groups of thought.

SLA – We are sensitive to the Workgroup’s charge. States want to show their success. Keep in mind when developing the metric: the plans were voluntary, the scope was broad, and states don’t want to feel penalized for not including a particular category that the metric chooses to measure. It may be possible to set up the metric in Survey Monkey so that the score is not shown.

WG – The states have given us valuable input and material with which to work. Next we will look at both documents and see how to merge and improve the metric.

Wrap Up – Mike

Both groups are at a place of general understanding and things are looking agreeable for a path forward with the national metric. Let’s try to meet again around the middle of September.

PPDC Pollinator Protection Plans Metrics Workgroup

Call-In Meeting 8/10/2017 2:00 – 3:00 pm

1-866-299-3188; 703-347-8657

Adobe connect:

<http://epawebconferencing.acms.com/r9nqmg9pekp/>

The objective of this 1-hour meeting is to discuss how best to proceed with the proposed metric.

Agenda:

Welcome, Introductions, Ground Rules, Agenda Review – Mike/Dee (5 min)

Workgroup members and participants will introduce themselves.

Review of Meeting Minutes from June 22, 2017 - Dee (5 min)

Finalize meeting minutes from the June and July meetings.

Discussion: Next Steps – Ray Brinkmeyer and Workgroup members (45 min)

Ray has volunteered to kick off the discussion. Workgroup members should be prepared to discuss direction of the metric in light of feedback from states and come to a consensus about the next steps towards reaching our goal in the development of a national measure of managed pollinator protection plans' success. Cary Giguere, SFIREG Chairperson, will be joining the call.

Wrap Up – Mike (5 min)

Pollinator Plan Measures

The main goal of a voluntary Pollinator Protection Plan is to reduce pesticide exposure through education, enhanced communication and collaboration among stakeholders. This goal is directly related to increasing the overall health of pollinators nationally.

Reducing exposure can be achieved in many ways, but can be difficult or costly to directly measure. It is recognized that there can be both lethal and sub-lethal effects from pesticide exposure; that pesticide exposure can be acute and/or chronic; and that there are different types of exposure, including oral and contact.

Pollinator plans are highly variable and based upon the most critical state needs. Plans have been primarily developed by pesticide regulatory state lead agencies (SLAs); although, in some states they have been developed by the university, or by specific grower groups working with beekeepers. These plans were developed with input from various stakeholders.

Plans often focus on increasing the awareness level of both pesticide users and beekeepers, and may include one or more of the components below, as well as other components:

- Increased outreach on how bees are exposed to pesticides, product selection and pesticide label comprehension. Outreach audience is variable among states.
- Methods to increase communication between pesticide users and beekeepers.
- Development of Best Management Practices or Standard Operating Procedures.
- Behavioral changes which may lead to reduced pesticide exposure.

To evaluate whether the plan is having an impact, both direct and indirect (surrogate) measures may be assessed. To assist EPA in determining plan trends, efforts, and impacts, a sample survey has been developed. SLAs have the option not to use the sample survey and, instead, select the most meaningful measures in their state. SLA's also have the option of providing a narrative assessment.

The survey was developed with the acknowledgment that most states have had their stakeholder meetings and have a written plan.

A more detailed list of performance measures is provided in the following document: SFIREG Joint Working Committee Performance Measures for Managed Pollinator Protection Plans (MP3):

<https://aapco.files.wordpress.com/2016/02/sfireg-joint-working-committee-performance-measures-for-mp3-meeting-revision-clean-up.pdf>

Survey - Questions are not in value of importance

In the last calendar year

1a. Does your state have a method to enhance communication between pesticide users and beekeepers?

Yes No Somewhat

Comments

1b. If you answered “yes” or “somewhat”, has an increase in communication been achieved through (check all that apply)

- Grower and beekeeper developed SOPs
- Fieldwatch or similar mapping program
- Flags
- Other _____

2a. Have Best Management Practices (BMP) or Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) been developed to reduce pollinator exposure to pesticides?

Yes No Somewhat

2b. Has there been an adoption of BMP’s or SOPs by beekeepers and applicators?

Yes No Somewhat Do not know N/A

2c. Have you or another party conducted a formal evaluation?

Yes No Somewhat N/A

Comments

3. Has there been increased outreach on how bees are exposed to pesticides, product selection and pesticide label comprehension.

Yes No Somewhat

Number of people reached: _____

Groups reached, Check all that apply

Agricultural

Certified applicators ____

Noncertified applicators ____

Non-agricultural/Urban

Certified applicators ____

Noncertified applicators ____

Homeowners ____

Comments

4. Is your state documenting behavior changes which may lead to reduce pesticide exposure?

Yes No Somewhat Do not know

5. Has there been a reduction in pesticide-related verified bee kills?

Yes No Do not know

Comments

6. Is your state (SLA or university) attempting to measure direct pesticide exposure to bees, by collecting data documenting the frequency or level of pesticides detected in pollen or other substrate; or by some other means.

Yes No Do not know

Comments

7. If applicable, please comment on any innovative methods to assess pesticide exposure, increase communication or educational efforts.

8. Are you coordinating activities or trainings with other agencies, university-extension or NGOs within your state?

Yes No Somewhat

Comments

9. How is your state defining a successful pollinator protection plan? Check all that apply.

a. Relying on the results of existing and currently collected honey bee data by federal agencies and national organizations. Such as data from, the USDA-NASS report and the Honey Bee Health Coalition report.

b. Relying on the results of state initiated pollinator health surveys.

c. Increased adopted of BMPs and SOPs by pesticide applicators and beekeepers.

d. Increase in communication between pesticide applicators and beekeepers

e. An increased level of understanding of how bees are exposed to pesticides, product selection and pesticide label comprehension by pesticide users

f. Reduction in pesticide-related verified bee kills

g. Reduction in the frequency and level of pesticides detected in pollen or other substrate.

h. Other