

US EPA ARCHIVE DOCUMENT

# PPDC Pollinator Protection Plan Metrics WG - Meeting Minutes

6/22/2017

## Attendees:

(in person) Mike Goodis, Lead, Meredith Laws, Tom Steeger, Dee Colby

(call-in) Stephanie Binns (for Aaron Hobbs), Ray Brinkmeyer, Richard Crespin, Mark Dykes, Jim Fredericks, Dudley Hoskins, Rose Kachadoorian, Peg Perrault, Caydee Savinelli, Julie Shapiro, Tim Tucker

## Agenda (attached)

### Welcome, Introductions, Agenda Review – Mike/Dee

Workgroup members and invited participants introduced themselves.

### Review of Meeting Minutes from May 2, 2017 - Dee

Meeting minutes were finalized from the May meeting and will be posted on the PPDC website.

### Feedback from the PPDC – Ray Brinkmeyer

*1) Provide a maximum number of options allowed in each category to avoid imbalance when states add their own, unique options for generating points or include a weighting factor for categories.*

WG Comment – The plan is not meant to limit, rather to include as many ‘inputs’ as possible.

*2) Support for point system, but leery of self-assessment. Possibly include a subtractive element in categories. Encourage use of citizen scientists.*

WG Comments – A self-assessment may over inflate their efforts. Citizen scientists could help getting the information out there; communication and participation are broad within states. From the beginning, involvement was stressed.

- We will need to figure out how self-assessment could be done and who within states would do the assessing. The opportunity to provide an explanation of the proposed metric to SFIREG will help them understand that our intent for the metric is that it not be burdensome and that the EPA would not be doing the assessment of their plan.

- Some states have concerns that regional offices will ask for scores, and some states could score low because there are no beekeepers. Also, there is concern that what was voluntary may become mandatory. Some states don’t want grading of un-mandated plans. However, we can communicate with the regions and we can work with states if they want to improve their plans.

*3) Plans are voluntary and many state plans are finalized; therefore, they will not change over time. State plans have their own metrics. A point system is a grading system. States already did their work and are done. A metric coming after the fact does not measure success of the plans.*

WG Comments – Hopefully explanation to SFIREG will clarify this. Our proposed metric has states focus on their own plan. During the development of plans, AAPCO indicated to the states that living documents would be more useful than a plan on a shelf, and therefore suggested internal assessments of BMPs. It will be important to point this out during SFIREG.

*4) Where there any feedback on plans initially? Workgroup response: No, plans were voluntary.*

*5) Measurement of pollinator protection is a difficult task and it is unfunded.*

6) Utilize people who specialize in evaluation. *Monitoring Plans vs. Monitoring Outcomes. Have a set of baseline measurements to be met independent of what states could add on to the point system. For example, are people willing to and do implement BMPs? There is strength when things are locally driven. The first approach is to assess if plans are being implemented and then, is the plan achieving what it said it was going to achieve. Group plans based on similarities and pool the assessments. An evaluator could help states improve plans now.*

WG Comments – We are looking at the plans at a national level and not a state level. Also, the Workgroup has an expert in evaluation who is contributing in the development of the metric.

7) *Feedback about the plans would be good once all have been looked at collectively.*

*Rick Keigwin, Acting Director OPP) Retroactive development of a metric is challenging but keep going.*

#### **Preparation for meeting with SFIREG – Caydee Savinelli**

A lead-in for SFIREG is attached. Comments that were made during editing of the presentation to be given to SFIREG were as follows:

- Show how some states are or propose to measure effectiveness of their plans (e.g. WI). States are sensitive to being told, especially for something that is unfunded.
- Trace best practices for behavioral change. How a behavioral change is introduced or communicated is as important as the intervention. Keep in mind that what motivates one doesn't motivate another. Trial runs of the proposed metric would be important.
- Be sure the transition from what is possible to measure based on what is in the plans to the proposed metric is obvious.
- It may be necessary to point out how very unique plans could get points and/or how they fit into proposed categories.
- Data management and the reporting of results have not been addressed yet.
- States are concerned with numeric values. The results may not be numbers reported but may be categories in a rubric representing a national profile of MP3 success with a possible option for states to publicize their self-assessed score.

#### **Meeting Recap – Dee**

Meeting with SFIREG – June 27, 2017 9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m. EST; in person and call-in

Next meeting...tentative date July 19, 2017 at 1:30-3:00 p.m. EST (*adjusted to July 27, 2017 at 2:00-3:30 p.m. EST*)

## Pollinator Protection Plans Metrics PPDC Workgroup

Call-In Meeting 6/22/2017 2:00 – 3:30 pm

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

Adobe connect:

<http://epawebconferencing.acms.com/r5ovyq4jam4/>

The objective of this meeting is to discuss the feedback that the full PPDC provided to the Workgroup about the proposed metric during the May 3, 2017 meeting and to prepare for the meeting with SFIREG on June 27, 2017.

### Agenda:

#### **Welcome, Introductions, Ground Rules, Agenda Review** – Mike/Dee (10 min)

*Workgroup members and participants will introduce themselves.*

#### **Review of Meeting Minutes from April 13, 2017** - Dee (5 min)

*Finalize meeting minutes from the May meeting.*

#### **Feedback from the PPDC** – Someone to lead discussion (30 min)

*1) Provide a maximum number of options allowed in each category to avoid imbalance when states add their own, unique options for generating points or include a weighting factor for categories.*

*2) Support for point system, but leery of self-assessment. Possibly include a subtractive element in categories. Encourage use of citizen scientists.*

*3) Plans are voluntary and many state plans are finalized; therefore, they will not change over time. State plans have their own metrics. A point system is a grading system. States already did their work and are done. A metric coming after the fact does not measure success of the plans.*

*4) Where there any feedback on plans initially? Workgroup response: No, plans were voluntary.*

*5) Measurement of pollinator protection is a difficult task and it is unfunded.*

*6) Utilize people who specialize in evaluation. Monitoring Plans vs. Monitoring Outcomes. Have a set of baseline measurements to be met independent of what states could add on to the point system. For example, are people willing to and do implement BMPs? There is strength when things are locally driven. The first approach is to asses if plans are being implemented and then, is the plan achieving what it said it was going to achieve. Group plans based on similarities and pool the assessments. An evaluator could help states improve plans now.*

*7) Feedback about the plans would be good once all have been looked at collectively.*

*Rick) Retroactive development of a metric is challenging but keep going.*

#### **Preparation for meeting with SFIREG** – Caydee Savinelli/Don Parker (35 min)

*What background information should we provide to SFIREG ahead of time to prepare them for discussion of the metric? A lead-in for SFIREG is below.*

*What questions do we want SFIREG to answer?*

*Finalize the presentation for the meeting with SFIREG. Attached is the presentation that was given to the PPDC on May 3<sup>rd</sup> (slides 1-15) for reference.*

**Wrap Up** – Mike (5 min)

**Meeting Recap** – Dee (5 min)

*Meeting with SFIREG – June 27, 2017 9:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m. EST; in person and call-in*

*Next meeting...tentative date July 19, 2017 at 1:30-3:00 p.m. EST*

## PPDC Pollinator Protections Plans Metrics Workgroup – Proposed Metric

The Pollinator Protection Plans Metrics Workgroup is charged with developing: 1) recommendations for how to evaluate/measure the effectiveness of state- and tribal-recognized pollinator protection plans at the national level; and, 2) a strategy to communicate that effectiveness to the public (defined broadly).

The EPA is asking for some type of measure that provides a reportable acknowledgement of evidence that MP3s are having a positive impact. This ‘measure’ is not intended to approve or disapprove MP3s, or even identify what is acceptable in an MP3.

What the Workgroup has found is that: 1) MP3s vary tremendously across states but are adapted to local needs, and 2) MP3s target improvement of local communication and thereby encourage behavior change. The idea is give credit where credit is due. With that in mind, the Workgroup is proposing a Point-System Metric containing categories based on common themes of MP3s (e.g., education) and line items within each category for states to document evidence of action (e.g. outreach materials for stakeholders). See below for sample categories and line items.

Because MP3s vary so much, not all states will report the same points. Therefore, multiple options for accruing points must be included in the Metric to acknowledge what all states are doing although not all will do the same. The Workgroup wants to leave flexibility to add additional points not yet realized in order to make sure credit is given where credit is due. A cumulative total, added across states sets a national baseline, which can then be compared across years, on a local scale if states desire and nationally. The Metric is to set a baseline of evidence that local people are working to solve the issue locally without EPA regulation. The metric is NOT to be used to compare states – the needs vary too much.

How to report out the results is still in discussion. The results may not be numbers reported but may be categories in a rubric, such as “developing” or “progressing” “fully implemented”, etc. The Workgroup intends to develop a guide as to the concept of points system and items within the point system.

The Workgroup believes this metric would be easy, flexible, acknowledge many efforts, fit multiple locations, and should be scored by the developers of the MP3. At this point, the Metrics Workgroup believes it is time to check with states for input before further development or time is invested in the concept.

### Question(s) for SFIREG:

How is your state planning to measure effectiveness of its plan?

Are there modifications to the proposed Metric that would improve the acceptance and/or function of it?

Is there a better, easier, alternative?

Would your state be interested in doing a mini-pilot of the Metric as it is now?

<b>Pollinator Protection Plan</b>						
<b>Proposed (DRAFT) National Metric</b>						
(Examples)		<b>All States</b>	<b>FL</b>	<b>ID</b>	<b>MA</b>	<b>MS</b>
<b>Category</b>	<b>Evidence Sought</b>					
<b>Stakeholders</b>						
	<b>Plan Participants/Endorsed By:</b>					
	State/Tribe Regulatory Authority/Agency/ Dept. of Agriculture (1 pt. for each)					
	Crop Consultants Associations (1 pt. for each)					
	University Extension Apiary or State Apiarist					
	University Extension Crop or IPM Advisors					
	One or more Beekeeper Associations (1 pt. for each)					
	One or more Crop Producer Associations (1 pt. for each)					
	Agricultural Aviation Association (includes pesticide applicators)					
	Pest Control Operators Association					
	State/Tribe Vector Representative/Public Health/Mosquito Control etc.					
	Local NGO (1 pt. for each)					
	Federal Agency (NRCS, FWS, etc.) Branch offices (0.1 pt each)					
	Lawn/Garden Associations					
	Other					
<b>Education</b>						
	Educational Materials Developed (1 pt/ each stakeholder group)					
	Educational Materials Presented (1 pt/ each stakeholder group)					
	Educational Materials Distributed (1 pt/ each stakeholder group)					
	Educational Materials Accessed					
	Educational Material includes Action for each stakeholder above					
	Number of Pollinator Specific Trainings (1 pt/each)					
	Outreach materials for stakeholders (1 pt/ each stakeholder group)					
<b>Education cont.</b>		<b>All States</b>	<b>FL</b>	<b>ID</b>	<b>MA</b>	<b>MS</b>

	national participation in MP3 processes/developments					
	Includes a Website with compiled outreach material					
	CEU courses developed					
	Other					
<b>Communication</b>						
	Identifies Avenue(s) for exchange of contact information					
	Identifies Topics/Need for Contacting other participants					
	Provides Yearly Stakeholder Review Meeting					
	Includes a Symbol/Reminder mechanism (e.g. bee flag)					
	Includes a Website with compiled outreach material					
	Includes a Voluntary Mapping System for crops					
	Includes a Voluntary Mapping System for apiaries					
	Other					
<b>BMPs</b>						
	BMP developed for beekeepers near crops					
	BMPs developed for producer with apiary nearby					
	BMPs for ag producers to promote pollinators (generally)					
	BMPs developed for pesticide applicators (crop and/or bee pests)					
	BMPs for other stakeholders' engagement					
	BMPs for Beekeepers					
	BMPs for honey bee husbandry					
	BMPs for nursery and landscaping industry					
	BMPs for urban and residential areas					
	BMPs for homeowners/the public					
	BMPs for forage/habitat					
	BMPs for pesticide risk to pollinators					
	Other					
<b>Progress measures</b>						
	Provides Stakeholder Annual Survey					
	Provides Mechanism for Stakeholder Revisions if needed on Annual Basis					
<b>Progress measures cont.</b>		<b>All States</b>	<b>FL</b>	<b>ID</b>	<b>MA</b>	<b>MS</b>
	Survey Evidence of Stakeholder Improved Awareness					

	Survey Evidence of Stakeholder Improved Participation					
	Survey Evidence of Stakeholder level of Satisfaction					
	Evidence of Plan Expansion/Inclusion of new Stakeholders					
	Survey Evidence (Stakeholder input) implying behavior change					
	Habitat Improvements Indicated					
	Nectar/pollen producing plants implements into Ag. Elements (buffers, etc.)					
	Other					
<b>Totals</b>						