

PPDC Pollinator Protection Plan Metrics WG - Meeting Minutes

5/2/2017

Attendees:

(in person) Mike Goodis, Lead, Meredith Laws, Tom Steeger, Dee Colby, Stephanie Binns (for Aaron Hobbs), Ray Brinkmeyer, Steven Coy, Richard Crespin, David Epstein, Jeanette Klopchin, Don Parker, Caydee Savinelli, Tim Tucker, Tom Van Arsdall, Andy Whittington

(call-in) Mark Dykes, Nichelle Harriot, Dudley Hoskins, Rose Kachadoorian, Peg Perreault, Julie Shapiro, Al Summers, Claudio Gratton

Agenda (attached)

Welcome, Introductions, Agenda Review – Mike/Dee

Workgroup members and invited participants introduced themselves.

Review of Meeting Minutes from April 13, 2017 - Dee

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

Report on the Wisconsin MP3 – Claudio Gratton, Dept. of Entomology, University of Wisconsin

The Wisconsin MP3 was developed as a collaborative effort between the State Department of Agriculture and University of Wisconsin to look at conservation approaches and BMPs as they relate to each area of agriculture within the state. The document was to be informative and educational, but not regulatory. It was meant to be the first step in pollinator protection in Wisconsin and to be updated periodically. The plan was released in January 2016. There was no funding for broad outreach, but newspapers and radio were disseminators of the plan to the general public. The plan also appears within the Department of Agriculture's website. In looking at ways to measure the impact of the plan, things like: discussion within the media, the number of hits to the website, grant proposals based on the plan, and pilot projects that are using the plan for guidance are being taken into account. However, these sorts of information are not easy to quantify or relate back to impact of the plan on pollinators.

Question: Are grants being funded to generate baseline information?

Yes, through specialty crop block grants via USDA.

Question: Who keeps track of the data?

A new infrastructure would need to be established to keep track of the data.

Question: Are people looking at/evaluating the plan?

No. There is no evaluation within the plan to look at specific stakeholders and use of BMPs. Development of the plan was a 2-year project with the writing of the plan in year 1 and PR in year 2, but the outreach/PR never happened. There was a public comment phase, release of the plan and news of the plan's release and that is where things were left.

Question: Was there any use of social media?

Some.

Question: Is there any sense of success of the plan as far as protecting pollinators?

Personal opinion, not so much, based on what was already occurring. There seems to be fairly steady interest in pollinator protection overall in Wisconsin.

Question: What about farm sectors and other stakeholders...any changes there?

Just with neonicotinoids. Homeowners are asking questions and planting forage for pollinators. Growers are asking questions about insecticides and how not to effect pollinators.

Question: Has there been any feedback from beekeepers?

Only at the time that the plan was released and from what appeared in the media.

Report from the Metrics Subgroup – Tom Van Arsdall

Subgroup members reviewed the progress of the group to date and the variety of resources that were used to formulate a metric. The proposed point system/rubric/self-assessment metric focuses on the qualitative themes shared across MP3s, such as engaging stakeholders, educational outreach, communication, and development of BMPs. The rubric approach would be a self-assessment by States as opposed to an outcome. The metric should be about what is familiar to the States and as simple as possible. Parts can be weighted for importance, such as with stakeholder involvement. The MP3s should encourage/focus on local stakeholders and not so much Federal involvement. The proposed metric doesn't measure how well States are engaging or communicating to stakeholders, just are they. States get points for taking action. Then there is opportunity to aggregate State scores within the rubric, based on total points, to provide a national level appraisal of pollinator protection efforts. Specific indices for a rubric have not been researched yet. Also, a guidance document will need to be developed. It was suggested that consultation with a Behavioral Economist would be useful, as well.

There is still much clarification that is needed but this approach has merit and encourages expansion and continued involvement within States. We want stakeholders to voice their views within the States. Ideally, the goal would be to engage those that have become or were disinterested. The stakeholders need to take responsibility for making plans work. There is "issue fatigue" and this metric would provide a fresh look at the issue annually.

Discussion from the Check-In with Workgroup Members – Metrics Subgroup facilitated

Dialogue continued from the Subgroup report. In discussing how best to present the proposed metric to the full PPDC, questions were brought up by group members for future consideration:

Does the Workgroup proposal provide information to the EPA on current progress of MP3s?

What resources will EPA or States need to implement our recommended metrics?

Where will the information housed or updated?

After the initial rollout, what is the plan to keep the momentum going?

What is EPA's long term plan for the evaluation of the MP3s?

Multiple pilot programs of the proposed metric may be needed to see that it provides an accurate assessment, particularly for behavioral changes.

Preparation for the Report to PPDC – Caydee Savinelli

The Workgroup prepared a presentation for the PPDC. Don Parker will give the presentation to the full PPDC and request feedback about the Workgroup's proposed metric. It was suggested that we lead in with the proposed metric and here's why (i.e. where we started vs. where we are now).

Wrap-Up – Mike

The focus for feedback from the full PPDC should be on, 'is this proposed metric meeting the charge; that is, are we on the right path?'

Meeting Recap – Dee

PPDC Meeting May 3-4, 2017...Report out on pollinators beginning at 9:30 a.m. EST.

Pollinator Protection Plans Metrics PPDC Workgroup

In-person Meeting 5/2/2017 1:00 – 4:00 pm

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

Adobe connect:

<http://epawebconferencing.acms.com/r1vcpx6rbcp/>

The objective of this meeting is to work through any issues with the proposed point system/rubric that Workgroup members may have concerns with and to prepare a presentation to introduce the metric to the full PPDC for feedback.

Agenda:

Welcome, Introductions, Ground Rules, Agenda Review – Mike/Dee (15 min)

Workgroup members and participants will introduce themselves.

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

Finalize meeting minutes from the April meeting.

Report on the Wisconsin MP3 – Claudio Gratton, Dept. of Entomology, University of Wisconsin (20 min)

Claudio has been involved with the WI plan since its beginning and will discuss the metrics of the WI plan, where the State is with measuring success of the plan and viewpoints.

Report from the Metrics Subgroup – Tom Van Arsdall (20 min)

Tom will present the continued progress of the Subgroup's efforts in developing a framework for a proposed survey and/or point system approach to measuring success of all States' plans.

Discussion from the Check-In with Workgroup Members – Metrics Subgroup (30 min)

Do members support the idea(s) that the Subgroup proposes and that the Workgroup will bring forward to the full PPDC and eventually recommend to the EPA?

Are there sources of dissatisfaction about the proposed idea(s) to be discussed and/or worked through?

BREAK (15 min)

Preparation for the Report to PPDC – Caydee Savinelli (50 min)

Prepare presentation for the PPDC. Does the Workgroup have questions for the PPDC?

Wrap-Up – Mike (15 min)

Meeting Recap – Dee (10 min)

Review any action items.

Next meeting...tentative date June 15, 2017 at 2:00-3:30 EST