PPDC Pollinator Protection Plan Metrics WG - Meeting Minutes

10/31/2017

Attendees:
(in person) Mike Goodis, Lead, Meredith Laws, Tom Steeger, Mary Clock-Rust, Dee Colby, Stephanie Binns (for Aaron Hobbs), Ray Brinkmeyer, Caydee Savinelli, Tom Van Arsdall, Andy Whittington, Liza Fleeson-Trossbach (invited guest);
(call-in) Michele Colopy, David Epstein, Rose Kachadoorian, Peg Perrault, Julie Shapiro, Robin Shepard, Al Summers

Agenda (attached)

Welcome, Introductions, Agenda Review – Mike Goodis/Dee Colby

Mike Goodis (EPA) welcomed everyone. He focused the group's attention on pulling together the final recommendation to the full PPDC by promoting the merits of the proposed metric and bringing the new PPDC members up to speed with MP3s and the Workgroup's charge.

Review of Meeting Minutes from September 11, 2017 – Dee Colby

Meeting minutes were finalized from the October 11 meeting and will be posted on the PPDC website.

Report on progress of tribal plans – Mary Clock-Rust

Mary provided an update on the progress of the Tribal Pesticide Program Council (TPPC) Pollinator Protection Workgroup. There are approximately 20 tribes that regularly participate in the Workgroup out of the 180 listed tribes in TPPC, though the Workgroup is open to any tribe that wants to participate. They meet monthly for teleconferences, most of the time with guest speakers that address relevant issues. Tribal interests for pollinator plans include protection of native pollinators and plants, medicinal plants and diversity of life in general. Challenges to the Workgroup include a lack of time and conflicting priorities for participation. However, there has been positive progress over the past year with several tribes making strides to develop tribal pollinator plans as well as involvement in a native bee identification course at the USDA facility in Logan, UT. It is best to check with EPA Regional Offices for inquiries about tribal plans and progress, but sometimes it can be difficult to get feedback from the tribes.

Mike pointed out that Agency Directives and the Workgroup's charge is to include tribes. Our Workgroup tribal representative has had limited participation and there were no tribal pollinator plans to include when developing the proposed metric; however, the Workgroup should point out that the proposed metric is flexible to be inclusive of all state and tribal plans to provide a national perspective of their success.

Preparation for the presentation to PPDC – Andy Whittington/Rose Kachadoorian

Mike's introduction will include background for the new PPDC members, from the Executive Order up to formation of the PPDC Pollinator Protection Plans Metrics Workgroup.

Andy and Rose went through each slide of the presentation (attached). Meeting participants provided editorial comments as the presentation was revised. It was asked if the full PPDC would be recommending the concept of the proposed metric or the actual questions to the EPA. The Workgroup agreed that it is best to focus on the concept of a national survey/questionnaire. They would remove the survey questions from the presentation and include a sample question if needed for reference.

It is important to point out during the final slide that the Workgroup feels that they have met the charge. The Workgroup has worked with states to develop a survey to monitor success of state MP3 plans on a national-level.

Evaluation Questionnaire – Workgroup
Survey questions were removed from the presentation.

Wrap Up/Recap – Mike Goodis/Dee Colby
Andy Whittington and Rose Kachadoorian will present to the full PPDC for the Workgroup at 10:30 a.m. – 11:45 a.m. EST on November 1, here in Arlington. A call-in option is available for this meeting…check the PPDC website for details.

The presentation will be emailed to all Workgroup members. In addition, a hard copy will be distributed to the full PPDC (excluding the survey questions) for reference. Rose will join the call at the start of the meeting to ensure she has a telephone connection and will unmute her line for her portion of the presentation.

[Note: the presentation to the Pesticide Program Dialogue Committee and Committee comments can be found at https://www.epa.gov/pesticide-advisory-committees-and-regulatory-partners/pesticide-program-dialogue-committee-ppdc, in the November 1, 2017 Meeting Transcript, pages 30-75.]

PPDC Pollinator Protection Plans Metrics Workgroup

Call-In Meeting 10/31/2017 1:00-4:00 pm EST
1-866-299-3188; 703-347-8657
Adobe connect:
http://epawebconferencing.acms.com/r5hsr39ndu0/

The objective of this meeting is to review the Workgroup's presentation of the proposed metric (i.e. questionnaire) for recommendation to the full PPDC on November 1, 2017.

Agenda:

Welcome, Introductions, Agenda Review – Mike/Dee (20 min)
Workgroup members and invited participants will introduce themselves. Mike will discuss the format for presenting to the full PPDC, and the procedure for the full PPDC to formally recommend the proposed metric (i.e. questionnaire) to the EPA.

Review of Meeting Minutes from September 11, 2017 - Dee (5 min)
Finalize meeting minutes from the October 11th meeting.

Report on progress of tribes – Mary Clock-Rust (15 min)
Mary will provide an update on the progress of the Tribal Pesticide Program Council (TPPC) Pollinator Protection Workgroup.

Preparation for the presentation to PPDC – Andy Whittington/Rose Kachadoorian (50 min)
Workgroup members will provide final editing remarks/revisions to the presentation that Andy and Rose will give to the full PPDC.

BREAK (15 min)

Evaluation Questionnaire – Workgroup (50 min)
Workgroup members will finalize the proposed metric, including wording of questions and assessment of the survey responses.

Wrap Up – Mike (20 min)
Andy Whittington and Rose Kachadoorian will present to the full PPDC for the Workgroup at 10:30 a.m. – 11:45 a.m. EST on November 1, here in Arlington. A call-in option is available for this meeting…check the PPDC website for details.

Meeting Recap – Dee (5 min)

Recommendations from the Pollinator Protection Plan Metrics Workgroup

November 1, 2017

MP3 Metrics PPDC Workgroup Summary

- Workgroup Charge and Member Representatives
- Process – Evaluation of MP3s
  - Problem Definition
  - MP3 Review
  - National Level Metrics Guidance
  - Implementation
- Feedback from PPDC
- Backup Slides
  - Survey Questions

Workgroup Charge

- The expectation for the workgroup was to develop:
  - 1) Recommendations for EPA to use in evaluating the effectiveness of pollinator protection plans at a national level; a means to monitor how well they are doing overall
  - 2) A strategy to communicate that effectiveness to the public. We will refer to ‘public’ in a broad definition.
  - The Agency views the outcomes of this work as a long term effort to look at trends versus a specific target.
- The WG commenced in November 2016 to report a proposal to the PPDC by November 2017.

Workgroup Member Representatives

- There are 24 members on the workgroup representing a wide range of stakeholders including: beekeepers, growers, States, tribes, industry, NGOs and consultants.
- American Beekeeping Federation, Apiary Inspectors of America, Beyond Pesticides, Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, CO Professional Beekeepers Association, CollaborateUP, Coy Bee Company, DOW AgroSciences, EPA Region 8, Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services, Keystone Policy Center, Mississippi Farm Bureau, NASDA, National Cotton Council, North Central Cooperative Extension Association, NPMA, Oregon Department of Agriculture, Pollinator Partnership, Pollinator Stewardship Council, Inc., Responsible Industry for a Sound Environment (RISE), Syngenta, University of Idaho and Invertebrate Ecology Inc., USDA, USGS Patuxent Wildlife Research Center

Process - Evaluation of State & Tribal MP3s

Problem Definition of Plans

- States & Tribal Nations – Working with stakeholders to promote pollinator health.
- Plans: Reduce exposure of bees to pesticides & develop local mitigation measures.
- EPA to develop metrics for evaluating the efficacy of these plans on a national basis.

MP3 Review

- What is the scope of each MP3?
- What are the areas of commonality across MP3s for national-level metrics?
- Do the MP3s identify metrics for evaluating success?

National-Level Metrics Guidance

- Identify metrics that can be used for a national-level evaluation of MP3s.
- Identify specific metrics to recommend to the PPDC.
- Identify processes for gathering information for national-level evaluation.

Implementation

- Identify process for providing states/tribes feedback on metric process.
- Develop strategy to communicate national-level metrics to the broader public.
- Identify possible time line for evaluating metrics.

MP3 Review

MP3 Review Summary

- **All available MP3 plans were reviewed**
- **Common Themes Identified**
  - Focus on enhancing communication between stakeholders
  - Focus on enhancing education & knowledge
    - Pollinators, Pesticide Stewardship, Pollinator Forage & Habitat
  - Best management practices
- **Differences**
  - Recognized great diversity among plans
  - Recognized differences in local stakeholders
- **Other Themes**
  - Some MP3 are very comprehensive, some focus more on beekeepers and pesticide applicators/users
  - State plans are voluntary and rely heavily on local cooperation between and across stakeholders

National-Level Metrics Guidance

- Developed a 5 Step process for national metrics
- Steps 1 to 4 – Presented today
- Step 5 – Take place post survey

National-Level Metrics Guidance

Step 1: Considerations

Step 2: Assessment Categories

Step 3: State MP3 Survey

Step 4: Survey Assessment

Step 5: Data Collection & Results

National-Level Metrics Guidance
Step 1: Considerations

- Need to have a mechanism to evaluate effectiveness of MP3s at a national level.
- Need to have comparable measures across states.
- Assessments will be at a national level and not compared between states.
- Survey tool will be used and there is a need to have a group to conduct the survey and collect results.
- Communicate effectiveness of the plans to the “public”

Step 2: Assessment Categories

- These categories were common across majority of MP3s
  - Communication
  - Best Management Practices or Standard Operating Procedures
  - Stakeholders
  - Education
  - Progress Measures or Behavior Changes

Survey Review

Step 3 – State MP3 Survey

- Worked with State Lead Agencies (SLA) on development of survey. This survey can be modified for use by tribes and territories.
- EPA will receive information on which states completed the survey and the responses will be transparent

Step 3 – State MP3 Survey Questions Summary

- **Communication**
  - Methods to increase communication between pesticide users and beekeepers
- **Best Management Practices or Standard Operating Procedures**
  - Developed to reduce pollinator exposure to pesticides.
  - List of BMPs and SOPs – i.e. – Communication, Pesticide Risk, Crop Producers, Beekeepers, Pollinator Forage & Habitat

Step 3 – State MP3 Survey Questions Summary

- **Education**
  - Coordination with other agencies, extension, NGOs, etc.
  - Outreach on honey bee exposure to pesticides, proper crop & pest product selection and pesticide label comprehension
  - Methods used for outreach, i.e. – Websites, Educational Materials etc.
- **Stakeholders**
  - Groups reached – Agricultural and Non-agricultural
  - Yearly stakeholder meeting

Step 3 – State MP3 Survey Questions Summary

- **Progress Measures or Behavior Changes**
  - Reduction on pesticide related verified bee kills
  - Measure of direct pesticide exposure to bees – collecting data in pollen or other substrate
  - Methods to assess pesticide exposure, increase communication or educational efforts
  - List of measures states are using to actively track success
    - Examples – National honey bee surveys, state surveys, increased adoption of BMPs, increase in communication and education on pesticide exposure
  - Funding for the listed measures

Step 4 – Survey Assessments

- Background Information – State MP3s
  - Each state had flexibility in developing MP3s & are very diverse
  - Aggregate assessment of the success of MP3s is an attempt to normalize the plans diversity and present information to the public.
- States will not be assessed on the individual surveys
- States responses will be transparent
- Survey tool will be utilized by state lead agencies
- Assessment Measures of Questions
  - Total percentage of tallied responses

Step 4 – Survey Assessment

- Assessment System
  - Based on total number of responses for each question
  - Based on percent of total of responses for each question
    - Mechanism to capture current and future effectiveness
  - Comments and Examples – Summarized and tagged
  - Example of Assessment Sheet

Category	Question Responses Yes, No etc.	Score: (Number) % of Total	Comments Tagged Phrases
Communication	**1a.** ◊ Yes ◊ No	**1a.** (#), % (#), %	
Communication	**1b.** ◊ SOPs or BMPs ◊ Online Mappling ◊ Flags ◊ Meetings ◊ Website ◊ Other_____	**1b.** (#), % (#), % (#), % (#), % (#), % (#), %	

Step 5 – Data Collection & Results Proposal

- AAPCO is offering to utilize SFIREG to facilitate the distribution and return of the survey.
- SFIREG to electronically distribute the survey (via Survey Monkey) to the 10 Regional SFIREG Representatives.
- The Regional Representatives would in turn work with the States in their respective regions to complete the survey.
- AAPCO will assist with data collection.
- Survey results would then be forwarded to EPA.

Conclusion

- The Charge to the Workgroup was to develop:
  - 1) Recommendations for EPA to use in evaluating the effectiveness of pollinator protection plans at a national level; a means to monitor how well they are doing overall.
  - 2) A strategy to communicate that effectiveness to the public.
- Workgroup Summary
  - Utilize existing mechanisms for development of a survey, data collection and results sharing with the EPA.
  - Survey and data collection will be an ongoing process.
  - EPA has an existing structure to communicate results.
  - Collaboration between EPA and Co-regulators

Feedback from PPDC

Thank You