

PPDC Pollinator Protection Plan Metrics WG - Meeting Minutes

11/01/2016

Attendees:

(in person) Mike Goodis, Lead; Marietta Echeverria, Co-Lead; Meredith Laws; Tom Moriarty; Dee Colby; Mary Clock-Rust; Stephanie Bins (for Aaron Hobbs); Ray Brinkmeyer; Steve Dwinell; Jim Fredericks; Nichelle Harriot; Dudley Hoskins; Jim Lyons; Caydee Savinelli; Robin Shepard; Tim Tucker; Andy Whittington
(phone) Evan Cole (for Tom Van Arsdall); Michele Colopy; Mark Dykes; Tim Hatten; Jeanette Klopchin; Don Parker; Peg Perreault; Bonnie Rabe; Julie Shapiro; Al Summers

Agenda (attached)

Welcome, Introductions, Agenda Review – Mike Goodis

Workgroup members introduced themselves.

Review of Meeting Minutes from October 12, 2016 - Mike

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

Finalize Ground Rules – Marietta Echeverria

Decision Making was added to the Ground Rules...see #11.

Much discussion was generated over Representation at the Discussion Table (#8) on whether to have open meetings or closed to workgroup members only. There was support for both possibilities. Many members who were agreeable to non-members listening in would like to be able prevent interruptions or participation from outside listeners. It was suggested that, to maximize transparency and at the same time group member participation, we state the Ground Rules at the start of each meeting and limit discussion to those on the meeting roster. Also, adding and adaptive management clause to the rule would allow for adjustments, if needed. Revised Ground Rules (attached) would be provided for workgroup comment.

Formalize Charge and Goals for the Workgroup – Mike

Mike directed the workgroup to come to an agreement for an overall objective of the Workgroup. A draft Charge Statement was provided as a point for discussion and/or agreement (see Strawman: Charge Statement, attached). Discussion included:

- Acknowledgment of the variety of pollinator protection plans and stages of implementation, and the fact that the plans are voluntary.
- For the most part, states' plans are geared toward improving communication between growers and beekeepers. This may be important to keep in mind as the workgroup develops recommendations for EPA to convey to the public that communication is working.
- Is the workgroup developing a narrow set of measures or something very broad? To clarify, each plan has its own set of measures, but the EPA wants to look at overall success of the plans; therefore, there is a different level of granularity.
- Perhaps the Charge needs to include or define the overall objective of the plans. Should there be a distinction between managed pollinators/bees and natural pollinators? While the majority of states have focused the efforts of their plans on managed pollinators, some states and tribes

are including considerations for native species. It was suggested to initially focus on managed pollinators and then expand the scope, if there are metrics in place, for native species.

Break

Presentation from Bonnie Rabe, Chair SFIREG/POM

Bonnie gave an overview of the work SFIREG has done to provide states and tribes with guidance to develop MP3s and for evaluating plan effectiveness. <https://aapco.files.wordpress.com/2015/08/sfireg-mp3-guidance-final.pdf>

In summary:

SFIREG is made up of members from each of the 10 EPA regions. There are two working groups, POM and EQI. Working committees met jointly to discuss MP3 plans and how to show that the plans are effective. After much discussion, the committees developed a document based on managed pollinator protection. The document asserts that plans must be flexible; that the document is not all encompassing and that states need to choose and refine what will work best for them. Some of what the committees agreed upon were behavioral changes and reduction of exposure to pesticides. This document may serve as a starting reference for our Workgroup. Bonnie reiterated that the main thing to recognize is that a document has to be flexible.

Report from Steve Dwinell, Chair of the AAPCO Pollinator Committee

Steve gave a presentation describing the work the American Association of Pesticide Control Officials (AAPCO) Pollinator Committee has conducted on national level metrics for evaluation of MP3s. <https://aapco.files.wordpress.com/2016/02/sfireg-joint-working-committee-performance-measures-for-mp3-meeting-revision-clean-up.pdf>

In summary:

AAPCO is developing recommendations to measure the effectiveness of managed pollinator protection plans. SFIREG and AAPCO are working in parallel. SFIREG consists of state regulators and EPA; the AAPCO pollinator committee interacts with a variety of groups and agencies. AAPCO started this project in 2014. The SFIREG document identifies 5 MP3 Goal areas:

1. Behavioral Changes Which Increase Pollinator Protection – practice changes, communication, collaboration, usage of educational resources, adoption of MP3 risk reduction recommendations.
2. Reducing Exposure of Bees to Pesticides – decrease bee kills due to pesticides, decreased pesticides in pollen analysis
3. Improve/Maintain Pollinator Health – adequate healthy hive populations and honey production
4. Compliance – availability of adequate and effective compliance assistance, label modifications protective to pollinators
5. National Improvement in Pollinator Health – this goal is an overall goal to show collectively the success of implementation of state MP3s.

For each goal, a specific objective was identified, target group(s), measure(s), and potential metrics. The primary focus of their evaluation of effectiveness was the ability of MP3s to change behavior to reduce exposure. They asked what are the best management practices and are people using them? There are best measures impacting behavior from the beekeeper side, grower side, and state side. AAPCO is

tracking MP3 plan status; SFIREG is pulling all the information together and the committee will present the information to the EPA; NASS is conducting surveys. The AAPCO website lists all MP3 plans that are in place (<https://aapco.files.wordpress.com/2016/06/master-mp3-inventory-june-2016-master-update-may-2016.pdf>).

Question for Steve: Is there any concern about the reliability of information that you get from surveys?

Answer: The biggest issue is with bee kills and which kills are related to pesticides. Information varies from state to state. Bee kill reports were not a good measure if plans were working and neither was pesticide usage unless the producer had changed a particular usage due to presence of bees.

Build a framework for a Work Plan - Mike and Marietta

Mike stressed that we want to achieve some progress to report tomorrow and a timeframe going forward, such as leads, subcommittees, etc. Marietta came up with a Strawman (see attached) as thought starters for conversation. To start, are these the right questions and if so how would we prioritize them?

Members brought up the fact that there is quite a bit of work that has already been done pertaining to metrics of MP3, so let's begin by looking at what has been done. Perhaps answer the question of have we reduced acute exposure; even though this may be over simplified in the scheme of things, we need to start with one question/goal and then build on it. Much discussion was generated about sub lethal vs. acute exposure, what we consider to be reliable data and how we define pollinator. It was suggested that as a workgroup we delineate what we are able to measure based on EPA's focus; our purpose is to help EPA determine how to measure the success of pollinator plans. It was asked that the EPA clarify to the group how the information will be used by the Agency.

Mike - The focus of the acute mitigation policy was on managed pollinators. The Agency could have done label restrictions but we wanted states to develop their own solutions. Now we need to know that this path is producing positive results. So, how should the EPA evaluate this policy of relying on plans to improve managed pollinator health by reducing exposure to pesticides, and how do we communicate the overall effectiveness of the plans to the public?

Members suggested that maybe the workgroup should be asking if the objectives of the MP3s are an effective means to increase communication and mitigate acute exposure of managed pollinators to pesticides. Also, that it will be critical to locate expertise to answer this question and to develop a communication strategy for relaying information of value to the public.

Mike - Better communication is the primary component for finding solutions between growers and beekeepers and adjustments to mitigate exposure. Both parties have the mutual benefit of better communication and when needed, that there is a change in behavior by one or both parties.

Discuss Report out for PPDC – Mike

Mike will report that the Workgroup is developing a work plan and charge and possibly mention some points of discussion in our group. He will state the overall objective for this PPDC Workgroup and a possible time frame forward.

Meeting Recap and Ideas for Next Meeting – Mike and Marietta

For December or January, the group could look at a state that has measures in place. We could also learn from experts on measurements.

Marietta will work on revising the charge to include discussion points from today's meeting.

There was discussion for the need for a sub-workgroup to begin developing a framework for a work plan for this coming year to share with the broader group. Many agreed. Ray Brinkmeyer, Caydee Savinelli, Jim Fredericks, Julie Shapiro, Jeanette Klopchin and Mark Dykes volunteered to form the sub-group along with EPA. The subgroup will come up with a draft of the work plan.

There was group agreement on having monthly meetings and then additional meetings for the subgroup to check-in. Mike suggested that we meet in person again at the next PPDC Meeting and whenever possible in person. Marietta mentioned an option for quarterly face to face and then monthly conference calls. This idea was agreeable to many as long as we keep the call-in option available.

FOLLOW UP:

1. **Marietta:** Revise the charge
2. **Subgroup:** Begin developing a work plan for the coming year
3. **Agency:** Choose a meeting time and agenda for next month
4. **Agency:** Circulate proposed agenda for next meeting

Pollinator Protection Plans Metrics PPDC Workgroup

In-person Meeting 11/1/2016 1:00 – 4:00 pm

1-866-299-3188; 703-305-8578

Adobe connect:

<http://epawebconferencing.acms.com/r3s4c32uenh/>

The objective of this meeting is to finalize the ground rules, develop and agree on a written charge statement, and establish a framework for a work plan to guide our activities for the coming year.

Agenda:

Welcome, Introductions, Agenda Review (10 mins)

Workgroup members will introduce themselves

Review of Meeting Minutes from October 13, 2016 (5 min)

Finalize Ground rules (5 min)

The group will come to agreement on ground rules that will guide the way the group interacts going forward. (Marietta)

Formalize Charge and Goals for the Workgroup (20 min)

The group will develop an agreed upon written statement which captures the charge and the goals for the workgroup.

Report from Steve Dwinell, Chair of the AAPCO Pollinator Committee (20 min)

Steve will give a presentation describing the work the American Association of Pesticide Control Officials (AAPCO) Pollinator Committee has conducted on national level metrics for evaluation of MP3s.

Presentation from Bonnie Rabe, Chair SFIREG/POM (20 min)

Bonnie will give an overview of the work SFIREG has done to provide states and tribes with guidance to develop MP3s and for evaluating plan effectiveness.

BREAK (15 mins)

Build a framework for a Work Plan (1 hour)

The group will draft a framework to guide our activities over the next year. The framework could include: identified deliverables from the Workgroup; goals by quarter; development of subgroups; and definition of roles and responsibilities (Mike and Marietta)

Discuss Report out for PPDC (15 mins)

Agree on report our topics to the full PPDC (Mike)

Meeting Recap and Ideas for Next Meeting (10 mins)

Review any action items and ideas for the next meeting. Set a date for the next teleconference. (Mike)

Ground Rules

(Adapted from the Honey Bee Health Coalition Ground Rules)

The following ground rules encourage productive and collaborative deliberation. All workgroup members will agree to follow them and give facilitators authority to enforce them:

1. **GOOD FAITH:** Act in good faith in all aspects of group deliberations with the intent to promote joint problem solving, collaboration, and collective, common-ground solutions addressing goals and specific objectives of the group once defined; **OWNERSHIP:** Take ownership in the outcomes and the success of the workgroup.
2. **OPENNESS:** Be honest and open in sharing your perspectives; be open to other points of view and to the outcome of discussions.
3. **FOCUS:** Maintain focus on the mission and goals of the workgroup as well meeting objectives; honor agendas.
4. **LISTENING:** Listen to each speaker rather than preparing your response; no interruptions; refrain from use of smart phones and other technologies.
5. **PARTICIPATION:** Participate actively, speak briefly, and agree succinctly. Be mindful and respectful of the presence of multiple backgrounds and areas of expertise and avoid the use of acronyms and technical language from your field. Identify yourself before speaking.
6. **RESPECT:** Disagree judiciously and without being disagreeable; do not engage in personal attacks; in all contexts, refrain from behavior that denigrates other participants or is disruptive to the work of the group.
7. **PREPAREDNESS AND COMMITMENT:** Prepare for and attend each session; get up to speed if you missed a meeting. EPA will draft agendas and minutes to post on the PPDC Workgroup website.
8. **REPRESENTATION AT THE DISCUSSION TABLE:** Participation in workgroup meetings is for members of the workgroup. If you are not able to attend as the representative for your member organization or company, you are invited to find a replacement from within your organization. Observers from the public are welcome at workgroup meetings as silent observers. Other members of the public will be informed through the PPDC Workgroup website (agendas and minutes) and will have opportunities to comment during full PPDC meetings. The workgroup has the prerogative to adjust this rule at any time for the purpose of workgroup functionality.
9. **CONFIDENTIALITY, COMMUNICATION AND ATTRIBUTION:** Meeting discussions are off the record and not for attribution. Do not make personal attributions outside of meetings, use discretion when characterizing the workgroup to others.
10. **FACILITATION AND CONFLICT RESOLUTION:** Let the facilitators facilitate; allow them to enforce the ground rules and engage them with any concerns.
11. **DECISION MAKING:** The workgroup will strive for decision making by consensus. Recommendations from the workgroup will be made to the full PPDC. The full PPDC will make recommendations to EPA.

FACA: Workgroups are allowed to form under a FACA advisory group, such as the PPDC. However, any recommendations that come out of the workgroup for the Agency's consideration must go through the full PPDC in order to be considered. Workgroup recommendations cannot go directly from a workgroup to the Agency.

PPDC Pollinator Protection Plans Metrics Workgroup - Strawman

Charge Statement:

The workgroup is charged with developing: 1) recommendations for how to evaluate/measure the effectiveness of pollinator protection plans at the national level; a means to monitor how well pollinator protection plans are doing overall, and 2) a strategy to communicate that effectiveness to the public (defined broadly). The workgroup's goal is to make final recommendations to the full PPDC by fall of 2017.

Background:

President Obama's 2014 Presidential Memorandum creating a federal task force to develop a national strategy to promote the health of honey bees and other pollinators directs the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to engage states and tribes in the development of pollinator protection plans. In the National Strategy document written in response to the President's directive, EPA identified managed pollinator protection plans (MP3) as an effective means of increasing communication between stakeholders and mitigating acute exposures of bees to pesticides.

MP3 Symposium Evaluation Session Summary: <http://honeybeehealthcoalition.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/MP3-Evaluation-Summary.pdf>

SFIREG Guidance for Development and Implementation of MP3s: <https://aapco.files.wordpress.com/2015/08/sfireg-mp3-guidance-final.pdf>

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

Workplan Framework:

Key questions/information needed to develop recommendations based on the charge statement:

What is the overall goal of pollinator protection plans?

How do pollinator plans improve pollinator health?

Is it sufficient to measure behavior changes? What about results (i.e., pollinator health metrics)?

How do other pollinator health stressors factor into the evaluation process (e.g., forage and nutrition, hive management, disease and pests)?

How are other environmental programs measured/evaluated nationally?

Who has expertise/resources in national measurement?

What are the data sources? What are the data gaps?

What is the timeframe for the evaluation? How much time to develop a baseline? Should measures change over time?

What are the criteria that metrics must meet?

Activities/Tasks/Subgroups:

Timeline/Deliverables/Outputs:

Q1 – Report out to full PPDC (November 2017)

Q2 – Report out to full PPDC

Q3 –

Q4 – Final recommendations to full PPDC

Schedule for meetings:

Regularly scheduled calls/webinars

Ad Hoc Subgroups

DRAFT