



State Pollinator Protection Plans (MP3s) - Update on Metrics

November 15, 2017

Presidential Directive to Improve Pollinator Health - Background

- ▶ On June 20, 2014, President Obama issued a memorandum calling on Federal agencies to increase and coordinate their efforts to improve bee health by developing an integrated strategy
- ▶ EPA committed to, among other things:
 - ▶ Restrict the use of products toxic to bees in crops with commercial pollination
 - ▶ Engage State and tribal partners in the development of managed pollinator protection plans

IN Pollinator Protection Plan

- ▶ Indiana plan developed in 2015
- ▶ Indiana plan approved by Board in 2016



Recommendations from the Pollinator Protection Plan Metrics Workgroup

November 1, 2017

Formation of EPA PPDC Work Group - Background

- PPDC (Pesticide Program Dialogue Committee) is a broadly representative federal advisory committee that meets with EPA biannually to discuss pesticide regulatory, policy and program implementation issues
- The WG commenced in November 2016 to report a proposal to the PPDC by November 2017.

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.

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

MP3 Metrics PPDC Workgroup Summary

- ▶ Workgroup Charge and Member Representatives
- ▶ Process - Evaluation of MP3s
 - ▶ Problem Definition
 - ▶ MP3 Review of Current plans
 - ▶ National Level Metrics Guidance
 - ▶ Implementation
- ▶ Feedback from PPDC

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

Step 1: Considerations



Step 2: Assessment Categories



Step 3: Develop 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

Step 3 - State MP3 Survey

- ▶ Worked with State Lead Agencies (SLA) on development of survey using “Assessment Categories” as basis of survey questions (SFIREG - State FIFRA Issues Research and Evaluation Group and AAPCO - Association of American Pesticide Control Officials)
- ▶ 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 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 Mapping ◊ 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