

MEASURING SUCCESS NATIONALLY

STATE POLLINATOR PROTECTION PLANS

Full SFIREG Meeting
December 3 & 4, 2018

HOW DID WE GET TO



HERE?

- The Impetus - State Managed Pollinator Protection Plans
- Current Status of Plans
- Measuring Plan Success
- Looking Ahead

RESPONSE TO POLLINATOR ISSUES

- In June of 2014, a Presidential Memorandum was issued which directed a federal Interagency Task Force to create a “*Strategy to Promote the Health of Honey Bees and Other Pollinators.*”
 - Co-Chaired by the United States Department of Agriculture and Environmental Protection Agency
 - Directed federal agencies and departments to undertake agency-specific actions to reverse pollinator losses and to help restore pollinator populations (i.e.: Defense; Education; Energy; Housing and Urban Development; Interior; State; Transportation.
- Among other things, the memo specifically directed the EPA to **engage state lead agencies for pesticide regulation in developing state managed pollinator protection plans as a means of mitigating the risk of pesticides** to honey bees and other managed pollinators.
- As a result of the Presidential Directive, the “*National Strategy to Promote the Health of Honey Bees and other Pollinators*” was released on May 19, 2015.

“FINAL GUIDANCE FOR STATE LEAD AGENCIES FOR THE DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF MANAGED POLLINATOR PROTECTION PLANS”

- State FIFRA Issues, Research, and Evaluation Group, in consultation with EPA, provided guidance to State Lead Agencies (June 2015)
 - Critical Elements of a Successful State Managed Pollinator Protection Plan
 - Optional/Recommended Elements of State Managed Pollinator Protection Plans
 - Select Resources including State Pollinator Protection Plans

“POTENTIAL MEASURES FOR STATE MANAGED POLLINATOR PROTECTION PLANS”

- State FIFRA Issues, Research, and Evaluation Group provided guidance to State Lead Agencies (December 2015)
 - Measures are Meant to be Flexible and Based on Individual State Pollinator Protection Plans or Activities
 - Measures may be Qualitative, Quantitative or a Combination of Both
 - Includes Goal Areas each with one or more Specific Objectives

STATUS OF STATE PLANS*

- Inventory all 50 States
- 44 or 88% of States have or intend to have a Plan
 - Various stages of development
- 23 or 52% of State Plans have been completed
 - 4 or 17% of completed Plans undergoing additional amendments at time of inventory

**AAPCO MP3 Inventory (January 2018)*

**- EPA'S DILEMMA -
MEASURING SUCCESS OF
SIMILAR BUT DIVERSE PLANS**



EPA'S PESTICIDE PROGRAM DIALOGUE COMMITTEE -METRICS WORK GROUP-

CHARGE

- Providing recommendations to EPA to use in evaluating the effectiveness of pollinator protection plans at a national level; and
- Developing a strategy to communicate that effectiveness to the public.

DETAILS

- One year term (October 2016 – October 2017)
- Goal - final recommendations to the full PPDC by fall of 2017
- Recommendation was presented and accepted by the full PPDC (November 2017)

PROPOSAL

- Utilizes Survey Instrument
- Outputs & Outcomes
- Aggregate Assessment
- Provides Flexibility
- Reviewed by AAPCO/SFIREG

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

- Questions focus on:
 - Critical plan elements (reference *Guidance for State Lead Agencies for the Development and Implementation of Managed Pollinator Protection Plans [SFIREG, June 2015]*)
 - Other questions to gather information on state specific components that reflect the uniqueness of the state
- Utilize AAPCO SFIREG to facilitate the distribution of the survey instrument
- Forward the data to EPA
- Communication of results by EPA through established mechanisms, for example,
 - Regional Offices
 - Associations
 - Other

LOOKING AHEAD

- Survey
 - Presented to Full SFIREG for comments and suggested revisions (June 2018)
 - Final survey will be forwarded to EPA (end of year) for consideration and finalization
- Distribution
 - Timing – Fall/Early Winter
 - Frequency - Annually

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

www.aapco.org

**Pollinator Protection
SFIREG**

<https://www.epa.gov/pesticides>

**Pollinator Protection
Pesticide Program Dialogue Committee**