

WISCONSIN POLLINATOR PROTECTION PLAN STAKEHOLDER MEETING

November 24th, 2015

UW Arlington Agricultural Research Station N695 Hopkins Rd, Arlington, WI

Stakeholders Present

Representative	Organization
Doug Hauke	Commercial beekeeper
John Manske	Cooperative Network
Amy Winters	CropLife America
Dan Hopkins	Environmental Protection Agency-Region 5
John Exo	Facilitator (UW Extension)
Thomas Green	IPM Institute
Erin Holmes	Pheasants Forever
David Flakne	Syngenta Crop Protection LLC
Kurt Waterstradt	US Fish and Wildlife Service
Steve Bertjens	USDA-Natural Resources Conservation Services
Christina Locke	UW-Madison
Mike Dummer	WI Agribusiness Association
Sara Ecker	WI Apple Growers Association
Liz Meils	WI Dept. of Agriculture
Mike Murray	WI Dept. of Agriculture
Jay Watson	WI Dept. of Natural Resources
Rich Henderson	WI Dept. of Natural Resources
Christa Wollenzien	WI Dept. of Transportation
Karen Gefvert	WI Farm Bureau
Brian Swingle	WI Green Industry Federation
Edward Knapton	WI Green Industry Federation
Dan Ziehli	WI Honey Producers Association
Mike Werner	WI Pest Control Association
Andy Wallendal	WI Potato and Vegetable Growers Association
Tom Lochner	WI State Cranberry Growers Association
Thelma Heidel-Baker	Xerces Society-Midwest region

Welcome and Overview

This is the third and final stakeholder meeting before the Wisconsin Pollinator Plan is released for public review in January. We began the meeting with updates since the last meeting on September 30th:

- The first draft of the plan has been created and sent to all stakeholders for review. Roughly one third of the stakeholder group has given written feedback about the draft

plan content. We will also collect feedback at today's meeting and moving forward through the public comment period. While the plan will be hosted by DATCP, it's a collaborative effort and we hope all stakeholders feel ownership of this process and the plan.

- Mike, Liz and Christina have had several speaking engagements related to the plan.
- On November 18th Mike and Liz presented an outline of the plan to the DATCP Board, along with some background on pollinator protection at the national and state levels. They discussed the plan development process including stakeholder meetings and the upcoming public comment period. Questions from the Board included how to measure effectiveness and concerns over plan recommendations becoming regulatory (concerns echoed in our stakeholder meetings). The slideshow presented to the DATCP Board can be viewed [here](#).
- Christina was able to attend a Monarch workshop in October. There is an effort across state DNRs to hold stakeholder meetings and produce habitat plans for monarch butterflies. How these may overlap with or be contained within state pollinator plans is an open question.

The group did brief introductions, with more time devoted to new stakeholders who were not present at the previous meetings. The group was asked if any major items were missed or misrepresented in the notes from meeting #2, which were shared among the group and are posted publicly on the [DATCP Pollinator Protection web page](#).

Comments on Draft Plan

In addition to written feedback submitted via email, the group was given the opportunity to give feedback on the draft plan at this meeting. Overall and BMP-specific comments and suggestions from the group included:

- Overall the group saw no major roadblocks to adopting the plan.
 - Easy, enjoyable to read – good style. Making it look good is the key to selling the document
 - Missing: who does what and planning in the future. It was noted that these items will be discussed later during today's meeting, and will tentatively be covered in Appendix A. Be aware of measuring effectiveness and regulatory creep
 - More distinction needed between managed and wild pollinators
 - Need better definition of terms: flower parts (diagram would be helpful), "forbs", pollen, nectar, and beekeeping terms
 - Replace "pesticide use" with "stressors" in overall goal. Stressors include pesticides, parasites, pathogens, etc.
 - BMPs are too detailed – provide references rather than explain in this document. Short one page or less handouts for specific target audiences thought to be useful. When read alone the BMP sections of the plan may be short enough
 - Highlight economic benefits – maybe pull out into separate section
 - Like detail and distinction for land users/managers

- Be careful about broad geographic scope resources/references – some MN specific resources for plant materials-. Pollinator STRIPS are regionally specific to Iowa. The plan needs to be Wisconsin specific.
- BMPs: Pollinator Health
 - Bee health issues related to overworking stress is lacking
 - Distinguishing between commercial and hobbyist BMPs would be useful
 - Several BMPs (not specified) are not fully supported by cranberry producers
 - Tank mixes: need resource for which specific mixes have synergy. Tank mixes are used for timely applications so less toxic chemicals can be used at effective times.
 - Commercial bumble bee hives are not recommended for apple production; this is to reduce disease transmission to native bees
 - Mention Import Report requirement for hives entering WI, refer to your city ordinances for local beekeeping regulations
- BMPs: Garden/Home
 - Broaden to include property managers and green industry overall
 - Expand illustrations – migratory map for monarch butterflies
 - Add the “Compensating for milkweed loss” box to this section
 - Native vs non native plants – emphasize appropriate plants for specific settings more so than native vs non native
 - Brief information about what people allergic to bee stings can do should be added.

Measuring Effectiveness of the Plan

Plans can be used to outline strategies to achieve goals. Though it is often difficult to measure progress towards goals, especially when the plan is voluntary, it is a useful exercise to think of ways to collectively measure progress. The purpose of this activity was to brainstorm, alone and then as a group, metrics and methods that could be used to measure plan effectiveness. The stakeholders recognized that some metrics will be easier to obtain, while others may fall outside the normal job duties of any one organization. Ideas and questions the group came up with:

- Behavioral surveys – pre/post, plan use (Pete Nowak; measuring behavioral change)
- Track website hits and calls to DATCP regarding plan
- Managed bee monitoring:
 - Hive health checklist via statewide
 - BeeInformed surveys for colony loss – also develop metrics for pollination success?
 - Can the NASS survey on managed bees/honey production be expanded?
- Sampling for wild bees – collaborative effort
- Number of entities (agencies, residents) and programs (CRP, etc.) using plan recommendations

- Any measurement should consider regional variation – north vs. south Wisconsin
- To determine if BMPs work (cause and effect) we need research
- How to disseminate plan and track change over time?
- Centralize information collected by individual groups in one place
- How do we know we have a problem and what the causes are?
- Will increasing habitat “solve” the problem?
- What is the most valuable success outcome of the plan? (# of bees? # of people reached?)

Who should measure effectiveness and how?

- Give out survey when plan is given out (on web or paper)
- What annual metric could we collect at the Fruit and Veg Growers Conference
- Staff time and resources needed
- Shortcomings of using state apiary inspection are recognized – no requirement to inspect or register hives in WI
- CRP acres and land enrolled in other programs
- DOT could monitor
- Long-term research for native pollinators
- WI doesn't have a Bee Informed Tech Team – started by Project Apis m. – grant funded
- Other states (e.g. TX, FL) have beekeeper-funded apiary programs
- Bee Informed surveys skewed towards small operations, because that is who responds to the surveys.

Future Updates to Plan

A common theme throughout our stakeholder process has been the question of how to keep the plan current into the future. A discussion around future plan updates produced these thoughts and suggestions:

- Annually, ask stakeholder group for updates/comments/discussion – online or in person (meeting should be held during the off-season)
- In addition to annual meeting, check in as needed for one-time issues (e.g., if the monarch butterfly or rusty-patched bumble bee is listed as an endangered species)
- Make updates as new science emerges – especially if it conflicts with what's written in the plan
- Add success stories of pollinator protection in WI
- For the first year, tally public comments and feedback, keep it a working document. After a year, ask stakeholder group if they'd like to reconvene.
- Collect feedback from other states with plans
- Potential to develop group-specific BMPs and share with stakeholders

Next steps

- Summary from this meeting will be sent to stakeholders and posted on DATCP website
- Edits provided by stakeholders will be incorporated into the next plan draft
- Draft will go to a graphic designer before going out for public review. If stakeholders want their edits incorporated in the version going out for public review, we need their edits by December 4th. Otherwise they can continue to provide comments and edits through the public review period.
- Public comment period will tentatively start around January 11th and last for two weeks. Stakeholders should disseminate the plan to their associates.
- After public comments are addressed, plan will be posted on DATCP website, and other methods of dissemination will be considered.