

DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TASK 1: OUTREACH AND EDUCATION

POLICY OBJECTIVES

- Improve Understanding of Pollinator Health Issues1
- Increase Reporting of Bee Incidents.....1

TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS

- Bee Incident Reporting.....1
- Pollinator Health Communication and Education Plan1

TASK 2: PESTICIDE REGULATION

POLICY OBJECTIVES

- Improve Pesticide Use Labels3
- Prevent Bee Die-Off Incidents Resulting From Pesticide Applications3

TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS

- Pesticide Labels3
- Specific Pesticide Use Restrictions4
- Penalties/Enforcement.....5
- Best Management Practices/Pesticide Use.....5

TASK 3: LICENSING AND TRAINING OF PESTICIDE APPLICATORS

POLICY OBJECTIVES

- Enhance Applicator Training on Pollinator Health6
- Improve Knowledge of Retail Sales Staff Selling General Use Pesticides6
- Improve Knowledge of Homeowners Applying General Use Pesticides6

TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS

- Applicator Training6
- Licensing7
- Point of Purchase Pesticide Use Education7
- Pesticide Use Reporting8

TASK 4: BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

POLICY OBJECTIVES

- Develop Best Management Practices to Improve Pollinator Habitat9

TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS

- State Pollinator Plan9
- Best Management Practices.....9
- State-Owned Lands10
- Locally-Owned and Private Lands11

DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

TASK 5: RESEARCH NEEDS

POLICY OBJECTIVES

- Address Pollinator Health Research Needs12

TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS

- Pollinator Health.....12
- Aviary Counts/Registration13
- Research on Effect of Pesticides on Pollinators13

TASK 6: FUNDING

POLICY OBJECTIVES

- Fund Recommended Actions to Improve Pollinator Health15

TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS

- Revenue Sources15
- Use of Revenue.....16

MISCELLANEOUS TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS17

DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

TASK 1: OUTREACH AND EDUCATION

POLICY OBJECTIVES:

- Improve Understanding of Pollinator Health Issues

Pollinator health information should be easily accessible to both the general public and pesticide applicators to better understand how to improve pollinator health, including enhancement of habitat and prevention of pesticide exposures. The goal is to reach a wider audience with the information that is already available.

- Identified Barriers to Progress:
 - ~ Oregon has not identified an overall strategy for addressing pollinator health issues.
 - ~ There is a lack of known, effective communication pathways to reach household pesticide users
 - ~ Federal restrictions on adding information to pesticide products.
 - ~ A lack of data on who uses pesticides, the pesticides used and the volume of pesticides used in order to effectively reach target audiences with appropriate information.
 - ~ Funding

- Increase Reporting of Bee Incidents

Currently, bee keepers may be reluctant to report bee die offs due to concerns over slow response from regulatory agencies, potential penalties for related activities (ex., off-label use of products by hive owner to address hive viability issue for which no product has been developed), and landowner reluctance to allow government agency staff onto property.

- Identified Barriers to Progress:
 - ~ Disincentives to reporting
 - ~ Lack of understanding about how to report incidents

TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Bee Incident Reporting

- (George Hansen) ODA should develop a document clearly explaining how bee-related incidents may be reported. The document should be easy to find on the ODA web page and also widely shared with the public and industry. Encourage re-posting of this information on other websites.

2. Pollinator Health Communication and Education Plan

- ODA should work with OSU to develop a pollinator health communication plan and to prepare public education information on pollinator health for use by others such

DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

as retailers and (Aimee Code) farmers and (Jeff Stone) the Oregon Association of Nurseries.

- (Jeff Stone) Outsource private communication firm to establish PSA, paid outreach plan over a two year period.
 - (Rich Little) A statewide coordinated educational outreach program for the public on “Pollinators Health and Protection” using the educational system OSU has in place through the extension office. Handouts and flyers jointly develop by OSU, ODA and Oregon Nursery Association. Dissemination methods: Coordinated use of many media sources: newspapers, community publications (High Point, Senior & Bloomers, & others) OSU extension Service groups and their newsletter etc. (example Master Gardeners, 4-H) Gardening groups such as OSFGC-Oregon State Federation of Garden Clubs. Community Gardens, schools gardens, Nursery through the Oregon Nursery Association. The idea is for the public to see the same message about pollinators in many places.
 - (George Hansen) Recommend that ODA hire a specialist in Pollinator Health Outreach and Education. This position would develop educational and training materials for the public and assist industry organizations with their pollinator protection education programs.
 - (Christy Splitt) Consider whether education-related recommendations should all include both ODA and OSU Extension. (Aimee Code) If communication plan is more than pesticides, ODA and OSU may not be the correct groups.
3. Funding should be provided to more widely distribute, regularly update and create mobile applications of the OSU publication “How to Reduce Bee Poisonings from Pesticides.”
 4. (Jeff Stone) Use existing state agencies, associations, environmental organizations and related fields to distribute changes in labeling, education materials by the state and federal governments and industry specific issues.
 5. (Jeff Stone) Examine the noxious weed program outreach mechanisms.

DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

TASK 2: PESTICIDE REGULATION

POLICY OBJECTIVES:

- Improve Pesticide Use Labels

Pesticide labels provide directions to users but are often complicated and difficult to read. At times, the addition of information on pollinator health has led to conflicting directions on a label.

- Identified Barriers to Progress:
 - ~ Label language is currently developed by the US Environmental Protection Agency. Oregon may require additional information on products but this has been done infrequently and requires a rulemaking process.
 - ~ Label language frequently does not adequately convey risk (i.e., risk = toxicity + exposure).
- Prevent Bee Die-Off Incidents Resulting From Pesticide Applications

There have been seven reported bee die-off incidents in Oregon since June 2013 that resulted from the use of neonicotinoids on Linden trees.

- Identified Barriers to Progress:
 - ~ Lack of knowledge about the effects of systemic pesticides on certain plant species.
 - ~ Pesticide products without the new label restrictions required by ODA in 2013 were still available for purchase in 2014.
 - ~ Pesticide applicators do not always read a pesticide product label to see if there have been changes since they last applied a product.
 - ~ (Aimee Code) Native bees cannot be removed from a treatment site as managed bees can.

TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Pesticide Labels

- ODA should continue to work with EPA to improve pesticide use labels and should advocate for prominent, easy-to-understand label information on the use of a pesticide product to protect pollinator health.
- ODA should continue to encourage EPA to develop a system to convey risk on pesticide labels.
- (Aimee Code) To expand upon and standardize the commitment of many retailers including Home Depot, Oregon should enact a law requiring labeling of plants for sale that have been treated with neonicotinoids. OR

DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

- (Aimee Code) Similar to Minnesota’s new law, Oregon should enact a law to prohibit the labeling of plants and plant materials that are treated with bee-lethal pesticides as “pollinator friendly” if there is still a detectable level of the pesticide in or on the plant. (Scott Dahlman) The fact that a plant was treated with neonicotinoids at any time while being grown is not necessarily useful information, and may not result in a plant that poses any unreasonable risk to pollinators. (Betsy Earls) The fact that a plant has been treated with neonics doesn’t mean that it is automatically lethal to bees—lethality is entirely dependent on the method of treatment, how long ago the plant was treated, and how much of the pesticide was used to treat it. Depending on these factors, a pesticide may only be present in the stems, leaves and petals, where it does not impact pollinators. Thus, a blanket requirement that any plant treated with a neonic be labeled is unnecessarily broad and will be difficult to enforce.
- (Aimee Code) ODA should adopt application rates for neonicotinoids for backyard use that are equivalent to agricultural use rates. (Scott Dahlman) ODA should not be in the business of changing label rates as they don’t have adequate resources to truly evaluate. Could support ODA making recommendations to EPA about label rate changes if a specific concern exists. (Betsy Earls) Again, the fact that a plant has been treated doesn’t automatically mean that it is lethal to bees by the time it reaches the consumer. Additionally, prohibiting the use of the term “pollinator friendly” will have no practical effect on whether bees actually forage the plant in question once it is purchased and planted.
- (Aimee Code) ODA should help create guidance materials for applicators to better explain label requirements.
- (Jeff Stone) EPA labeling to include more symbols to aid bilingual language challenges.

2. Specific Pesticide Use Restrictions

- (Aimee Code) The 2013 ODA decision requiring that the use of existing stocks of imidacloprid and dinotefuran products with old labels must follow new label requirements regarding Linden trees should be continued.
- ODA should expand the ban on the use of certain neonicotinoids on Linden trees to include two additional neonicotinoids (clothianidin and thiamethoxam).
- (Aimee Code) Extend ODA’s current ban on the use of dinotefuran and imidacloprid on Linden trees to application on other key non-crop pollinator host and forage plants.
- (George Hansen) Direct ODA to create and publish a list of pesticides requiring classification as “Restricted Use” as defined in current statute: ORS 634.006 (21) “Restricted-use pesticide” means any pesticide or device which the department has found and determined to be so injurious or detrimental to persons, pollinating insects, bees, animals, crops, wildlife, land or environment, other than the pests it is intended to prevent, destroy, control or mitigate, that additional restrictions are required.
- (Christy Splitt) Prohibit neonicotinoid use on state lands.

DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

- (Christy Splitt) Direct the State IPM task force to review use of neonicotinoids on state lands and seek alternate solutions.

3. Penalties/Enforcement

- (George Hansen) Recommend that penalties for confirmed applications of pesticides contrary to label instructions or without a required license should include covering the cost of mitigation of continued damage for the period of residual toxicity, and repairing damage to the environment and property damage caused by the application as determined by the ODA. Paying for cleanup required by damage to streams, soil, aquatic life, bee hives (managed and unmanaged) are examples of possible penalties.
- (Ramesh Sagili) ODA should look into possibility of significantly increasing the penalties (\$ amount) for pesticide use violation.
- (Ramesh Sagili) ODA should develop a more systematic inspection program to enforce proper application of pesticides.

4. Best Management Practices/Pesticide Use

- (Jeff Stone) Develop and make available pesticide BMPs. Model language in the North Dakota as an appendix to the report.
- (Rich Little) Request that EPA conduct all field test of pesticides as they are formulated for sales (complete with additives) to determine true level of toxicity to target and non-target organism.

DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

TASK 3: LICENSING AND TRAINING OF PESTICIDE APPLICATORS

POLICY OBJECTIVES:

- Enhance Applicator Training on Pollinator Health

The current applicator certification and re-certification system does not require that applicants earn credits in pollinator health courses. (Aimee Code) Many people who regularly apply neonicotinoid pesticides as part of their job are not licensed applicators.

- Identified Barriers to Progress:
 - ~ Difficulty identifying coursework in pollinator health.
 - ~ (Aimee Code) General use pesticides, including almost all neonicotinoid products, can be used by nursery employees and farm employees without obtaining a pesticide applicators license since the application occurs at their place of employment.
 - ~ (Aimee Code) General use pesticides, including almost all neonicotinoid products, can be used by most landscapers without obtaining a pesticide applicators license.
- Improve Knowledge Of Retail Sales Staff Selling General Use Pesticides

Retails sales staff are the primary point of contact for homeowners purchasing pesticides but may not have training in pesticide use.

- Identified Barriers to Progress:
 - ~ High staff turn-over at retail establishment can make maintaining a trained sales force challenging.
- Improve Knowledge Of Homeowners Applying General Use Pesticides

Homeowners applying pesticide products typically have no training in pesticide use and may believe “more is better.”

- Identified Barriers to Progress:
 - ~ Pesticide labels can be difficult to understand.
 - ~ Developing an effective public education program that reaches homeowners is challenging.

TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Applicator Training
 - ODA should establish an online training resource that is coded by topic so applicators can search for classes on specific topics, including pollinator health.

DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

- (George Hansen) Require attending a “Pollinator Protection” training module in order to be licensed to apply or prescribe pesticides in Oregon.
- (Jeff Stone) Focus of education, training to all pesticide users. Variable and accessible information for both the licensed pesticide applicator, general pesticide user and the consumer.
- (Rich Little) Increase training required by applicators covering what IPM is and how it is used. Emphasize how it can improve safety issues and reduces costs over the long term. More likely to create healthier plants while reducing pesticide usage.
- (Jeff Stone) Online tools must be activated. The bee keeper site is not active and could be linked to a central source (ODA) with connections to industry, bee keepers and environmental organizations.
- (Ramesh Sagili) ODA should mandate exclusive pollinator credits to the existing pesticide applicator credit hour requirements.
- (Jeff Stone) Beta test training programs in Oregon through the North American Pesticide Program and collaborate with other entities such as BeelInformed Project (through AmericanHort) and the Honeybee Health Coalition (Clinton Global Initiative).

2. Licensing

- Oregon should require an applicator license for anyone who applies general use pesticides on a regular basis as part of their employment.
- Oregon should require a license for crop advisors and others who give advice on purchase and use of pesticides. (Scott Dahlman) Crop advisor certifications already exist. Certification for every person who works in a retail store that sells pesticides is unrealistic. (Betsy Earls) Oregon retail employees are not appropriate educators on the subject of pesticide application. High employee turnover would make it impossible to ensure sales people are adequately trained for this purpose, and offering incorrect advice could potentially lead to a far worse result than offering no advice at all. Pesticide and pollinator education should be provided by people who have more extensive and up to date training than a retail employee can be given— ideally by the State through OSU or its extension programs.
- (George Hansen) Recommend that licenses be required for application of any registered pesticide (general or restricted) if such pesticides are applied as a business or commercial endeavor. Sale of pesticides in quantities for commercial or business use should be allowed only when a valid applicator’s license is produced. (I am assuming that commercial beekeepers would be included as is the case in California)

3. Point of Purchase Pesticide Use Education

- Oregon should require a licensed applicator or trained professional to explain the use of a product prior to providing it to a customer (ex., similar to receiving a prescription from a pharmacy). (Scott Dahlman) Who is going to do this? There’s no counterpart to a pharmacist in regards to pesticides. There’s simply no structure I

DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

place to make this happen. (Betsy Earls) See above comments about retail employee training and turnover. Additionally, requiring products to be sold “behind the counter” would be impossible to manage without a significant allocation of resources, as Oregon doesn’t have a structure in place to regulate or enforce such a system. None of the bee deaths recently reported in Oregon have been from home pesticide application, thus, any consideration of allocating resources in this manner should be low on the task force’s priority list.

- (Jeff Stone) Engagement of the master gardeners to be a resource for the general public as a means to assist education levels at the point of purchase.
4. Pesticide Use Reporting (George Hansen) Recommend that the requirement to record and report all business and commercial pesticide use to the State be reactivated and funded.

DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

TASK 4: BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

POLICY OBJECTIVES:

- Develop Best Management Practices to Improve Pollinator Habitat

Best Management Practices (BMPs) are those practices determined to be the most efficient, practical, and cost-effective measures identified to guide a particular activity or to address a particular problem.

- Identified Barrier to Progress:
 - ~ The development of BMPs will require a public process that necessitates staff support and adequate funding.

TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. State Pollinator Plan

- (George Hansen) The Legislature should direct ODA to develop a Pollinator Plan based on the model of the North Dakota Pollinator Plan and provide funding for this work.
- (Jeff Stone) Develop plan following the North Dakota model for pollinator protection.
- Oregon should prepare and implement a state Pollinator Health Strategy. The Strategy should address both native and managed pollinators and should be developed with stakeholders through a public process and include period reviews and updates. Plan elements to include:
 - Formal arrangement for communication between growers and bee owners
 - Method/mechanism to know if there are (Aimee Code) native or managed bees near a treatment site
 - Method for growers to contact bee keepers
 - Notification time frame for pesticides applications
 - Recommendation to grower and applicators on how to minimize risks to bees
- (Jeff Stone) Presidential memorandum implementation plan, timeline and cost estimates. Pursuit of National Pollinator Health Strategy, Research Action Plan and broad public education effort.

2. Best Management Practices

- ODA and OSU Extension should work with stakeholder groups to develop best management practices (BMPs) to improve pollinator health in urban, roadside and agricultural areas.
- (Rich Little) Encourage ODA to continue to and expand their work with plant product groups/organizations and our neighboring states to determine and develop “Best

DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

Management Practices” (BMPs) to protect our pollinators of different crops grown in our region.

- (Jeff Stone) Scalable voluntary BMPs for pesticide use for pollinator health and consistent pollinator health plans among the states.
- OSU Extension should extend the reach of its existing programs targeted at pollinator health.
- (Aimee Code) Encourage regional Conservation Implementation Strategies (CISs) to encourage/incentivize pollinator habitat projects.
- (Aimee Code) Encourage contracting of beneficial insect habitat through the Conservation Stewardship Program.
- (Rich Little) Encourage ODA to continue to and expand their work with plant product groups/organizations and our neighboring states to determine and develop “Best Management Practices” (BMPs) to protect our pollinators of different crops grown in our region.

3. State-Owned Lands

- (George Hansen) The Legislature should direct State entities that manage lands, parks, rights of way and other properties to use existing funding and to make a priority the development and maintenance of pollinator habitat within their jurisdictions.
- (George Hansen) Implement at the State level the directives in the White House Memorandum Section 3 (Increasing and Improving Pollinator Habitat) as appropriate.
- (Jeff Stone) Develop a plan that uses plant material along transportation corridors and establishment of pollinator areas on public land.
- (Jeff Stone) Develop state work plan between agencies to implement and meet President Obama’s executive order on pollinator health.
- (Aimee Code) Require Oregon's state-owned lands (e.g. Dept of State Lands, OR Dept of Fish and Wildlife, OR Parks, etc.) to incorporate pollinator habitat into new landscaping and restoration projects.
- (Rich Little) Review of policies covering use of or encouraging making right-of-ways friendly to pollinators through pollinator’s friendly plantings, restricting some pesticides and/or herbicide applications. This includes Oregon state, county and local public properties such as roads, rest stops campgrounds, and parks.
- (Christy Splitt) Require Oregon's state-owned lands (e.g. Dept of State Lands, OR Dept of Fish and Wildlife, OR Parks, etc.) to support and incorporate pollinator habitat.
- (Christy Splitt) Require Oregon's state-owned lands (e.g. Dept of State Lands, OR Dept of Fish and Wildlife, OR Parks, etc.) to incorporate pollinator habitat into new landscaping and restoration projects.

DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

4. Locally-Owned and Private Lands

- (George Hansen) Recommend that the Legislature encourage counties, municipalities, and private land owners to make a priority the development and maintenance of pollinator habitat.
- (Rich Little) Review of policies covering use of or encouraging making right-of-ways friendly to pollinators through pollinator’s friendly plantings, restricting some pesticides and/or herbicide applications. This includes private property such as power-line right-of-ways, railroad right-of-ways, and logged sites.

DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

TASK 5: RESEARCH NEEDS

POLICY OBJECTIVES:

- Address Pollinator Health Research Needs

Research is needed to identify, manage and mitigate threats to both managed and native pollinators, including research in the following areas:

1. Rapid bee pest and disease diagnostics;
 2. Investigating effects (sub-lethal and chronic) of systemic insecticides (especially neonicotinoids) on honey bee colony health and native bees;
 3. Studies focused on interactions of multiple stress factors that are negatively impacting bee health (pests and diseases, pesticides, nutrition, genetic diversity etc.);
 4. Both basic and applied studies on improving bee nutrition; and
 5. Long term studies/surveys to (Betsy Earls) to benchmark and monitor populations of bees and their health.
- Identified Barriers to Progress:
 - ~ Funding
 - ~ (Betsy Earls) Inoperable registration process for commercial beekeepers (the link for commercial beekeepers to register their hives doesn't even work).

TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Pollinator Health

- Fund the establishment of a state of the art bee health diagnostic facility at Oregon State University.
- (Jeff Stone) Integrated research plan with state and federal partners with aggregated funding requests and areas of focus identified. OSU focus on diagnostics (rapid response), nutrition and mites.
- (Jeff Stone) Research data gap analysis needed for national approach to resolving pollinator health.
- (George Hansen) Create a competitive grant program for research proposals on pollinator health issues.
- (George Hansen) Develop sustainable funding for a Pollinator Extension program to work with the bee industry on identifying and managing bee health issues.
- (Jeff Stone) Ask EPA to expedite review of product to control mites. (Jeff Stone) More overt connection with the IR-4 program). (Jeff Stone) IR-4 project identification and research. Focus on mite problem and the need for product registration for hives.

DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

- (Aimee Code) Support and possibly seek funds for pollinator habitat field trials at the Corvallis NRCS Plant Materials Center.
- (Jeff Stone) Federal research dollar aggregation and establishment of national “expertise centers” (OR, MD, OH etc.).

2. Aviary Counts/Registration

- (Jeff Stone) Aviary registration for baseline of hive locations, numbers, etc.
- (Betsy Earls) Fund studies on the number, type, and location of bee colonies in Oregon, both native and managed. Without a baseline measurement of bee populations in Oregon, it will be nearly impossible to determine whether the state is making progress in supporting pollinator health, or managing and mitigating threats to them.
- (Betsy Earls) Facilitate better/more effective processes for commercial beekeepers to register their colonies with ODA.
- (Rich Little) Bee hives in Oregon to be registered. Require bee hives coming into Oregon to be registered as to who owns them, where the hives will be located and where the hives came from or were located for pollination services. ODA will conduct random inspection of hives in Oregon for the purpose of pest and pathogen detection. Not pesticide compliance. If a pest/pathogen of concern is detected further inspections of nearby hives and other hives of those owners are conducted. Right now no records exist that will permit these types of pest detection inspections to be performed to protect Oregon bee hives from introduced pests/pathogens. Bee hives that remain in Oregon should also be registered as a means of protecting them as well. New/additional funding and staff will be required by ODA to perform these “new” functions.
- (Jeff Stone) National registration of for hives including diagnostic evaluation of hive health.

3. Research on Effect of Pesticides on Pollinators

- Fund studies on the effects of neonicotinoids on pollinators, the interaction of multiple stressors negatively affecting pollinators, basic and applied studies on improving bee nutrition and long-term surveys to monitor pollinator populations. (Scott Dahlman) It would be good to look at supporting efforts that are already taking place on this front instead of trying to create a new program if possible.
- (Rich Little) Encourage EPA to conduct and/or Oregon to fund studies that are required to produce real field exposure data, that is using pesticides in their sales formulations with all the included chemicals, inert ingredients, & carrier chemicals in field trials not lab conducted exposure using just the active ingredient.
- (Rich Little) Encourage EPA to conduct and/or Oregon to fund studies of sub-lethal, cumulative doses of chemicals in our pesticides.
- (Rich Little) Encourage EPA to conduct and/or Oregon to fund studies of pesticides of common tank mixtures used in Oregon for toxicity to pollinators.

DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

- (Jeff Stone) Evaluation of cost of alternative pesticides, relative health assessments for both pollinators and humans, and impact on cost of production and potential economic loss to agriculture to provide product to market.

DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

TASK 6: FUNDING

POLICY OBJECTIVES:

- Fund Recommended Actions to Improve Pollinator Health
- Identified Barriers to Progress:
 - ~ \$
 - ~

TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Revenue Sources

- Pesticide Registration Fee
 - (George Hansen) Increase the pesticide registration fee to \$200 per product. The current fee is \$160/product; the statute allows a fee up to \$250/product.
 - (Rich Little) Increase of the pesticide registration fees from \$160.00 to \$200.00. Thereafter during each two year budget period that the fee be increased by \$5.00 with the funding to provide budgetary support for ODA bee/pesticide inspections investigations.
 - (Jeff Stone) Increase pesticide registration fee to the national average (\$160 from \$121) to conduct pesticide education and outreach to pesticide users for emerging pesticide use purposes.
- Applicator License Fee
 - (George Hansen) Increase the applicator licensing fees to a level commensurate with fees in nearby states.
- Commercial Hive Registration Fee
 - (Jeff Stone) Registration of hives and 15 cents per hive on those with 5 or more in production to evaluate nutrition, mite, pesticide exposure and other factors that impact pollinator health.
 - (Betsy Earls) Increase registration fee on commercial hives – Oregon’s current fee is below the nationwide average.
- (Jeff Stone) Coordinated effort among Oregon researchers to secure funding from national research entities (Horticultural Research Institute, SCRI, etc.) as well as next phase funding through the USDA Specialty Crop Grant program.
- (Rich Little) Examine variations of the CA Mill Tax, Unclaimed Gas Tax as additional funding sources for ODA.
- (Rich Little) Special Oregon license plates for “Protect Our Pollinators.”
- (Rich Little) Annual income tax: provide a check box to support OSU Bee Lab.
- (Aimee Code) Research whether ODA could earmark Technical Assistance, Local Management Agency Funds, and/or Ag Water Quality Funds to go into pollinator work with the Conservation Districts in the state.

DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

2. Use of Revenue

- (George Hansen, Aimee Code, Christy Splitt) The revenue from the increased fees should be used to fund:
 - (1) A new position at ODA or Extension to lead a new pollinator health outreach and education program, and
 - (2) A new grant program for outreach projects and research needs.
- (Jeff Stone) Direct appropriation by the State of Oregon to the OSU Extension Office for outreach and education to agriculture and landscapers.
- (Jeff Stone) Funding of ODA policy package of \$75,000 for phase 1 of pollinator health education for the 2015 Oregon Legislative Session.
- (Scott Dahlman) Any raising of the pesticide fees would need to be tied to a pesticide related function. There are statutory restrictions regarding how that money can be used. Fully funding a pollinator specialist exclusively with pesticide fees would take a statutory change that would be very difficult to get support for.

DRAFT RECOMMENDATIONS – FOR DISCUSSION PURPOSES ONLY

MISCELLANEOUS TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS:

- (Jeff Stone) Legislative action taken by the state legislature relating to pollinator health should be incorporated in the Pesticide Stewardship Program.
- (Rich Little) Resolution from Oregon State Senate and House to recognize the value of pollinators in enhancing Oregon's health and that we have an obligations to protect them. Like the Presidential Memo it will state for Oregon including all public agencies we all have a role in working together to protect our pollinators.