

For discussion purposes only
9/24/2014
DRAFT

REPORT TO THE OREGON LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Task Force on Pollinator Health

October 2014

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Executive Summary.....	1
II. Task Force on Pollinator Health.....	1
Purpose	1
Task Force Members.....	2
Task Force Meetings	2
III. Task Force Recommendations	
▪ Task 1 – Outreach and Education	
▫ Policy Objectives	3
▫ Task Force Recommendations.....	4
▪ Tasks 2 – Pesticide Regulation	
▫ Policy Objectives	5
▫ Task Force Recommendations.....	6
▪ Task 3 – Licensing and Training of Pesticide Applicators	
▫ Policy Objectives	8
▫ Task Force Recommendations.....	8
▪ Task 4 – Best Management Practices	
▫ Policy Objectives	10
▫ Task Force Recommendations.....	10
▪ Task 5 – Research Needs	
▫ Policy Objectives	12
▫ Task Force Recommendations.....	12
▪ Task 6 – Funding	
▫ Policy Objectives	14
▫ Task Force Recommendations.....	14

List of Appendices

- A. Enrolled HB 4039
- B. Task Force Meeting Agendas
- C. Summary of Task Force Recommendations

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Task Force on Pollinator Health was established during the 2014 Legislative Session by the enactment of House Bill 4139. This document is the Task Force report.

In June 2013, at least 25,000 bees were found dead in a Target parking lot in Wilsonville, Oregon. The Oregon Department of Agriculture (ODA) concluded that the bee deaths were directly related to the use of the pesticide dinotefuran, which had been applied to nearby linden trees to control aphids. ODA subsequently adopted permanent rules restricting the use of certain pesticide products containing dinotefuran and imidacloprid and now requires an Oregon-specific label statement on these products as a condition of annual registration in 2014. Beginning January 1, 2014, application of these products on linden, basswood, or Tilia tree species is prohibited.

During the 2014 session, House Bill 4139 was introduced partly in response to a number of bee kills associated with the use of these products on Linden trees. As enacted, House Bill 4139 established the Task Force on Pollinator Health to examine issues relevant to pollinator health and report to an interim legislative committee related to agriculture no later than October 1, 2014. The measure also directs Oregon State University, in consultation with ODA, to develop educational materials on best practices to avoid adverse effects from pesticides on pollinators.

The Task Force held six meetings between June and September 2014. In addition to the sharing of information gathered by Task Force members, testimony was received from individuals with expertise in a variety of areas related to pollinator health. The following themes emerged from Task Force discussions:

- ❖ Pollinator health is a complex and multi-factorial issue.
- ❖ A public outreach and education strategy on pollinator health issues is needed.
- ❖ Pesticide product labels are often difficult to read and understand.
- ❖ Little is known about homeowner use of pesticide products.
- ❖
- ❖
- ❖

II. TASK FORCE ON POLLINATOR HEALTH

PURPOSE

House Bill 4139 (2013) directs the Task Force on Pollinator Health (Task Force) to examine issues relevant to pollinator health, including but not limited to:

1. Proposed and enacted pesticide regulations from other states and countries that are more protective of pollinator health than the pesticide regulations of the United States Environmental Protection Agency.
2. Public education and outreach plans regarding pollinator health that have been successful in other states.
3. The effectiveness of applicator licensing, other legal requirements, and incentives in matters affecting pollinator health.
4. Possible funding streams for efforts to promote or protect pollinator health.
5. How other states gather data on populations of bees or other pollinating insects.
6. Existing best management practices for applying neonicotinoids to avoid harming pollinating insects.

The bill directs the Task Force to submit a report, which may include recommendations for legislation, to an interim committee of the Legislative Assembly related to agriculture no later than October 1, 2014.

TASK FORCE MEMBERS

The 10 member Task Force includes two legislators who serve as non-voting members and eight members appointed by the Governor who represent a variety of interests involved in pollinator health issues. A Task Force membership roster appears below.

Name	Affiliation	Interests Represented
Ramesh Sagili, Chair	Department of Horticulture, Oregon State University	University faculty specializing in science of pollinator health
Senator Chuck Thomsen	State Senator Appointed by the Senate President	Oregon Legislature
Representative Jeff Reardon	State Representative Appointed by the Speaker of the House	Oregon Legislature
Aimee Code	Xerces Society	Advocacy group dedicated to protection of pollinators and invertebrates
Scott Dahlman	Oregonians for Food and Shelter	Advocacy group for farmers
Betsy Earls	Associated Oregon Industries	Advocacy group for retailers
George Hansen	Beekeeper	Public
Rich Little	Master Gardner	Public
Christy Splitt	Oregon League of Conservation Voters	Advocacy group dedicated to environmental protection
Jeff Stone	Oregon Association of Nurseries	Advocacy group for nurseries and greenhouse producers

TASK FORCE MEETINGS

The Task Force held a total of six meetings at the State Capitol; its first meeting was on June 30, 2014. The table below shows meeting dates and agenda topics; a complete set of meeting agendas appears in Appendix __ of this report.

Meeting	Topics Addressed
June 30, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Task Force Organization and Election of Chair • Overview of HB 4139 • State of Pollinators in Oregon • Pesticide Certification and Licensing in Oregon • Task Force Objectives, Timeline and Work Plan
July 31, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Task Force Work Plan • Outreach and Education Programs
August 6, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other States' and Countries' Pesticide Labeling Laws and Regulations to Protect Pollinators • Pesticide Applicator Training, Certification and Licensing
August 18, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview of Other States and Countries Pesticide Laws and Regulations • Presidential Memorandum on Pollinator Health • Pollinator Research Needs
September 16, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Best Management Practices for Neonicotinoids • Funding Options to Promote and Protect Pollinator Health • Review and Discuss Draft Recommendations
September 29, 2014	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consideration of Task Force Report / Public Comment Opportunity

III. TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS

The Task Force has developed a set of recommendations in each of the following areas: outreach and education, pesticide regulation, licensing and training of pesticide applicators, best management practices, research needs and funding. For each area, policy objectives and identified barriers to achieving those objectives are identified. The recommendations are listed in three categories based on the level of agreement reached by the Task Force on each recommendation. “*Consensus*” recommendations received strong support from all Task Force members. “*Majority*” recommendations received support from at least five members and no significant opposition. “*Minority*” recommendations were opposed by at least two members.

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 product labels.
- ~ 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

Consensus Recommendations

The TFPH recommends that:

- 1.1 An Oregon Pollinator Health Outreach and Education Plan should be developed.
 - A (private contractor) OR (ODA-hired pollinator health outreach specialist) OR (ODA and OSU jointly) should develop an Oregon Pollinator Health Outreach and Education Plan. The plan should:
 - Ensure educational information is appropriate and effective for a licensed pesticide applicator, a general pesticide user and the consumer.
 - Rely on a variety of media sources and existing organizations to disseminate the materials.
 - Examine existing, effective outreach programs, including the state’s noxious weed program, during plan development.
- 1.2 The Bee Incident Reporting System should be clarified.

The Oregon Department of Agriculture (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 be widely shared with the public and industry. The posting of this information on other websites should be encouraged.
- 1.3 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.”

Majority Recommendations

A majority of the TFPH recommends that:

- 1.4 Information on pollinator health should be distributed using existing state agencies, associations, environmental organizations and others in related fields.

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.
- ~ Native bees cannot be removed from a treatment site in the same manner as managed bees.

TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS:

Consensus Recommendations

The TFPH recommends that:

2.1 Pesticide Labels

- (a) ODA should continue its on-going work with the US Environmental Protection Agency (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.
- (b) ODA should continue to encourage EPA to develop a system to convey risk to pollinators on pesticide labels.
- (c) ODA should help create guidance materials for applicators to better explain label requirements.

2.2 Specific Pesticide Use Restrictions

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.

2.3 Develop and make available pesticide use best management practices.

Majority Recommendations

A majority of the TFPH recommends that:

2.4 Pesticide Labels

EPA labeling should include more symbols to aid bilingual language challenges.

2.5 Specific Pesticide Use Restrictions

Direct ODA to create and publish a list of pesticides requiring classification as “Restricted Use” in accordance with 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.

2.6 Violations: Inspections/Penalties/Enforcement

ODA should develop a more systematic inspection program to enforce proper application of pesticides.

Minority Recommendations

A minority of the TFPH recommends that:

2.7 Pesticide Labels

- (a) 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.
- (b) 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.
- (c) ODA should adopt application rates for neonicotinoids for backyard use that are equivalent to agricultural use rates.
- (d) 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.

2.8 Specific Pesticide Use Restrictions

- (a) ODA should expand the ban on the use of certain neonicotinoids on Linden trees to include two additional neonicotinoids (clothianidin and thiamethoxam).
- (b) 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.
- (c) Prohibit neonicotinoid use on state lands.
- (d) Direct the State IPM task force to review use of neonicotinoids on state lands and seek alternate solutions.

2.9 Violations: Inspections/Penalties/Enforcement

- (a) 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.
- (b) ODA should look into possibility of significantly increasing the penalties (\$ amount) for pesticide use violation.
- (c) ODA should conduct random hive inspections for the purpose of pest and pathogen detection. If a pest/pathogen of concern is detected, further inspections of nearby hives and other hives of those owners should be conducted.

2.10 Best Management Practices/Pesticide Use

- Use North Dakota Pollinator Protection Plan as a model and include as an appendix to this report.

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. 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.
- ~ 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, and
 - Most landscapers without obtaining a pesticide applicators license.

- ***Improve Knowledge of Retail Sales Staff Selling General Use Pesticides***

Retail 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

Consensus Recommendations

The TFPH recommends that:

3.1 Applicator Training

ODA should amend OAR 603-057-0135 to include a “Pollinator Protection” training module as a core credit requirement for a pesticide applicator license.

3.2 Point of Purchase Pesticide Use Education

Use master gardeners as a resource for the general public to assist education at the point of purchase.

Majority Recommendations

A majority of the TFPH recommends that:

3.3 Applicator Training

- (a) ODA should establish an online training resource that is coded by topic so applicators can search for classes on specific topics, including pollinator health.
- (b) The Integrated Pest Management (IPM) training required for applicators covering what IPM is and how it is used should be increased.
- (c) ODA should beta test training programs, including but not limited to the North American Pesticide Program and collaborate on training with other entities such as BeeInformed Project (through AmericanHort) and the Honeybee Health Coalition (Clinton Global Initiative).

3.4 Pesticide Use Reporting

Reactivate and fund the requirement to record and report all business and commercial pesticide use to the State (Pesticide Use Reporting System).

Minority Recommendations

A minority of the TFPH recommends that:

3.5 Licensing

- (a) Oregon should require an applicator license for anyone who applies general use pesticides on a regular basis as part of their employment.
- (b) Oregon should require a license for crop advisors and others who give advice on purchase and use of pesticides.
- (c) Allow sale of pesticides in quantities for commercial or business use only when a valid applicator’s license is produced.

3.6 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 retail customer (similar to receiving advice from a pharmacist before purchasing a prescription).

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 with staff support and adequate funding.

TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS

Consensus Recommendations

The TFPH recommends that:

- 4.1 Best Management Practices
OSU Extension should extend the reach of its existing programs targeted at pollinator health.
- 4.2 State-Owned Lands
ODOT should develop a plan for using plant material along transportation corridors to establish pollinator habitat on public land.

Majority Recommendations

A majority of the TFPH recommends:

- 4.3 State Pollinator Plan
 - (a) ODA 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 periodic reviews and updates.
Plan elements to include:
 - Formal arrangement for communication between growers and bee owners,
 - Method/mechanism to know if there are native or managed bees near a treatment site,
 - Method for growers to contact bee keepers,
 - Notification time frame for pesticides applications, and
 - Recommendation to grower and applicators on how to minimize risks to bees.

- (b) Prepare a Presidential Memorandum implementation plan, including a timeline and cost estimates for pursuit of a National Pollinator Health Strategy, Research Action Plan and broad public education effort.
- (c) Oregon Legislature should adopt a resolution recognizing the value of pollinators in enhancing Oregon’s health and that we have an obligation to protect them.

4.4 Best Management Practices

ODA and OSU Extension should continue and expand work with the US Department of Agriculture and stakeholder groups and neighboring states to develop best management practices (BMPs) to improve pollinator health in urban, roadside and agricultural areas and to protect our pollinators of different crops grown in our region.

4.5 Locally-Owned and Private Lands

- (a) Legislature should encourage counties, municipalities, and private land owners to make a priority the development and maintenance of pollinator habitat.
- (b) Legislative action taken by the state legislature relating to pollinator health should be incorporated in the Pesticide Stewardship Program.

Minority Recommendations

A minority of the TFPH recommends that:

4.6 Best Management Practices

Develop scalable, voluntary BMPs for pesticide use to protect pollinator health and to lead to consistent pollinator health plans among the states.

4.7 State-Owned Lands

- (a) The Legislature should direct State agencies 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. Implement at the State level the directives in the White House Memorandum Section 3 (Increasing and Improving Pollinator Habitat) as appropriate.
- (b) Review state policies covering the use of or encouraging making right-of-ways friendly to pollinators through pollinator’s friendly plantings, restricting some pesticides and/or herbicide applications, including state, county and local public properties such as roads, rest stops campgrounds, and parks.

4.8 Locally-Owned and Private Lands

- (a) ODOT should review policies covering use of or encouraging making right-of-ways friendly to pollinators through pollinator friendly plantings and 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.
- (b) Encourage regional Conservation Implementation Strategies to encourage/incentivize pollinator habitat projects.

- (c) Encourage contracting of beneficial insect habitat through the Conservation Stewardship Program.

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
- ~ The online registration process for commercial beekeepers is not functioning.

TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS

Majority Recommendations

A majority of the TFPH recommends:

5.1 Pollinator Health

- (a) Fund the establishment of a state of the art bee health diagnostic facility at Oregon State University. Estimated budget is \$500,000 for equipment and annual budget of \$500,000 (salaries of two technicians and supplies and field team of two technicians to travel and sample hives.
- (b) Integrate pollinator health research plan with state and federal partners with aggregated funding requests and areas of focus identified. OSU to focus on diagnostics (rapid response), nutrition and mites.
- (c) Complete a research data gap analysis for national approach to resolving pollinator health.
- (d) Create a competitive grant program for research proposals on pollinator health issues.

- (e) Develop sustainable funding for a Pollinator Extension program to work with the bee industry on identifying and managing bee health issues.
- (f) Ask EPA to expedite review of product to control mites. More overt connection with the IR-4 program). IR-4 project identification and research. Focus on mite problem and the need for product registration for hives.
- (g) Support and possibly seek funds for pollinator habitat field trials at the Corvallis NRCS Plant Materials Center.

5.2 Research on Effect of Pesticides on Pollinators

- a. Fund studies on the effects of neonicotinoids on pollinators, the interaction of multiple stressors negatively affecting pollinators, and basic and applied studies on improving bee nutrition and long-term surveys to monitor pollinator populations.
- b. Encourage EPA or Oregon to fund and conduct studies of sub-lethal, cumulative doses of chemicals in our pesticides.
- c. Encourage EPA or Oregon to fund and conduct studies of pesticides of common tank mixtures used in Oregon for toxicity to pollinators.
- d. Evaluate the cost of alternative to pesticide use, including a relative health assessment for both pollinators and humans, and the impact on the cost of production and potential economic loss to agriculture to provide a product to market.

Minority Recommendations

A minority of the TFPH recommends:

5.3 Pollinator Health

Aggregate federal research dollars and establish national “expertise centers.”

5.4 Apiary Counts/Registration

- (a) Establish apiary registration for baseline of hive locations, numbers, etc.
- (b) Fund studies on the number, type, and location of bee colonies in Oregon, both native and managed to establish a baseline measurement of bee populations in Oregon to determine whether the state is making progress in supporting pollinator health or managing and mitigating threats to them.
- (c) Require registration of bee hives including ownership, origin and where hives have traveled via a re-activated online beekeeper website.
- (d) Establish a national registration system for hives including diagnostic evaluation of hive health.

5.5 Research on Effect of Pesticides on Pollinators

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.

TASK 6: FUNDING

POLICY OBJECTIVES

- ***Fund Recommended Actions to Improve Pollinator Health***

Identified Barriers to Progress:

- ~ \$
- ~ The uses of pesticide registration and applicator license fee revenues are statutorily restricted.

TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS:

Majority Recommendations

A majority of the TFPH recommends:

6.1 Use of Funds

- (a) Support ODA policy package of \$75,000 for phase 1 of pollinator health education program in the 2015 Oregon Legislative Session.
- (b) Support a direct appropriation to the OSU Extension Office for outreach and education on pollinator health to agriculture and landscapers.
- (c) The revenue from increased fees should be used to fund:
 - A new position at ODA or Extension to lead a new pollinator health outreach and education program, and
 - A new grant program for outreach projects and research needs.

Minority Recommendations

A minority of the TFPH recommends:

6.2 Revenue Sources

- (a) Increase the pesticide registration fee.
 - The current fee is \$160/product; the statute allows a fee up to \$250/product.
- (b) Increase the applicator license fee.
- (c) Increase commercial hive registration fee.
- (d) Coordinate efforts 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.
- (e) Examine variations of the CA Mill Tax, Unclaimed Gas Tax as additional funding sources for ODA.
- (f) Establish special Oregon license plates for “Protect Our Pollinators.”
- (g) Establish annual income tax: provide a check box to support OSU Bee Lab.

(h) 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.

APPENDIX A

77th OREGON LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY--2014 Regular Session

**Enrolled
House Bill 4139**

Sponsored by Representative REARDON; Representatives BARTON, KENY-GUYER,
Senator JOHNSON (Pre-session filed.)

AN ACT

Relating to pollinator health; and declaring an emergency.

Be It Enacted by the People of the State of Oregon:

SECTION 1. Oregon State University, in consultation with the State Department of Agriculture, shall develop educational materials regarding the best practices for avoiding adverse effects from pesticides on populations of bees and other pollinating insects. The educational materials must include, but need not be limited to, measures that pesticide applicators and pesticide trainees can take to protect honeybees and bumblebees. The university and the department shall design the requirements to ensure that any pesticide applicator applying or supervising the application of a pesticide is knowledgeable regarding alternatives to, the appropriateness of, and precautions for pesticide use that may be injurious to the health of bees and other pollinating insects. The department shall make the educational materials described in this section a part of the education required for taking the pesticide applicator licensing examination under ORS 634.122.

SECTION 2. (1) The Task Force on Pollinator Health is established, consisting of 10 members appointed as follows:

- (a) The President of the Senate, after consultation with the Speaker of the House of Representatives, shall appoint one nonvoting member from among members of the Senate.
- (b) The Speaker of the House of Representatives, after consultation with the President of the Senate, shall appoint one nonvoting member from among members of the House of Representatives who are from a different political party than the member appointed by the President of the Senate.
- (c) The Governor shall appoint eight voting members as follows:
 - (A) One member who is a university faculty member specializing in the science of pollinator health.
 - (B) One member representing an advocacy group for nurseries and greenhouse producers.
 - (C) One member representing an advocacy group for farmers.
 - (D) One member representing an advocacy group dedicated to the protection of pollinators and invertebrates.
 - (E) One member representing an advocacy group dedicated to environmental protection.
 - (F) One member representing an advocacy group for retailers.
 - (G) One member, who is certified as a master gardener under the Oregon State University Master Gardener program, representing the public.
 - (H) One member, who is a beekeeper, representing the public.

- (2) The task force shall undertake activities to examine issues relevant to pollinator health, including but not limited to:
- (a) Studying proposed and enacted pesticide regulations from other states and countries that are more protective of pollinator health than the pesticide regulations of the United States Environmental Protection Agency.
 - (b) Studying public education and outreach plans regarding pollinator health that have been successful in other states.
 - (c) Evaluating the effectiveness of applicator licensing and other legal requirements, and of incentives, in matters affecting pollinator health.
 - (d) Identifying possible funding streams for efforts to promote or protect pollinator health.
 - (e) Investigating the means used by other states to gather data on populations of bees or other pollinating insects.
 - (f) Evaluating existing best management practices for applying neonicotinoids in a manner that avoids harming pollinating insects.
- (3) The task force may take actions necessary and proper to carry out the work of the task force, including but not limited to scheduling hearings and taking testimony on matters related to pollinator health.
- (4) A majority of the voting members of the task force constitutes a quorum for the transaction of business.
- (5) Official action by the task force requires the approval of five or more voting members of the task force.
- (6) The task force shall elect one of its voting members to serve as chairperson.
- (7) If there is a vacancy for any cause, the appointing authority shall make an appointment to become immediately effective.
- (8) The task force shall meet at times and places specified by the call of the chairperson or of a majority of the voting members of the task force.
- (9) The task force may adopt rules necessary for the operation of the task force.
- (10) The task force shall submit a report in the manner provided by ORS 192.245, and may include recommendations for legislation, to an interim committee of the Legislative Assembly related to agriculture no later than October 1, 2014. The task force may provide progress reports to an interim committee related to agriculture prior to October 1, 2014.
- (11) The Legislative Administration Committee shall provide staff support to the task force.
- (12) Members of the task force who are not members of the Legislative Assembly are not entitled to compensation, but may be reimbursed for actual and necessary travel and other expenses incurred by them in the performance of their official duties in the manner and amounts provided for in ORS 292.495. Claims for expenses incurred in performing functions of the task force shall be paid out of funds appropriated to the committee for purposes of the task force.
- (13) All agencies of state government, as defined in ORS 174.111, are directed to assist the task force in the performance of its duties and, to the extent permitted by laws relating to confidentiality, to furnish such information and advice as the members of the task force consider necessary to perform their duties.

SECTION 3. Section 2 of this 2014 Act is repealed on the date of the convening of the 2015 regular session of the Legislative Assembly as specified in ORS 171.010.

SECTION 4. This 2014 Act being necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health and safety, an emergency is declared to exist, and this 2014 Act takes effect on its passage.

Appendix B

(Task Force Meeting Agendas)

Appendix C

SUMMARY OF TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS

1. OUTREACH AND EDUCATION		
1.1	Develop Oregon Pollinator Health Outreach and Education Plan	consensus
1.2	Clarify the bee incident reporting system	consensus
1.3	Provide funding to distribute OSU publication “How to Reduce Bee Poisonings from Pesticides”	consensus
1.4	Distribute information on pollinator health using existing state agencies and others	majority
2. PESTICIDE REGULATION		
2.1 (a)	ODA should continue its on-going work with the US Environmental Protection Agency (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.	consensus
2.1 (b)	ODA should continue to encourage EPA to develop a system to convey risk to pollinators on pesticide labels.	consensus
2.1 (c)	ODA should help create guidance materials for applicators to better explain label requirements.	consensus
2.2	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.	consensus
2.3	Develop and make available pesticide use best management practices.	consensus
2.4	EPA labeling should include more symbols to aid bilingual language challenges.	majority
2.5	Direct ODA to create and publish a list of pesticides requiring classification as “Restricted Use” <u>in accordance with</u> 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.	majority
2.6	ODA should develop a more systematic inspection program to enforce proper application of pesticides.	majority
2.7 (a)	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.	minority
2.7 (b)	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.	minority
2.7 (c)	ODA should adopt application rates for neonicotinoids for backyard use that are equivalent to agricultural use rates.	minority
2.7 (d)	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.	minority
2.8	ODA should expand the ban on the use of certain neonicotinoids on Linden trees	minority

(a)	to include two additional neonicotinoids (clothianidin and thiamethoxam).	
2.8 (b)	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.	minority
2.8 (c)	Prohibit neonicotinoid use on state lands.	minority
2.8 (d)	Direct the State IPM task force to review use of neonicotinoids on state lands and seek alternate solutions.	minority
2.9 (a)	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.	minority
2.9 (b)	ODA should look into possibility of significantly increasing the penalties (\$ amount) for pesticide use violation.	minority
2.9 (c)	ODA should conduct random hive inspections for the purpose of pest and pathogen detection. If a pest/pathogen of concern is detected, further inspections of nearby hives and other hives of those owners should be conducted.	minority
2.10	Use North Dakota Pollinator Protection Plan as a model and include as an appendix to this report.	minority
3. LICENSING AND TRAINING OF PESTICIDE APPLICATORS		
3.1	ODA should amend OAR 603-057-0135 to include a "Pollinator Protection" training module as a core credit requirement for a pesticide applicator license.	consensus
3.2	Use master gardeners as a resource for the general public to assist education at the point of purchase.	consensus
3.3 (a)	ODA should establish an online training resource that is coded by topic so applicators can search for classes on specific topics, including pollinator health.	majority
3.3 (b)	The Integrated Pest Management (IPM) training required for applicators covering what IPM is and how it is used should be increased.	majority
3.3 (c)	ODA should beta test training programs, including but not limited to the North American Pesticide Program and collaborate on training with other entities such as BeeInformed Project (through AmericanHort) and the Honeybee Health Coalition (Clinton Global Initiative).	majority
3.4	Reactivate and fund the requirement to record and report all business and commercial pesticide use to the State (Pesticide Use Reporting System).	majority
3.5 (a)	Oregon should require an applicator license for anyone who applies general use pesticides on a regular basis as part of their employment.	minority
3.5 (b)	Oregon should require a license for crop advisors and others who give advice on purchase and use of pesticides.	minority
3.5 (c)	Allow sale of pesticides in quantities for commercial or business use only when a valid applicator's license is produced.	minority
3.6	Oregon should require a licensed applicator or trained professional to explain the use of a product prior to providing it to a retail customer (similar to receiving advice from a pharmacist before purchasing a prescription).	minority

4. BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES		
4.3	OSU Extension should extend the reach of its existing programs targeted at pollinator health.	consensus
4.2	ODOT should develop a plan for using plant material along transportation corridors to establish pollinator habitat on public land.	consensus
4.3 (a)	ODA should prepare and implement a state Pollinator Health Strategy.	majority
4.3 (b)	Prepare a Presidential Memorandum implementation plan, including a timeline and cost estimates for pursuit of a National Pollinator Health Strategy, Research Action Plan and broad public education effort.	majority
4.3 (c)	Oregon Legislature should adopt a resolution recognizing the value of pollinators in enhancing Oregon’s health and that we have an obligation to protect them.	majority
4.4	ODA and OSU Extension should continue and expand its work with the US Department of Agriculture and stakeholder groups and neighboring states to develop best management practices (BMPs) to improve pollinator health in urban, roadside and agricultural areas and to protect our pollinators of different crops grown in our region.	majority
4.5 (a)	Legislature should encourage counties, municipalities, and private land owners to make a priority the development and maintenance of pollinator habitat.	majority
4.5 (b)	Legislative action taken by the state legislature relating to pollinator health should be incorporated in the Pesticide Stewardship Program.	majority
4.6	Develop scalable, voluntary BMPs for pesticide use to protect pollinator health and to lead to consistent pollinator health plans among the states.	minority
4.7 (a)	The Legislature should direct State agencies 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. Implement at the State level the directives in the White House Memorandum Section 3 (Increasing and Improving Pollinator Habitat) as appropriate.	minority
4.7 (b)	Review state policies covering the use of or encouraging making right-of-ways friendly to pollinators through pollinator’s friendly plantings, restricting some pesticides and/or herbicide applications, including state, county and local public properties such as roads, rest stops campgrounds, and parks.	minority
4.8 (a)	ODOT should review policies covering use of or encouraging making right-of-ways friendly to pollinators through pollinator friendly plantings and 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.	minority
4.8 (b)	Encourage regional Conservation Implementation Strategies to encourage/incentivize pollinator habitat projects.	minority
4.8 (c)	Encourage contracting of beneficial insect habitat through the Conservation Stewardship Program.	minority

5. RESEARCH NEEDS		
5.1 (a)	Fund the establishment of a state of the art bee health diagnostic facility at Oregon State University. Estimated budget is \$500,000 for equipment and annual budget of \$500,000 (salaries of two technicians and supplies and field team of two technicians to travel and sample hives.	consensus
5.1 (b)	Integrate pollinator health research plan with state and federal partners with aggregated funding requests and areas of focus identified. OSU to focus on diagnostics (rapid response), nutrition and mites.	consensus
5.1 (c)	Complete a research data gap analysis for national approach to resolving pollinator health.	consensus
5.1 (d)	Create a competitive grant program for research proposals on pollinator health issues.	consensus
5.1 (e)	Develop sustainable funding for a Pollinator Extension program to work with the bee industry on identifying and managing bee health issues.	consensus
5.1 (f)	Ask EPA to expedite review of product to control mites. More overt connection with the IR-4 program). IR-4 project identification and research. Focus on mite problem and the need for product registration for hives.	consensus
5.1 (g)	Support and possibly seek funds for pollinator habitat field trials at the Corvallis NRCS Plant Materials Center.	consensus
5.2 (a)	Fund studies on the effects of neonicotinoids on pollinators, the interaction of multiple stressors negatively affecting pollinators, and basic and applied studies on improving bee nutrition and long-term surveys to monitor pollinator populations.	consensus
5.2 (b)	Encourage EPA or Oregon to fund and conduct studies of sub-lethal, cumulative doses of chemicals in our pesticides.	consensus
5.2 (c)	Encourage EPA or Oregon to fund and conduct studies of pesticides of common tank mixtures used in Oregon for toxicity to pollinators.	consensus
5.2 (d)	Evaluate the cost of alternative to pesticide use, including a relative health assessment for both pollinators and humans, and the impact on the cost of production and potential economic loss to agriculture to provide a product to market.	consensus
5.3	Aggregate federal research dollars and establish national "expertise centers."	minority
5.4 (a)	Establish apiary registration for baseline of hive locations, numbers, etc.	minority
5.4 (b)	Fund studies on the number, type, and location of bee colonies in Oregon, both native and managed to establish a baseline measurement of bee populations in Oregon to determine whether the state is making progress in supporting pollinator health or managing and mitigating threats to them.	minority
5.4 (c)	Require registration of bee hives including ownership, origin and where hives have traveled via a re-activated online beekeeper website.	minority
5.4 (d)	Establish a national registration system for hives including diagnostic evaluation of hive health.	minority
5.5	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.	minority

6. FUNDING		
6.1 (a)	Support ODA policy package of \$75,000 for phase 1 of pollinator health education program in the 2015 Oregon Legislative Session.	consensus
6.1 (b)	Support a direct appropriation to the OSU Extension Office for outreach and education on pollinator health to agriculture and landscapers.	consensus
6.1 (c)	The revenue from increased fees should be used to fund: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A new position at ODA or Extension to lead a new pollinator health outreach and education program, and ▪ A new grant program for outreach projects and research needs. 	consensus
6.2 (a)	Increase the pesticide registration fee. The current fee is \$160/product; the statute allows a fee up to \$250/product.	minority
6.2 (b)	Increase the applicator license fee.	
6.2 (c)	Increase commercial hive registration fee.	minority
6.2 (d)	Coordinate efforts 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.	minority
6.2 (e)	Examine variations of the CA Mill Tax, Unclaimed Gas Tax as additional funding sources for ODA.	minority
6.2 (f)	Establish special Oregon license plates for “Protect Our Pollinators.”	minority
6.2 (g)	Establish annual income tax: provide a check box to support OSU Bee Lab.	minority
6.2 (h)	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.	minority