Vermont 2016 legislation
Pollinator Protection Committee Composition

- Vegetable Farmer
- University researcher
- Dairy Farmer
- Pesticide dealer
- Greenhouse owner
- Secretary of Agriculture
- Tree fruit grower
- 2 beekeepers
- Not for profit
Charges of the State Pollinator Protection Committee

1. Evaluate the status in Vermont of the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s five pillars of pollinator health. The five pillars of pollinator health are: pollinator biology; nutrition and habitat; pathogens and pests; pesticide use; and genetics and breeding.

2. Evaluate the effectiveness of pesticide applicator licensing and other pesticide requirements in the State in protecting pollinator health.

3. Evaluate other state or international pesticide regulations that are more protective of pollinator health than the pesticide regulations of Vermont or the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.
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4. Study available education and outreach plans from other states that have been successful in increasing public awareness of pollinator health issues.

5. Evaluate best management practices for application of neonicotinoid pesticides in a manner that avoids harm to pollinators.

6. Consider the requirements in State Clean Water Act regarding buffers along State waters and whether and how areas in buffers or other areas that require perennial vegetation should be encouraged for use as pollinator forage zones or pollinator growing areas.
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7. Identify possible sources of funds for use in the protection of pollinator health.

8. Develop a State pollinator protection plan using the framework and critical elements from the Association of American Pesticide Control Officials Pollinator Protection Plan guidance.

Report to the Legislature
A few consensus recommendation themes

Healthy populations of managed honey bees can protect native bees.

Gaps exist in Vermont-specific data as related to pesticide usage (including miticides), pathogen and pest loads in Vermont pollinators, and economic thresholds of pests and pesticide use, especially related to treated corn and soybean seeds in Vermont’s dairy systems.

Funding should be earmarked for pollinator programs that would incentivize pollinator-friendly practices on farms and protect farmers from incurring any related economic loss.

Education & outreach for all
Pest thresholds:
• **grubs** is an average of 2 grubs/location averaged over 5 scouting locations.
• **wireworms** is an average of 1 wireworm/location averaged over 5 scouting locations.
as identified in digging or baiting assessments

Stand loss thresholds:
• **corn** crop is 15%
• **soybean** crop is 30%
GENERAL AGREEMENT

Pesticides used in Vermont should be based on need, not used prophylactically.

The Agency of Agriculture, Food & Markets should classify all pesticides with active ingredients that are highly toxic to bees restricted use products (Vermont Class A).

Vermont Agency of Agriculture, Food & Markets should not renew the special registration of coumaphos (Checkmite+) for the in-hive control of Varroa mites by beekeepers within the state of Vermont.

The Vermont Agency of Agriculture should explore creation of a POLLINATOR PROTECTION FUND and identify funding mechanisms that supports work to protect pollinator health and that do not have a negative impact to farmers in Vermont.

SPLIT OPINION – FAVORABLE

The Agency of Agriculture, Food & Markets should classify all pesticides that contain neonicotinoid active ingredients as restricted use products (Vermont Class A). Exempt veterinary products, but we recommend research on the effects of these products on pollinators.

The Agency of Agriculture, Food & Markets will use its regulatory authority of treated articles to develop best management practices (BMPs) on planting neonicotinoid treated corn/soybean seed starting as soon as possible. They will not be permitted unless a quantifiable demonstrated need can be identified by scouting techniques.

SPLIT OPINION – UNFAVORABLE

The Agency of Agriculture, Food & Markets should prohibit the application of systemic pesticides that are highly toxic to bees to accessible pollinator attractive plants until after flowering. Exemptions for research with demonstrated limited risk and for the management of invasive species when effective alternatives are unavailable.
Act 99. An act relating to regulation of treated article pesticides

“Treated article” means a pesticide or class of pesticides exempt under 40 C.F.R. § 152.25(a) from regulation under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, 7 U.S.C. § 136-136y

So....
Secretary of Agriculture *may* adopt by rule

(1) BMPs relating to the sale, use, storage, or disposal of treated articles

(2) Requirements for the response to or corrective actions for exigent circumstances or contamination from a treated article that presents a threat to human health or the environment;

(3) Requirements for inspection of treated articles

(4) Requirements for persons selling treated articles to keep or make available to the Secretary records of sale of treated articles

(5) Requirements for reporting of incidents resulting from accidental contamination from or misuse of treated articles

Cannot interfere if the treated article is already regulated by another state entity.
Where do we go from here?
Voting/recommendation categories

- **Consensus**: recommendations received strong support from all
- **General agreement**: recommendations received support from at least five members and no significant opposition.
- **Split opinion (favorable)**: recommendations were supported by 5 or more members and opposed by at least two members.
- **Split opinion (not favorable)**: recommendation supported by at least 2 to 4 members, but does not reach 5 votes of support.

*one committee member unable to attend final meeting*