

## NAUFRP Executive Committee Minutes

October 7, 2014

Salt Lake City, Utah

Executive Committee Participants: Steve Bullard, President (Stephen F. Austin State University); Jim Allen, President-Elect (Northern Arizona University); David Newman, Secretary-Treasurer, (SUNY); Phil Tappe, Southern Regional Chair (University of Arkansas); Tim White, Immediate Past President (University of Florida); Kamran Abdollahi, Diversity Chair (Southern University); Keith Belli, Research Chair (University of Tennessee); Jim Johnson, International Chair (Oregon State University); Carolyn Brooks, ARD 1890s; Mike Messina, Northeast Regional Chair (Pennsylvania State University); Kurt Pregitzer, Western Regional Chair (University of Idaho); Jim Zazcek, North Central Regional Chair (Southern Illinois University); Rob Swihart, At-Large (Purdue University); Bob Wagner, Extension Chair (University of Maine); Janaki Alavalapati, Policy Chair (Virginia Tech University); Terry Sharik, Education Chair (Michigan Tech University); Randy Nuckolls, NAUFRP General Counsel, Terri Bates, NAUFRP Executive Liaison,

NAUFRP Member Participants: Keith Owens, Oklahoma State University and also representing the National Association of University Fisheries and Wildlife Programs (NAUFWP); David Greene, Humboldt State University; Jim Burchfield, University of Montana; Steve Shaler, University of Maine; Steve Tesch, (Oregon State University)

NAUFRP Guests and Presenters: Neils Koch, IUFRO President; Mike Wingfield, IUFRO Vice President and Incoming President; Su See Lee, IUFRO Vice President; Ann Bartuska, USDA Under Secretary for Research, Education and Economics; Jim Reaves, Deputy Chief, Research & Development, USDA Forest Service; Cindi West, Associate Deputy Chief, Research and Development, USDA Forest Service; Luis Tupas, Deputy Director for Bioenergy, Climate and Environment, USDA National Institute for Food and Agriculture (NIFA); Eric Norland (NIFA), Catalino Blanche (NIFA); Paul Trianosky, Senior Director, Conservation Partnerships, Sustainable Forestry Initiative; Matt Menashes, CEO, Society of American Foresters (SAF); Louise Murgia, Senior Director, Field Services, SAF; Dave Walters, SAF President; Bob Alverts, SAF Vice-President; Carol Redelsheimer, Director, Science and Education, SAF

### Introductions

The agenda was reviewed. Terry Sharik has requested time for discussion of the NAUFRP name.

A motion was made by Tim White, second by Terry Sharik, to accept the minutes from the March 3-4, 2014 Executive Committee meeting in Washington, D.C. Steve has indicated a change on page 5 that Terri will make. The minutes were adopted unanimously.

President's Report, Steve Bullard: Steve noted this unique opportunity to meet in conjunction with the 2014 IUFRO World Congress. He is involved in the opening and closing ceremonies as NAUFRP's representative. He noted the \$5,000 provided by NAUFRP for graduate student registration scholarships and an additional \$5,000 that will support an international student survey conducted by Terry Sharik. He noted the work of the committee chairs: this organization works because of individual hard work. The Diversity Logic Model is moving forward. Jim Johnson will report later on the National Alliance of Forest Owners (NAFO) survey. Steve is planning to go to the NAFO annual meeting in November. He discussed the background of the carbon fundamentals document that NAUFRP is circulating for signatures of support. The intent was to share it with faculty but it seems that direction was not clear. NAUFRP is trying to build a stronger relationship with the Forest Landowners Association (FLA). Steve has submitted a piece for the magazine on why a forest landowner needs to care about the McIntire-Stennis (McStennis) program. He would like to help facilitate other NAUFRP members doing something similar once or twice a year. Steve thanked everyone for their help. He and Jim Allen have agreed to transition the office at the end of the calendar year.

Treasurer's Report, David Newman: David discussed the three page handout which depicted NAUFRP's budget and actual income and expenses for 2013 and 2014 as well as a proposed budget for 2015, noting that there was an error in the projected 2015 budget deficit. It will be corrected for distribution at tomorrow's General Assembly meeting. He

also shared a spreadsheet of 2014 dues income from NAUFRP members. This launched a discussion of whether NAUFRP should explore other sources of revenue. For example, NAUFRP pays dues to BAC and NAFO and southern NAUFRP members to FLA. Kurt noted that for the amount we invest, NAUFRP as an organization is a valuable resource: however, we need to do more with relationships at the national, and especially, at the regional levels. It was felt that the list of non-paying dues institutions should be shared once a year. Terry Sharik suggested a one pager be developed pointing out the advantages of NAUFRP membership to the university agriculture community; the support from agricultural deans would be very helpful. A motion was made by Keith Belli, second by Janaki Alavalapati, to adopt the budget proposed for 2015. It was adopted unanimously.

Washington Counsel, Randy Nuckolls: Randy discussed potential political scenarios for the upcoming mid-term elections in November. There is a Continuing Resolution in place through December 11<sup>th</sup> at current funding levels. He noted 10 years ago McStennis was funded at \$21 million; it is now \$34 million. Funding for the NIFA Agriculture and Food Research Initiative (AFRI) has grown steadily since the beginning of the program and this Administration wants to double it. Forestry had competed very well for dollars, especially in the cap grant arena. Keith Belli added that we've been effective by communicating to faculty that 'forestry' does not have to be in the title and getting them on review panels. Tim White said his faculty is saying they are seeing less forestry and feel we've lost ground. Janaki has heard similar comments from his faculty as well. Keith will follow-up on this at the AFRI meetings he plans later this fall. Randy was asked if Congress will be more effective after the elections. He said Congress is losing the institutional memory on how to act. After the elections, NAUFRP will develop a new Congressional target list and invite our members to come to DC. Steve Bullard said this effort needs to include partners.

Diversity Chair Report, Kamran Abdollahi: Kamran reported on the progress of the Logic Model. The Forest Service is providing \$50,000 in seed money to the Society of American Foresters (SAF) to get it started. A planning meeting will be held in DC and facilitated workshops around the country. It has been frustrating to get momentum going behind diversity efforts. Everyone has activities but we know we haven't had the impact or effectiveness desired. Forestry has the lowest diversity of any discipline. There are a couple of opportunities coming up. Next year's SAF Convention will be in Baton Rouge. We may be able to test the (Logic) model; hopefully the 1890's and Hispanic institutions will be active participants. In April 2015, also in Baton Rouge, Southern University will host a workshop and invite the NAUFRP leadership to attend. Funding from SAF Council is being sought for students to attend the 2015 convention. Kamran was asked if there are regional disparities in diversity enrollment. Terry Sharik has developed a map (presented at the Berkeley conference but not yet published). Rob Swihart believes this could help drive the Logic Model and help with regional diversity recruitment and retention.

Research Chair Report, Keith Belli: Keith reviewed the findings and recommendations of the National Academy of Science's (NAS) comprehensive review of the AFRI program. Keith was the only person with a natural resource background on the panel. The report was released in September. Keith provided a handout which strips down the overall report to specific conclusions and recommendations that he felt NAUFRP should be aware of. The report is final; USDA's reaction is being awaited.

Policy Chair Report, Janaki Alavalapati: Janaki reviewed NAUFRP activities that are key to how we influence policy (handout). We have been effective through the Forests in the Farm Bill Coalition and the Forest Climate Working Group. NAUFRP is currently working with SAF and NAFO on a document regarding the 'Science Fundamentals of Biomass Carbon Accounting'; it is being circulated at this time among NAUFRP administrators and faculty for sign-on support. NAUFRP has co-signed a number of joint letters that are posted on the webpage dealing with climate change, appropriations, wildfire funding and timber tax provisions.

Education Chair Report, Terry Sharik: Terry reviewed his written report. He is very involved with the IUFRO Congress. NAUFRP has urged member institutions to create chapters of the International Forestry Student Association (IFSA) and the number has increased. Terry will be conducting a student survey at the Congress regarding their perspectives on enrolling in undergraduate forestry programs and building upon previous surveys he has conducted. He is currently working on a manuscript on natural resource undergraduate enrollment trends for publication in the SAF Journal of

Forestry next year. The development of the 'Educational Clearinghouse' on the NAUFRP webpage is waiting on a comprehensive re-design being done by Mississippi State University. Terry raised several questions regarding this including who will have access, who is responsible for updates and revisions? Steve said the committee chairs need to be responsible for this as the re-design will be structured around NAUFRP committees. Terry acknowledged the contributions of Bill Richardson (USDA FAEIS) who recently passed away. He worked to make Terry's enrollment trend data compatible with the FAEIS data base. Bill was invaluable; Terry believes we need to convey the importance of this work to the FAEIS leadership. (Action Item) Janaki will find out who NAUFRP needs to write to highlight Bill's work and ensure it is continued with his successor. Steve noted Terry's work and involvement in the UC-Berkeley Forestry Education Summit. Terry said much remains to be done on diversity. Our student bodies are at 14%, the college population at 33% and workforce 10%. Steve recognized Terry's work in these many areas. He reminded that the NAUFRP Undergraduate Strategic Plan grew out of a NIFA grant.

At the March 2014 Executive Committee there was extensive discussion regarding revising the NAUFRP webpage to better align it with the work of the committees. Karen Brasher at Mississippi State University maintains the webpage for an annual fee and was asked to develop a re-design. Copies of a 'skin' were distributed. The proposal was well liked. Steve Bullard asked that further comments be provided to Terri and they would be communicated back to Karen.

International Chair Report, Jim Johnson: Jim reported that the NAUFRP IUFRO Scholarship program was very successful. A total of 33 graduate students from 19 member institutions received \$150 for registration fees for the IUFRO Congress. (These are listed on the handout Jim provided.) Two of these students later received Diversity Scholarships and NAUFRP was refunded \$300. Interest in forming US chapters of the International Forestry Student Association (IFSA) has grown and are now at Oregon State, University of Washington, Michigan Tech and Salish Kootenai College. IUFRO has hired a D.C. law firm to become a 501(c) (3). This will allow federal agency personnel to serve on the IUFRO Executive Committee which has been a problem in the past.

NAFO Survey, Jim Johnson: Jim reported on the survey sponsored by NAUFRP on NAFO member perceptions of and need for forestry and natural resources-related research. (A written report was provided.) It was two years in the making. Thirty NAFO members were selected; the response rate was 70 percent. There is a 32-page report that will be made available. The good news is that NAFO members value their research from the universities and cooperatives. We are their primary source for where they get their research. The survey identified top issues of concern and level of satisfaction with the current intensity of research on these issues. Respondents were also asked to list top resources and tech issues that need priority research in their regions over the next five years and long term. The 'take away' for NAUFRP is that the NAFO membership has real and pressing research needs; these are well-articulated in the report. NAUFRP should work to develop and maintain a relationship with NAFO and seek out NAFO members to serve on advisory boards, participate in cooperatives, conduct collaborative research, etc.

Extension Chair Report, Bob Wagner: Bob reviewed his work to develop MOAs with key partners and provided a handout that depicts a framework for the NAUFRP webpage for 'Forest Research, Education & Outreach Priorities of Partner Organizations'. These groups often do not have research and education priorities articulated. We are helping them do this. The American Forest Foundation is the first organization we are developing a MOA with. We are not likely to have a MOA with NAFO but will work with them to translate the survey into a format for the webpage. Bob is in the process of talking to Paul Trianosky at the Sustainable Forest Initiative about a MOA. He has not made as much progress with NASF and NWOA to date but plans to continue work with them. Bob plans to populate the NAUFRP webpage with these partners and their research, education, and extension outreach priorities and to keep it updated on an annual basis. The strategy is to bring an array of partners to our webpage for this unique information. The focus is on a few partners to begin with; he has an expansive list to build upon. Bob also distributed a detailed written outreach and extension report.

1890 University Report, Carolyn Brooks: Carolyn provided a written report and noted that the 1890s will kick off the 125<sup>th</sup> Anniversary commemorating the signing of the Second Morrill Act at the 2014 APLU Meeting in Orlando, FL next month. There will be a number of events next year in Washington, D. C. highlighting the accomplishments and impacts

of the 1890 institutions. More information can be found at [www.1890universities.org](http://www.1890universities.org). Carolyn's written report included specific updates and information on research and other activities and events at NAUFRP 1890 member institutions.

Budget and Advocacy Committee (BAC) Report, Tim White: Tim reviewed the background on NAUFRP's involvement and membership in BAC. The goal is advocacy for McStennis, AFRI and RREA funding.

Neils Koch, IUFRO President, Mike Wingfield, IUFRO Vice President & Incoming President and Su See Lee, IUFRO Vice President greeted the NAUFRP Executive Committee and joined for lunch. *(Terri to try and get photos from IUFRO staff.)*

Ann Bartuska, USDA Under Secretary for Research, Education and Economics: Ann provided an update on the Climate Hubs that were announced in 2012. Randy Johnson from the Forest Service is the current head but the leadership will rotate every two years. She also discussed the formation of the Foundation for Food and Agricultural Research (FFAR) which was established by the Farm Bill. A board has been named and the Foundation will receive \$200 million which must be matched by non-federal funds. The governance is still being worked out by the intent is for the Foundation to connect with the private sector. Ann thinks there are opportunities here for projects/portfolios at a landscape level for forestry and urges NAUFRP to keep an eye on this. A Presidential Memorandum on Pollinators has come down from the White House and agencies are to develop plans and a strategy by December. New research needs will be identified and addressed beginning in the FY16 budget. Ann's last topic was the 'One Health'. This program originated from concerns around the transfer of disease from animals to humans but there is now greater recognition of the connectivity aspects. Proposals are popping up in different places and she hopes common ground will be found. These are complex, multi-disciplinary questions.

Jim Reaves, Deputy Chief, Research & Development, USDA Forest Service (FS): Jim discussed appropriations, in particular, FIA. He reported that Grants and Agreements are roughly 13-15 percent of their budget -- \$38 million, although not all goes to universities. When reductions come, they try hard not to impact what is going to the university grants. FS R&D does not have the science capacity they used to. They have met with ERS to ensure the FS is not duplicating research. R&D has produced two new reports on outdoor recreation on federal lands and the decline of world market share of roundwood, federal and private. Jim discussed the status of national program leaders and the recent realignment of the Washington Office that will result in staff reductions and more integration. Jim is trying to get the Station Directors to coordinate hiring expertise. Cindi West said the FS is still struggling with diversity. She referenced the Virginia Tech Conference and enrollment trends -- all this leads to the Logic Model which R&D has contributed \$50,000 towards. It will probably begin with a meeting convened in Washington, D.C. and include other professional societies. Steve Bullard commented that it is not just a diversity issue but a numbers one too. The universities are challenged to sustain their capacity. Cindi said the easiest way for the FS to hire students is through the ORISE (Oak Ridge Institute for Science and Education) which is an EPA-affiliated Program.

Luis Tupas, Deputy Director for Bioenergy, Climate and Environment, USDA National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA): Luis noted Ann's comments on 'One Health'. NIFA is looking at multiple aspects of health -- environmental and economic. Environmental health includes sustainable agriculture and waste management. Economic health is where agriculture contributes to bio-economy and products. NIFA is not involved directly in the Climate Hubs but they are deeply involved in the cooperative extension aspects. Eric Norland is part of the group looking at how NIFA will fit into this. The Education and Literacy Initiative is a full work force development program in experimental learning and creates research extension undergraduate experience. It's an opportunity for training research scientists and extension specialists and is a way to learn skills and how to interact. This would be a RFA. Luis talked about the Forestry Products Advanced Utilization Research Program authorized under the Farm Bill (Section 7310). It was authorized at \$7 million and must be an integrated research and education, competitive and multi-institutional or multi-state program/project. By the time the Farm Bill passed, it was too late to get funding for this program into the process for FY15 and 16. NIFA will begin the process of their FY17 budget next February. Luis is seeking input from NAUFRP on how and what this initiative should focus on, what is achievable and what are the metrics. Input can be off-line or in formal recommendations. This is an opportunity for NAUFRP to talk amongst its members first. Randy said NAUFRP should

target the end of the calendar year for developing any recommendations. At our last meeting there was discussion of a workshop; maybe something similar should be considered. Steve Tesch and Steve Shaler are interested in working on this. Steve Bullard added that when the RFA comes out, there is an opportunity for a NAUFRP proposal (workshop) in one of the five AFRI categories. Luis said a conference grant can come from the foundational areas and that they can be awarded out of panel -- but there has to be a RFA. A workshop does not need to definitely be Sec. 7310. Luis is looking forward to a new McStennis Strategic Plan. Luis will try and find seed funds to help with the process. FRAC's recommendations were delivered to the USDA Secretary last week and included one for funding McStennis at \$50 million annually. Luis also discussed the National Academy of Science review of AFRI.

Paul Trianosky, Senior Director, Conservation Partnerships, Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI): Paul noted he has been working with Bob Wagner on a MOA. Paul discussed SFI's Conservation and Community Grants Program. It has been in place since 2010 -- \$2 million in grants for research has been leveraged by partner contributions and matching funds to \$7 million. The RFPs are very broad and have served their purposes fairly well. Now, they are engaged in a process to sharpen and narrow the focus of their grant program. The timing of the RFPs will be shifted to late summer/fall with responses/proposals generated by the end of the calendar year; decisions and funding availability by January 2016. This means there will be no grants in calendar year 2015. SFI hopes to acquire additional funding and increase the amount of leverage: it has been 3:1. About 80-85 percent of the grants are going for conservation research. Paul was asked how much is going to universities. He thinks for 2012 it was probably about 30 percent directly but he also thinks universities are involved with the other recipients. Steve Bullard attended the SFI annual meeting in 2013 and was struck by the diversity of the participants -- some we have lost contact with. Student scholarships were available and attendance by students good. Steve urged NAUFRP colleagues to attend SFI meetings when they occur in their regions. The 2015 conference will be in Lake Tahoe and will celebrate their 20<sup>th</sup> anniversary. They are thinking about how to characterize the impact of SFI's work. What is their footprint? Over 250,000 acres have been SFI certified in the United States and Canada; it is the largest forest certification program in the world and the only program in the world to have a fiber-sourcing component. The standards are being revised and will be out in 2015.

Keith Owens, President-elect, National Association of University Fisheries and Wildlife Programs (NAUFWP): Eric Hallerman, NAUFWP's president, has focused on two things: participation and dues structure. Currently they have about 150 individual members and charge a flat rate of \$600. They have developed a one-pager on the benefits of being a member. Many of the 1890 institutions have fish and wildlife programs but are not members. Dan Edge is involved with developing a clearing house for distance education. A problem is quality control. They are interested in collaborating and interacting with NAUFRP. They have a very similar structure with regional chairs but not committee chairs. Steve noted that NAUFWP have joined us for Hill visits in the past and Randy is their Counsel as well. Terry asked what are the major factors preventing the two associations from becoming one. Keith has not heard this specifically or formally addressed but noted NAUFRP is closely affiliated with SAF and that is a barrier. Rob said other issues include there is no comparable source of formula dollars like McStennis and that there are a number of fish and wildlife cooperative units outside forest and natural resources units.

Society of American Foresters: Matt Menashes, CEO, Louise Murgia (Senior Director, Field Services), Dave Walters (President), Bob Alverts (Vice-President) and Carol Redelsheimer (Director, Science and Education): Dave said they have spent the last three years figuring out where they are -- rebranding and focusing. They are committed to developing a better partnership with NAUFRP. Matt noted, as Dave said, they would have done well in consulting with NAUFRP. They began working on incentives for two-year degree holders to continue their education and get on a pathway to becoming certified foresters. This was shared with Council and accepted. The intent was to encourage continuing education and to encourage the exceptional technician. There would be an eight year work requirement. When they began discussing this with members they start getting some serious questions and pushback, notably one meeting in Texas last summer which Steve Bullard attended. This appears to be an issue in some states and regions and not others. Steve clarified that when he spoke in Texas, it was as a Dean and not as NAUFRP President. The identity of professional foresters is linked to a four-year program; the SAF 'proposal' would tear that down. Terry shares these concerns. Matt said he wants to hear more and go back to their certification board and Council and determine what their desired outcome here is. It would be a mistake to try and put a desired outcome into an existing program. Tim said it would be very good to

hear from employers: employers can tweak the tech training but they want students to have the soft skills when they are first hired. Terry suggested that maybe we can get there by determining what professional skills, knowledge, behavior and ability we mean and want. We have trouble producing a professional in four years as it is. If there is agreement, then we can have this discussion, but we need to agree on outcomes. Rob agrees with Terry. We want a pathway for professional development. Keith noted that more than half of his students are transfers from community college where tuition is free. If UT didn't get the transfer students, they would shut down. David Newman is in a different position: he is responsible for forest technicians at their forest ranger school. He agrees that a two-year tech student is not going to be the same as a four-year student. Jim Zazcek believes this would undercut the accreditation process and eliminate a lot of four year programs. Louise asked how do we encourage two-year students to seek further education and development? Jim Allen asked what is the demand for this? Matt says the latter is a very perceptive question. In hindsight, they need to acknowledge that although the intentions were good, they need to step back and figure out next steps. Steve appreciated the SAF leadership joining the meeting and looks forward to further discussion. Carol talked about changes to the accreditation standard for forest technician. It transitioned from recognition to accreditation in 2009. There has been no comprehensive look at the standard in 20 years. SAF now has four accreditation standards. The wording for all "general standards" will be revised to match. Carol reported that they have had their first program review and site visit on the Natural Resource Management Accreditation. She cannot discuss details before the committee meets. From her perspective, she is very pleased at how well the standard, as written, works when applied. David said from his experience, fundamentally, the review is not that much different than the others. It was interesting because it was new for the Review Team. These students are not forestry 'want-to-be's'; they have chosen to focus more broadly. SUNY has three times the students in natural resources than in forestry. Tim chaired the team and from his perspective, it was a good experience because it was a management degree, different from environmental science. It is broader because it is learning and managing for multiple things; students are better at engaging with the public. With respect to structure and focus on management plans, Terry believes the NR standards are better than the forestry standard. Other comments: accreditation is the stamp of professionalism. NRM was not created to get away from forestry but for those interested in a broader education. The question is what is the value of accreditation, not why is SAF doing accreditation of NRM. Terry asked what is the role of other professional societies in NRM accreditation? Where is SAF on this? Carol said they are still working on this. To participate in the accreditation process, you must be a SAF member.

*Minutes Approved  
March 2, 2015  
Washington, D.C.*