

## NAUFRP EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

March 2-3, 2015  
Washington, D.C.

Executive Committee Participants: Jim Allen, President (Northern Arizona University); Steve Bullard, Immediate Past-President (Stephen F. Austin State University); David Newman, Secretary-Treasurer, (SUNY-ESF); Phil Tappe, Southern Regional Chair (University of Arkansas); Kamran Abdollahi, Diversity Chair (Southern University); Keith Belli, President-Elect (University of Tennessee); John Hayes, International Chair (Colorado State University); Mike Messina, Northeast Regional Chair (Pennsylvania State University); Janaki Alavalapati, Policy Chair (Virginia Tech University); Terry Sharik, Education Chair (Michigan Tech University); Red Baker, Research Chair (University of Kentucky); 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); Steve Tesch, Oregon State University; Dan Robison, West Virginia University;

NAUFRP Guests and Presenters: Eric Hallerman, President NAUFWP, (Virginia Tech), 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); Matt Menashes, CEO, Society of American Foresters (SAF); Bob Alverts, SAF President; Tom Martin, President and CEO, American Forest Foundation; Doug Austen, Executive Director, American Fisheries Society; Steve Koehn, Director and Beatra Wilson, Cooperative Forestry, USDA Forest Service; Ali Mohammed (NIFA), Wendy Fink, Association of Public Land Grant Universities; Jay Farrell, Executive Director, National Association of State Foresters; Susan Stein, Director, Agroforestry Center, USDA Forest Service; Steve Hart, R&D USDA Forest Service; Felipe Sanchez, R&D USDA Forest Service

Welcome and Introductions. The agenda was reviewed; there were no changes.

Terry Sharik made a **motion**, seconded by Steve Bullard, to adopt the draft minutes of the October 7, 2014 Executive Committee meeting in Salt Lake City, UT. These have been previously circulated for review and comment on two occasions. Several edits and corrections were noted. The minutes were unanimously approved with the noted edits.

Jim Allen reviewed a list of potential NAUFRP priorities for 2015-16 (handout) he had developed and asked for comments or further suggestions. Janaki suggested it might be of value to have a panel of experts on climate science meet with NAUFRP. This might be a way to reach out to organizations that are not as directly involved in forestry and other branches of government like the White House Office of Science and Technology (OST) which is a driver of policy decisions more than ever before. Randy suggested identifying a committee with Wendy Fink and involving the Board of Natural Resources (BNR). Randy noted another audience we need to educate on the BNR Roadmap is the Forest Service. Randy has talked to Jim Reaves about targeting a date to meet with the FS R&D leadership. He asked Wendy whether Catherine Wotecki or Ann Bartuska had been briefed on the Roadmap. She said no, only Sonny Ramaswamy has. He asked her also who is the chair of BNR? She said it is supposed to go the Chair on Ecology but that is not 100 percent certain. John Hayes recommended using the report as a means to the end – it can be used as a venue to get in the door to talk to non-traditional forestry people. He supports Janaki's suggestion but also to use the Roadmap to get into other areas to raise the profile of the BNR and APLU. Janaki believes this could lead to new funding from non-conventional sources.

Policy Committee Report, Janaki Alavalapati: Janaki shared a written report noting that NAUFRP has been very engaged with two groups: the Forests in the Farm Bill Coalition and the Forest Climate Working Group. Both are led by Rite Hite at the American Forest Foundation (AFF). He highlighted policy letters that NAUFRP has signed on to over the last year. These are posted on the NAUFRP webpage. Also notable is the letter we generated for the U.S. Environmental

Protection Agency (EPA) on the science fundamentals of forest biomass accounting which 100 of our members and their faculty signed. We did receive a response from EPA on this. Steve Bullard noted that this effort helped cement our relationship with Dave Tenny and NAFO (National Alliance of Forest Owners). Janaki noted that the American Forest Foundation has adopted a position to support McIntire-Stennis (McS) program funding at \$35.5 million in FY2016. This is a 5 percent increase over last year's funding and the President's FY16 request. Randy discussed the President's budget for NIFA which provided increases for Hatch and AFRI and sprinkled \$20 million in competitive funds over three programs. McS was not part of this. BAC wants these increases but not as competitive dollars. The increase would mean a 5 percent increase for Hatch and thus, we sought a 5 percent increase for McS as well – the same percentage as Hatch. BAC supports this. An argument for the McS increase is the 1890s impact on McS. This is something to work on for the FY17 budget. In reality, we are likely to see the FY16 Budget Resolution decrease agriculture dollars. The irony of this is that the 2007 McS Strategic Plan recommended support for competitive dollars at a certain minimum level but the President's FY16 budget excludes the competitive component for McS while adding it to three other capacity programs. Randy noted that BAC opposes the competitive funding component in the budget mainly because they believe this is OMB's backdoor way of squashing capacity programs. Resuming his report, Janaki said that the FCWG is seeking members to serve on two working committees (Carbon Mitigation Technical and Carbon Incentives Policy). We sent a request to the listserve and understand there were a number of volunteers. Randy said it is important that we remain a part of BAC. Much credit needs to be given to Tim White for being engaged with them. If he wasn't on the phone with them, BAC would never have supported a McS budget increase. Janaki suggested going together with 1890s. Jim asked if we want to identify a committee but Randy wants to talk to Wendy first. There was discussion about regional committee chairs; we used to have these but do not currently. A weak link at the moment is the fact that two regional chairs are not here but maybe we can tap into regional committee chairs at a different level (faculty).

Education Committee Report, Terry Sharik: Terry reviewed his written report. He noted that there will be a special edition of the *Journal of Forestry* later this year focused on the University of California Berkeley Forestry Education Summit. He will have an article on improving diversity as well as one on undergraduate enrollment trends. He noted that work remains to be done with integrating his enrollment data with FAEIS, especially in the wake of Bill Richardson's death. Janaki asked if he could help by talking to the FAEIS representatives at Virginia Tech. Terry thought that would be good and said he would also like to make a trip to Blacksburg to meet with them at some point. Terry conducted an international student survey at the Salt Lake City IUFRO World Congress and SAF Convention asking what attracted them to forestry/natural resources and what did not. He was pleased with the 50-plus percent response rate. A survey of the NAUFRP student population is probably needed because there is a bias in the IUFRO and SAF National Convention student survey population. He has several items ready to go up on the Education Clearinghouse webpage although it would be good to discuss guidelines on what material should go there with the regional committee chairs. Steve believes education within NAUFRP deserves more emphasis; the culture needs to be changed. He reviewed the background on how the idea for the Education Clearinghouse was generated and also discussions about re-designing the webpage (the latter began at this meeting last year) around the committee structure. The Extension-Outreach Committee has material to be profiled -- the idea is to post and maintain the research priorities of our partners. **Action Item:** Jim Allen to talk to George Hopper about next steps for the webpage. Terry serves on a USDA Employment Outlook Report Team for agriculture and natural resources which will present draft results this Thursday at APLU and final results at the APLU annual meeting. Wendy said there is a meeting on Friday between the Board of Agriculture and the National Academy of Science (NAS) to plan a workshop on the agriculture (broad use, includes natural resources) workforce pipeline. **Action Item:** She will get us information on it. Steve noted that the Biennial Conference on University Education in Natural Resources (UENR) is in the works for March 2016 at Stevens Point, WI. It has been five years since the Undergraduate Strategic Plan was developed. It might be good to consider reconvening the Task Force to revise and update the Plan and list of accomplishments. John Houghton, who is now retired, may still be in the area and able to help on this. Keith Owens pointed out that item 12 on Jim's Priority list should include other societies.

Research Committee Report, Red Baker: Red has just assumed this chair position. He has identified some potential efforts/activities (handout) for the research committee and asked for comments and discussion. One idea is to develop and/or renew relationships with agencies NAUFRP hasn't touched base with in recent times. He plans to visit the National Science Foundation tomorrow and continue the trips back to DC to visit with NIFA and other agencies. He asked for additions to his list and possible contact points. **Action Item:** Janaki has DOE contacts and will provide to Red.

A question for discussion is whether the database created for NIFA should be shared more broadly with other agencies/organizations? He will ask NSF about their needs. Steve thinks it would be relatively easy to email those in the database and ask that they update their material and solicit additional names at the same time. From the earlier discussion, it is clear that there needs to be close coordination between BAC and NAUFRP's Research and Policy chairs. Wendy noted there is a big push within APLU to have a coordinated message. There will be a joint 'Cops' (APLU ESCOP and ASCOP) meeting this summer to focus on developing a 'unified message'. She would really like to see two representatives from NAUFRP and the professional societies involved. It will be July 20-22 in Providence, RI. Wendy will send further information on this to Terri and Jim. Terry suggested that revisiting the McS formula could lead to increasing some political clout. Eric Norland said since FRAC advises on the distribution of McS funds, it would be good to get that topic on their agenda. Steve said changing the formula would require a change in the law. Steve reviewed the background on how/why the 2007 McS Strategic Plan addressed having a competitive component in McS. (Bush Admin was zeroing out capacity programs in favor of competitive). Phil Tappe will be going with Red to NSF tomorrow; others are invited.

Diversity Committee Report, Kamran Abdollahi: Kamran distributed a written report that included a list of upcoming diversity-related meetings. Plans for the Logic Model workshops were discussed. He identified opportunities for diversity outreach and feedback as well as possible collaboration with Hispanic and Tribal partners.

Doug Austen, Executive Director, American Fisheries Society: Doug noted that Matt Menashes, Ken Williams (Executive Director, The Wildlife Society) and he have been with their professional societies less than two years. Doug was formerly at the US Department of Interior and head of the Pennsylvania state agency. AFS has about 70 chapters. Ken was to be here today but was unable to make it due to illness. He was going to talk about Cooperative Units; they do phenomenal work. AFS and TWS met here last summer with NAUFWP. Doug discussed the Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership (TRCP) which includes 35 non-profits. It is an advocacy group and does a good job with consistent and effective messages. AFS and TWS are planning a first ever joint meeting between the two societies in 2019. They expect attendance to be between 5,000 and 7,000 – the largest professional (natural resources) meeting ever. They are attending each other's annual meeting and have formed working teams/groups that are meeting jointly. Terry referenced the Denver meeting that took place sometime around 2011/2012 and involved multiple natural resource professional societies. There was tremendous energy around that meeting but then the executive directors of several of the organizations left and things seem to fizzle out. Michael Hutchins (TWS) seemed to be the force behind it all. There was a publication that came out of it that was very useful and is available on the web (<http://joomla.wildlife.org/documents/cnrs.report.pdf>). A complication at the time was the debate around the SAF accreditation issue of natural resource management programs. Doug said nothing has been resurrected since he came on board with AFS. Randy asked for more information on TRCP. Doug reiterated it is an advocacy group with funding from multiple sources ([www.trcp.org](http://www.trcp.org)). Randy noted that forestry and natural resources have no active constituencies and this group is of interest to us. Matt said there is a role for SAF in TRCP. It started with a fisheries/aquatic agenda. Matt says the role for Doug, Ken and he is to move conservation a step forward. There is a distinction between professional natural resource societies and this organization which meets twice a year in DC and invites external groups in. Eric Norland noted AFS's Hutton Program: high school students are attached to a professional with a paid internship. These students often go into the profession. He asked if TWS or SAF have a similar program? Doug said the program has been a wonderful success, especially for diversity. It has been around for 15 years and has federal funding. Steve noted that a natural tie for AFS and TWS is the Biennial Conference on University Education in Natural Resources. There are several things underway that place us all on parallel paths. Jim asked about next steps. Terry says a lot happens around education. **Action Item:** at minimum, have one representative for each natural resource society at the UENR conference. **Action Item:** Terri to ensure Doug and Ken (and Matt) have information on the next 2016 UENR conference.

Eric Hallerman, President, National Association of University Fisheries and Wildlife Programs (NAUFWP): Eric said both our organizations have a fundamental interest in education. NAUFWP looks forward to seeing the Education Clearinghouse. An ongoing issue is tuition and USDA. Eric believes there is value in meeting with NAUFRP and would like to see it happen regularly, maybe mid-year. Regarding a merger of our two associations, he believes they have their own identity. Most of their members are department heads and see the world a bit differently, but there is merit to

institutionalizing some things. Terry noted that when we changed our name there was debate on other names including using 'Natural Resources' but in the end we backed away because of the perception it might not be welcomed by NAUFWP. Jim Allen noted we would be making joint Hill visits tomorrow. Eric thinks that is important. John Hayes agrees with Eric about not merging; it might dilute both organizations and we can be stronger as two. Jim asked if a forestry session at the joint AFS/TWS meeting might be feasible? Doug said yes and noted that a recent issue of their magazine focused on fire impacts on aquatics. Eric said our committee structures are similar and it might be valuable to get them together.

Cindi West, Associate Deputy Chief, USDA Forest Service Research & Development: Cindi reviewed a handout on the Forest Service R&D FY16 budget recommendations. Their budget is organized around seven strategic program areas, many of which are cross-cutting (i.e. restoration). The proposed FY16 budget for the Forest and Inventory Analysis (FIA) Program is up by \$12 million which would reduce the inventory cycle and bring Alaska into the program. But the FIA increase comes at the expense of other program areas. If it passes, there would mean an eight percent reduction cut from other programs. The fundamental challenge in the FS budget is fire funding: it eats away at everything – 50 percent of the budget is tied up with fire. The states are investing less in FIA than in the past which shifts capacity to the FS. The FS is investing in technology – remote sensing will eventually help decrease FIA costs. They are also working to make FIA data more accessible and available. An emphasis area in the budget is the National Center for Natural Resource Economics Research. This is a virtual center using partners including universities. LuAnn Lohr is the coordinator and comes out of the university system. A focus area for R&D next year will be describing, estimating and valuing ecosystem services. R&D has the leadership for 3 of the USDA Climate Hubs and two sub-hubs. There is no additional funding for this; it is being redirected. Cindi says this is an extension opportunity; look at leverage. Questions: this is somewhat confusing – are there formal links between USGS hubs and these? Is there a clear way to engage? Cindi says the Climate Hubs have been set up to identify science gaps and are to work collaboratively across all lands. The USDA hubs are about tech transfer to non-federal entities. Several examples are provided in the handout. 'Pollinators' are a focus/priority of the Administration. There are gaps in forest knowledge and native plants. Another priority of the Administration is building new and enhancing existing partnerships with the Tribes through a Tribal Roadmap. The Revitalize American Manufacturing and Innovation Act was passed in late 2014. The FY16 budget includes \$80 million in funding to support two Institutes focused on bio-based materials and cellulosic nano materials. The vision is to have a network to share resources and learning. Institute structure and solicitations are still being developed. Industry collaboration and matching funds will be required.

Steve Koehn, Director, Cooperative Forestry, USDA Forest Service: Steve was recently on a University of Florida SAF accreditation review where he asked about diversity recruitment and retention plans and learned the university really did not have one. Tim White and Steve discussed the possibility of a grant to develop a master plan for universities at a comprehensive and individual scale. Beatra Wilson on his staff works with the 1890s. Steve is here to offer his help; he is just learning about plans for the Logic Model. He doesn't want to reinvent anything. Ali said McS funds can be used to bring in the 1862 and 1890s to exchange students and faculty. Steve Bullard said McS funds can be used to do this kind of research. Terry asked Steve Koehn if he is thinking only about race/ethnic diversity or whether he would include gender and socio-economic diversity parameters? Steve indicated all. Matt said the biggest challenge in the next 20 years is the changing nature of forest landowners – they will be a different kind of person and will put pressure on 'us' on how forestry is to be practiced in the future. We have to train the next generation to practice-act-speak in that new context. What are the next steps? The Logic Model is the first. A major question is whether to involve other agencies. April 21 is an opportunity for a workshop in Baton Rouge; another is at the November 2016 SAF Convention also in Baton Rouge. The first action is to engage a contractor; a team is needed for this. Dan says we need an inventory of what works and does not. Steve said yes, this is Stage 3 of the Logic Model: who is doing what and what works. Terry said there is a list of strategies in his JOF article.

Cindi said about 15 percent of the R&D budget goes to the universities and the FS also helps funnel dollars from other agencies to the universities. R&D contributes another \$20-\$35 million to university infrastructure. The Forest Service R&D leadership is concerned they won't be able to replace their retiring FS scientists. Red asked what the percentage in FS R&D is real vs. actual. Cindi said, bottom-line there is not a huge decrease, but a lot is going into FIA.

Bob Alverts, President and Matt Menashes, CEO, Society of American Foresters: Bob met with NAUFRP last year and talked about SAF's priorities. These matched well with NAUFRP's. A shared theme is 'growing the pie'. Bob noted that Steve Bullard served on the search committee that recruited Matt. SAF currently accredits 46 four-year programs and 24 two-year programs. Member loss is approximately five percent a year; SAF is not alone in this downward trend. Only one-third of their membership is under 50 years of age which is a great concern. Membership stands at approximately 12,000. The next generation is key to the future. SAF is working to find ways to engage new members. They are also working to strengthen governance. Matt has restructured the staff. They want to be relevant to their members and not associated as a trade association. SAF officers are trying to get out around the country to speak with the SAF membership in one voice.

Matt said SAF is putting new energy into relationships. He has restructured their government affairs staff and policy committee. What is key to him is re-engaging with the community and focusing on common objectives. For 100 years, SAF has operated as a federation and never established a common vision of the membership. A role is to try and reconnect people to natural resources. SAF and NAUFRP are in a unique position to rebuild public trust in the natural resource profession. We cannot change the face of the profession without engaging the public and stakeholders – and who those stakeholders are needs to be broadened to include those who impact resources (climate, health care, ... ) Society is changing at a rapid pace. We need to be part of the conversation and valuation. The universities saw the changes before SAF did because of students and changes in programs (example: SUNY with first SAF accreditation in Natural Resource Management). SAF is now paying dramatic attention to students and student chapters recognizing they need to grow the younger member age class. Matt intends to develop relationships with student chapter advisors. They are beginning a pilot program to offer accredited institutions a voucher for a complimentary application fee for the student Candidate Certified Forester program (handout). Matt hopes to begin a discussion of future Council of Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) accreditation of SAF in Baton Rouge. SAF received a letter denying them certification as an accreditor on February 19<sup>th</sup>. Matt has appeared before the CHEA Board. Denial was based on the partial failure of one standard out of the 50. CHEA wants SAF accredited institutions to publicize student achievements; about 60% of the accredited institutions are doing that. The thinking now is that they will reapply; it is a two-year process. Matt says it is up to the institution as to where and how much information to put out, but it is by degree program that is accredited. The recommendation is to get that information close to the Home Page. Question: is there a guidance memo? Matt says they will have one when they get further clarification. Terry says he does not remember being asked to provide this information. Another issue the SAF Board is looking at is third party reviewers. They have left it to Matt who constitutes a third party. Matt says it is probably easiest to go back to CHEA but he is not guaranteeing that. Bob said an option might be to bring the natural resource societies together for a third party review. Q: Is the Southern Group of State Foresters now considering hiring graduates from non-accredited institutions? Matt said that the states increasingly don't like to be exclusive with their hiring practices. Matt said the rankings of SAF's journals are not to scale as others like Ecology – so the value is not there. They are trying to reverse that. They are also trying to feature research articles in *The Forestry Source*; the purpose is to build relationships. SAF is also going to try and build a book publishing role and would like to hear from NAUFRP on this. The idea is to pursue original materials. Bob discussed the concept of a SAF role managing land/estates noting there are multiple dimensions and complexities to this. A committee headed by Tammy Cushings is being formed; names are being solicited. Q: what is the primary goal of this -- financial, educational? Bob said that is part of the question; he thinks this could be multi-dimensional. Q: SAF's use of social media with students? Matt says this is a great idea. They have year round interns and Bob said University of Georgia and Florida students are being challenged to propose five apps that SAF could develop assuming they had the resources. Jim Allen noted that a professor at NAU has founded Women in Wildlife on Facebook that has been successful.

Tom Martin, President and CEO, American Forest Foundation: About a year ago, AFF funded an effort to try and figure out how to develop a common message. Weyerhaeuser, Plum Creek and the Endowment were some of the groups involved. They reached a conclusion that there are two types of internal audiences (CEOs and 'us' -- the rank and file -- stakeholders, employees of companies, mid-management, consultants, ...) and three external audiences (policy makers, customers and potential employees) that we/they want to reach. Part of the problem is 'our' (forestry's) inability to tell a coherent story. AFF believes the answer is not a big ad campaign, but of communicating basic values (socio, economic) and developing basic mechanisms to tell the story. Tom hopes this effort will provide the language and a framework to

tell a 'personal' story. Universities are important to the effort of forestry, conservation, production. Red asked if AFF plans to engage extension folks? Tom said very much so once there is more shape. It probably won't launch for another 10 months. Steve noted at the Berkeley Summit on Forest Education the Curriculum session discussed whether the term 'forestry' was attractive. The feeling was that it seems like forestry has lost the high ground. Dan said high school students are more attracted to environmental science. Tom said Project Learning Tree (PLT) is in the midst of being reworked. They hope to tie PLT more closely to what educators are held accountable to. John asked if they are engaged with 4H? Tom said yes. Another issue AFF is focused on is Tax Reform. Congressman Camp and Senator Baucus left a proposal that dealt with TIMOs, long-term capital gains and the reforestation deduction. The likelihood of Congress accomplishing anything complex like tax reform is minimal but there will still be a lot of debate and posturing for future elections -- tax reform resonates well with voters and candidates. Tom feels we will have an opportunity to tell the story of forests. Issues in play that could involve research from universities include looking at the impact of tax code changes on environmental detriments derived from ownership fragmentation/parcelization, long-term impacts on forests if capital gains treatment and/or the reforestation deduction is changed. They have put together a coalition (forest products companies (Plum Creek), conservation groups (TNC, CF, Land Trust, NAFO) to solicit ideas on tax policies. Different ideas have come up, for example, deductions for wildlife feed plots and recreation establishment costs. Steve asked if AFF has a vehicle we can use to communicate the relevance of forestry and careers in forestry? Tom said yes. Another effort they are involved in and includes the Endowment is trying to figure out a strategic position for the forestry sector in Carbon. There are blind spots and gaps in carbon science that need research. Other potential research areas are: relationships between markets and private forest owners, helping to understand long-term forest health relative to markets (i.e. European pellet). More states will be adopting strategies for Carbon; we're missing how to monetize long-term forest carbon. Other potential research areas: assumptions around wood-building longevity; long-term U.S. fiber outlook; long-term impact of harvesting on forest soil carbon and soil productivity; strategies for dealing with surge harvesting especially after a natural disaster and recycling of wood building components. Tom's final words were that AFF very much values and appreciates NAUFRP's partnership.

Luis Tupas, Deputy Director, Bioenergy, Climate and Environment, USDA national Institute of Food and Agriculture: Luis reported on the President's FY2016 proposed budget. AFRI would be increased by 25 percent. The Advanced Forest Products Program is not funded. The Innovation Institute is funded at \$80 million (see Cindi West). NIFA is very pleased with the budget. The RFP for the Climate Change and Water Challenge Area was released last week. FY17 budget planning is in the early planning stages and this is a good point for input on the McS Strategic Plan. Discretionary funds are very limited. **Action Item:** NAUFRP to provide Luis a prospectus per the McS Strategic Plan. NIFA can provide up to \$50,000 for a workshop and a proposal can be reviewed off-panel. Randy suggested Steve and Red work on this. Eric Norland asked for more specifics on the FY17 planning process: time wise, when are the best points for NAUFRP input. Luis said get recommendations to the Director Sonny Ramaswamy by July. The Administration is very interested and has an initiative on bio-economy (jobs, economic growth and stability) where forest product utilization would fit. It could be a state/regional initiative. Randy asked Luis to provide some background on the proposal for a competitive capacity grant component in certain programs. Luis encouraged NAUFRP to remind Sonny that when the 1890s were added to McS, there were no additional funds to absorb this, yet in the newly proposed competitive components, increases are provided. The 2008 Farm Bill, which made the 1890s eligible, predates Sonny. Luis urged framing things around how they can help economics. He urged NAUFRP to meet with Sonny one-on-one. The \$20 million proposed for the competitive components would go to three programs (Hatch, Evans-Allen and Smith-Lever). Terry asked how much McS goes to the 1890s? In 2015, the amount was about \$1.8 million. Luis again urged NAUFRP to develop ideas for FY17 around bio-economy and the 1890 institutions. **Action Item:** letter to Sonny and small group visit with Sonny per FY17 budget recommendations. The background on NAUFRP's FY16 recommendation to increase McS by five percent was explained to Luis – this is equivalent to the Hatch proposed increase in the President's budget. Luis reviewed the Centers of Excellence; these are not brick and mortar. They are recognition to a NIFA awardee that has also fulfilled legislative requirements. If there are two proposals of equal merit, that award will go to the one designated as a Center of Excellence. It's a 'branding'. Wendy advises to keep the Board of Agriculture informed and involved so they are not surprised as things evolve on NAUFRP future budget recommendations.

A written report was submitted by Bob Wagner, Chair of the Extension and Outreach Committee. Bob is stepping down as chair. Discussion about possible chair replacements.

Treasurer's Report, David Newman: David reviewed a hardcopy report that focused primarily on the close out of calendar year 2014. The final numbers came in a little under budget, however we did not pay anything out for the Education Clearinghouse (\$3,000) or International Student Survey at IUFRO (\$5,000). Both of these will be carried over to 2015. Handout and discussion about setting up a credit card through NAUFRP's bank, PNC, to accept annual dues payments. David says his own institution presses them to do as much by credit card as possible. The proposal here would be via a Gateway on our webpage – all handled by PNC (no impact on the webpage manager other than initial set-up). There would be several one-time costs to set it up and a monthly fee. We would propose a three percent administration fee to cover our costs. David would like Executive Committee approval to pursue this -- specifically, approval to set the process up and charge a 3 percent administration fee. Steve Bullard made a **motion** to do this; seconded by Keith Belli. The motion passed by unanimous approval. Discussion followed about membership and non-payment of dues. Using the regional chairs to encourage engagement and participation was suggested. Also, it would be useful to develop a one-pager on the value of membership to use in 'recruiting'. Mike said he contacts all the Northeast university reps and includes a request to let him know if they want to be taken off his contact list; so far, no one has made that request. Eric Hallerman was asked how NAUFRP handles dues. He said they charge a flat fee by program. They also have a new tier of membership for individuals at \$150/annually. They have about 38 programs that pay and 3-4 individuals. Questions about the correlation between an institution's ATR representative and forestry and how many ATR's were at the March 2014 meeting? Eric Norland said there were about 80. **Action Item:** There appeared to be consensus to develop a one-pager on the value of membership that the regional chairs can use. It was noted that there is value in counting the non-dues paying institutions. Also noted, there is agreement to share the list of non-dues paying members annually.

Forestry Research and Advisory Council (FRAC): Eric Norland reported on behalf of FRAC; he is a current member. There are four categories of membership. Five new members have just been appointed. The Forest Service provides support for FRAC; Daina Apple is the lead. In the past that function was traded off regularly between NIFA and the Forest Service, but is now permanently housed with the Forest Service. The agenda is set by the chairperson who is currently Cassandra Mosely, University of Oregon. FRAC develops a report and recommendations once a year for the Secretary of Agriculture. This has included recommending McS funding be increased to \$50 million annually and making the 1994 institutions eligible for the program. Discussion: it is hard to find current info on FRAC on-line. A FRAC webpage is under construction. It has been 20 years since the NRC National Assessment on Forest Research Capacity -- this might be a good agenda item for FRAC. Eric said it would be good for NAUFRP to get on the FRAC agenda. There are periodic calls for nominations. At least two names go forward to the Secretary for selection. In the past, NAUFRP has written to support specific nominations. Perhaps a letter/email to Cassandra Mosely requesting agenda time. FRAC will next meet in June or July and submit their report to the Secretary in later summer. **Action Item:** NAUFRP will request time on FRAC's agenda at their next meeting in June. Randy noted that we worked to get the \$50 million recommendation from FRAC. Two years ago, the members on FRAC had little understanding of the McS program. Eric reviewed the current FRAC membership list. Academics included Adrian Leighton, Myron Floyd, Bob Smith, Deb McCullough. Another option is to invite FRAC to meet with NAUFRP and/or the BNR. Randy thinks comparable proposals/recommendations coming from multiple groups like FRAC and NAUFRP will elevate things with Sonny. Eric said that FRAC wrote an interim report this year regarding the Forest Service R&D budget recommending that it be no less than 10 percent of the total agency budget including FIA (currently R&D is 7-8 percent including FIA). Eric thinks the BNR Roadmap and NAUFRP priorities should be on the FRAC agenda. Randy said we will follow-up with Daina Apple but we need to be specific with her. FRAC needs formal and regular input from NAUFRP. Eric said someone other than himself needs to advocate for the NIFA budget. It was suggested that the BNR Chair brief FRAC on the Roadmap. Bob Smith will be going off FRAC; we should seek to have a NAUFRP Executive Committee member nominated for FRAC membership when that happens.

ATR Report, Steve Bullard: Steve said that Catalino's interpretation of NIFA guidance is that McS funds cannot be used for international research work. USDA lawyers have been looking into this question for some time but have not provided a formal response. Eric suggested this topic be brought to Sonny. Steve said we had been pushing to use McS funds for research on scholarship and learning on forestry and natural resources. At first, Catalino seemed okay with this but now seems to be waffling. This may need to be addressed with Sonny or Luis. Steve has a faculty member with a proposal that will be a test case. **Action Item:** Red will author a proposal for a conference planning grant. Planning

conferences are usually about the state of science and Eric suggested to try and work in forests with climate change or water. What is the time frame for this? The work/results that came out of the Shepherdstown meeting was pretty comprehensive. It may be that not a lot has changed and a starting point might be the existing Strategic Plan.

International Chair Report, John Hayes: NAUFRP has been invited to the Conference of Deans and Directors of European Forestry Faculties and Schools (ConDEFFS) in Bulgaria in May. John cannot attend but Jim is considering. John is a new chair and solicited ideas and suggestions for him to pursue. Terry noted the several International Forestry Student Association (IFSA) chapters have been formed in the US. There is a lot going on internationally at our institutions, but it has never been pulled together. It would be helpful to know what others are doing. We don't know what our international capacity is. Keith said this might be an idea for the fall meeting. John's only reservation is it is constantly evolving. Terry would like something akin to the Education Clearinghouse. An example of a geographic database that could be used for tracking international activity is the one being used at the University of Florida IFAS to track research activity within that program at county, state, and country scales (<http://research.ifas.ufl.edu/research/research^map>).

Jay Farrell, Executive Director, National Association of State Foresters (NASF): Jay introduced NASF's current intern, Nicole Leinders, St. Lawrence University. NASF has a program of four paid interns a year. They look for different types of backgrounds varying in communications and policy. Jay will send Terri an announcement for their summer internship to distribute on the listserv. Jay had a folder handout that covered NASF appropriation requests and other key issues which include the Fire Funding legislation. This legislation has bi-partisan support in Congress. NASF's appropriations focus is on the Forest Service. Industry (AF&PA) is pushing hard for FIA. Joe Fox, Arkansas State Forester, will testify in the House on Waters of the US. Jim Carl, Florida State Forester, will testify on appropriations. NASF will soon publish a BMP Report on the 'State of the States on BMPs'. This was done in partnership with Virginia Tech, SFI and S&PF and addresses implementation rates. The ultimate audience is EPA to inform the debate that BMPs work. This should be out by April 1 and found on their website. Scott Josiah, Nebraska State Forester, is NASF's appointed liaison with NAUFRP. Steve asked Jay if NASF supports McS funding appropriations? Jay said yes but that hasn't been a priority but hopes to help where he can. Jay is enthusiastic about formalizing their partnership with us. Red noted that McS helps address local priorities and many of the universities work closely with State Foresters. The NASF Executive Committee meets next in DC April 27-29 and NAUFRP will be invited. It was suggested that Larry Biles, Kansas State Forester, would be a good liaison with NAUFRP.

Sonny Ramaswamy, Director, USDA National Institute of Food and Agriculture, by conference phone: Sonny gave a FY 2016 budget overview. He is pleased with the President's budget for AFRI; it is up 38 percent from last year's level. AFRI is authorized at \$750 million; this budget is starting to get there. Sonny highlighted three areas of critical interest to the Administration: pollinators, anti-microbial resistance, and bio-economics. He encourages everyone to read the budget narrative; it will help with formative thinking and to pull together compelling grant proposals. There is a 50 percent increase for investments in foundational areas. In 2014 they had over 3,000 RFAs of which over 1,200 were recommended for funding; 382 of these were actually funded. In the 'Plants' area they had 151 proposals, 25 were recommended as outstanding but they could only fund 10. They are proposing two Innovation Institutes (see Cindi West discussion also). The Hill directed these be incorporated into AFRI and they are in the areas of bio-manufacturing and nano-cellulostics. There is a \$20 million increase request to support new competitive elements in three existing programs. NIFA will launch a new website next week. Terry asked about the reporting system; problems with it were discussed at last year's ATR meeting. What is happening with it? Sonny said they have had a lot of input and invites more. They want it to be completely user friendly; they are also going to seek authority through the *Federal Register* to gather even more data. Randy said that as part of our work to update the McS Strategic Plan, we are trying to understand how we can be helpful to Sonny in making the case for increased capacity in FY17. We are talking to Luis about a planning conference. Sonny says we need to get a cost of living increase for our programs. He spoke of the '3 Cs': capacity, capital infrastructure, competitive grants. Sonny has been really pushing for the last and it has finally floated up. APLU wants the \$20 million increase to be non-competitive. It is critically important to talk about the capacity of all endeavors and truly maintain it. Randy asked why McS was not a part of the \$20 million competitive component? How did it get built? Can Sonny help us understand the background? Sonny said "no comment". Randy said, if the \$20 million was to encourage closer relationships between 1862 and 1890s, the last Farm Bill rolled the 1890s into McS, with no net increase. NAUFRP encourages NIFA to address that beginning in the FY17 budget. Sonny advised



to pursue this quickly; the FY 17 priorities are underway. Come in with a compelling concept note that he can use and he will promise he will consider it. Think it through carefully – tie to jobs, economic terms and ask to take McS from where it is today to where we think it needs to be. Randy explained to Sonny the background for BAC's recommendation for a five percent increase in McS (its equivalent to the Hatch increase.) Steve asked if a concept paper should include the 1994s which was a FRAC recommendation? Sonny said absolutely – and think about linking it to economic viability of community. Question about the BNR Roadmap and sustainable agriculture. Sonny said the game in town is AFRI, noting BIRDI went from \$30 million to \$3 million. He urged NAUFRP to get into the habit annually of developing compelling priorities. Sonny said we need to get our faculty to sign up for panels. Jim Allen said we have worked hard on that and have a list on our webpage although it may need to be updated. Regarding the 1994s, the challenge is most are two-year programs, and do not have research capacity. After the call ended, Randy said we need to justify asking for more dollars each year. He also noted Sonny's recommendation to develop a concept paper every year. **Action Item:** Jim will start a one-pager and share it with the Executive Committee for feedback. Randy urged attention to the P-Cast Reports; many relate to AFRI. The key message should underscore the need to not only maintain capacity and increase it tied to emerging national needs and use new partners. We need to communicate to our faculty the foundational opportunities.

Southern NAUFRP Report, Phil Tappe: Southern NAUFRP met in SLC with very good attendance: 15 universities were represented and several partners including Eric Young, Bill Hubbard and Keith Argow. They discussed the need for a regional website and tabled that till they see what happens with the NAUFRP webpage. They discussed the Comparative Data Survey's value and decided not to make any changes. In the past, southern NAUFRP has met in conjunction with the Forest Landowners Association (FLA) annual meeting/convention, however they may try a new model -- rotating the meeting among the southern member institutions. The date is not set but hopefully it will be at Virginia Tech. Red said SNAUFRP has felt value in the FLA membership but wonders what impression others have? Steve has had several articles in their magazine. Membership costs them \$100.

Northeastern NAUFRP Report, Mike Messina: Mike provided a written report from the Northeast and North Central NAUFRP joint meeting in Salt Lake City. They have discussed merging but decided not to; they will continue to meet together. Jim Zazcek will serve one more year as the North Central Chair. They are talking about a one-day fly-in meeting with Michael Rains in later May at the Philadelphia airport. They did this five years ago and found it very useful. In SLC, their institutions shared a one-pager each on what is going on each campus. Mike will share with the Executive Committee a PowerPoint developed by Mike Rains on "The State of the Union and the New 114<sup>th</sup> Congress: Potential Impacts on Research & Development, USDA Forest Service.

Western NAUFRP plans a summer meeting at Colorado State University.

Randy said he can travel to the regional meetings (or skype) and can help arrange for a Congressional member or staff to attend which might attract more interest. David asked if NAUFRP can support a regional conference/meeting through NAUFRP's Strategic Investment grants? The consensus was yes, especially in the vein of strengthening regions. Steve suggested consideration be given to including faculty and/or associate deans in the meetings.

Annual Meeting Plans, Keith Belli. Several topics for the annual meeting in Baton Rouge have surfaced: Logic Model workshop; National Research Capacity and ensure it covers teaching and outreach (the last was in 1999-2000, Cubbage); McS Strategic Plan workshop (need direction: why, who for, difference from Roadmap); International activities on campus.

**Action Item:** Executive Committee (Jim, Steve, Keith, Randy) Conference Call within a month to follow-up on this meeting.

Adjourned.

*Approved  
November 2, 2015  
Baton Rouge, LA*

