

## NAUFRP EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

March 7-8, 2016

Washington, D.C.

Executive Committee Participants: Jim Allen, President (Northern Arizona University); Steve Bullard, Immediate Past-President (Stephen F. Austin State University); Keith Belli, President-Elect (University of Tennessee); David Newman, Secretary-Treasurer, (SUNY-ESF); Phil Tappe, Southern Regional Chair (University of Arkansas); Kamran Abdollahi, Diversity Chair (Southern University); John Hayes, International Chair (Colorado State University); Mike Messina, Northeast Regional Chair (Pennsylvania State University); Janaki Alavalapati, Policy Chair (Auburn University); Terry Sharik, Education Chair (Michigan Tech University); Red Baker, Research Chair (University of Kentucky); Andrew Ezell, Extension Chair (Mississippi State University); Kurt Pregitzer, Western Regional Chair (University of Idaho); Mark Rickenbach, North Central Regional Chair (University of Wisconsin-Madison); Mary Watzin, At-Large (North Carolina State University); Tim White, At-Large (University of Florida) Randy Nuckolls, NAUFRP General Counsel; Terri Bates, NAUFRP Executive Liaison

NAUFRP Member Participants: Jim Johnson (Oregon State University), Dan Robison, (West Virginia University), Andrew Storer (Michigan Tech University)

NAUFRP Guests and Presenters: Eric Norland (NIFA), Catalino Blanche (NIFA); Matt Menashes, CEO, Society of American Foresters (SAF); Bob Alverts, SAF Immediate Past-President; Clark Seely, SAF President; Carol Redelsheimer, Director of Science and Education, SAF; Ali Mohammed (NIFA), Wendy Fink, Association of Public Land Grant Universities; Felipe Sanchez and Emilee Blount, Acting Associate Deputy Chiefs, R&D USDA Forest Service; Dave Tenny, President and CEO, National Alliance of Forest Owners

Introductions were made. Jim Allen noted that Rob Swihart, who was not able to attend this meeting, will be leaving the Executive Committee; he is stepping down as Department Head at Purdue. Carolyn Brooks is retiring this summer and a new 1890's representative will need to be determined.

The Agenda for this meeting was approved. A motion was made by David Newman, seconded by Mark Rickenbach, to accept the November 2, 2015 Executive Committee minutes. Terry Sharik had a number of questions and edits; he will provide these directly to Terri. The motion was approved unanimously.

Treasurer's Report, David Newman: David reviewed a final report for Income and Expenses in 2015 (handout). He noted that the \$3,000 allocated to the webpage Education Clearinghouse is carried over to 2016; he asked how much longer NAUFRP anticipated doing this? Jim said he thought the funds would be utilized this year. David noted that BAC dues to APLU have increased by over \$1,000 and this needs to be factored into future budgets. Fees related to accepting dues payments by credit card have been higher than anticipated. We have asked institutions paying by credit card to add an additional three percent to their payments; not all have done so. In addition, a \$25/month Transarmor Fee has been added for additional protection. We did not request this but have the option of opting out. David believes allowing institutions to pay by credit card is a service. He would like to go one more full year before evaluating if this is a practice we wish to continue. In the future, we will modify dues invoices to indicate what the payment should be if a credit card is used. David proposed increasing compensation to Randy and Terri by \$2,000 each. If this is approved, NAUFRP would run an approximate \$11,000

deficit on paper in 2016. The proposal passed unanimously. There was concern about running a deficit and this led to further discussion about member dues and those institutions that do not pay. Wendy Fink said APLU had this problem at one point but their president made personal contacts and calls to the non-payers. They also developed a 'list of shame' that was circulated. Action Item: Jim, Randy and Terri will work with the regional chairs to identify who has personal contacts with the NAUFRP institutions that have not been paying dues.

Policy Report, Janaki Alavalapati: Since the Executive Committee meeting last November, the Forest Carbon Working Group (FCWG), which NAUFRP is a member of, has adopted a 'Tool Kit' intended to help provide strategies and policies to states for the Clean Power Plan. NAUFRP worked to improve language on the importance of extension and education. Janaki's experience with the Farm Bill working group and FCWG is that we are good followers and not necessarily leaders. He asked what one issue we want to work strategically on with partners. He has some ideas but would like to hear from others first. Jim Allen noted that the APLU Forest Health Initiative we are discussing and/or the McIntire-Stennis Strategic Plan might be good examples. Once they are more fully developed, we can take them back to our partners. Mary noted the water initiative INFEWS – we have as much expertise in water – why aren't we there? Energy and Food are other examples. Wendy said there was a lot of back and forth with USDA on the water initiative and in the end there was not anything new in the President's budget. They hope to see it reflected in the RFAs. The water program was put together very quickly at the behest of USDA; literally, they had about a month's timeframe. As a result, there was no input from the BNR. Since then, APLU has initiated a new process to develop big, new ideas that will better involve broader input. Randy reinforced the importance of meeting with the USDA RFA program coordinators and getting good forestry people on the review panels. Eric noted that one of AFRI's Grand Challenge Areas is Water in Agriculture. Forestry is not there. We need to get forestry sprinkled in. Forest scientists/researchers need to see themselves and not be a footnote.

Education Report, Terry Sharik: The International Association for Society and Natural Resources meets in Houghton from June 22-26, 2016; this is a premier natural resource society and there is still an opportunity to participate. Terry reviewed his written report. He and John Hayes are exploring the possibility of NAUFRP becoming a 'Professional Partner' of IFSA (International Forestry Students' Association). John has made several contacts but has had no response. Terry served on a Forest Service panel on workforce issues where he presented on diversity trends in the student population and workplace. The FS workforce demographic is almost identical to the student population which suggests NAUFRP schools are the major pipeline. In February, Terry and Keith Belli participated in a National Academy workshop on the workforce in Agriculture and Natural Resources; they are writing individual chapters. Terry is also participating in a planning committee for a SAF Diversity and Inclusion Tract for the next SAF national convention; this is being led by the Forest Service and anyone can be a member. He needs to meet with the new FAEIS leadership at Virginia Tech. The last survey was in 2012 and it is time for a new one. NAUFRP transitioned its survey data to FAEIS in 2009. Steve complimented Terry for citing the NAUFRP Undergraduate Strategic Plan in his written report and noted that it's been five years since it was completed; perhaps we should revisit it? Terry is doing a lot of what the Plan laid out. There was discussion about sending out Undergraduate Strategic Plan seeking to determine its accomplishments, needed revisions and what has not been addressed.

Extension Report, Andy Ezell: Andy needs to do follow-up on the status of partner MOAs. He helped with the verbiage for the CCP Tool Kit. Eric Norland provided information for page 2 of Andy's written report. He is also preparing the call for nominations for the 2016 Family Forest Education Award.

Research Report, Red Baker: Since last November's meeting, members of the McIntire-Stennis Strategic Planning Committee have been interviewing stakeholders. The group will convene here later this week. For tomorrow, Red has arranged for Bryce Stokes and Zia Haq from the Department of Energy (DOE) to present on DOE bioenergy programs. He had also hoped to bring a representative in from the INFEWS program but it did not work out for this meeting. He has learned that NIFA now has a point person for INFEWS; this is new since August when Red and Keith met with representatives from both agencies. He would like feedback after tomorrow's DOE panel. Red noted the proposed funding changes for the Joint Fire Science Program impacts many of our institutions. There is a Senate hearing tomorrow on this to be aware of. Red and Keith made a trip to DC last August and met with NIFA and NSF. He has asked Eric to keep us informed on the next FRAC meeting which will likely be in August in DC. There was discussion about FRAC's perception that certain pipelines for scientists are drying up (entomology, pathology). Steve said we need to focus on the workforce and desired output. Keith thinks we should do another Keathley Report; it's been about 15 years. Eric suggested this should be a conversation item with the NIFA higher education folks. Eric serves on FRAC and cited the 4-5 academic seats (Adrian Leighton, Myron Floyd (NC State), Deb McCollough (MI State), Glenn Stanosz (Univ WI), Bob Smith (Va Tech). NAUFRP should look for the next opportunity to nominate academics. It was noted that the last time NAUFRP submitted several nominations for FRAC, none were selected; this is/was a concern. (<http://www.fs.fed.us/research/about/forestry-research-council/>)

John Cissel, Program Director, Joint Fire Science Program (JFSP) by conference phone: John provided an overview and information on the current status of the proposed budget changes. The program is 18 years old and the changes in the FY17 President's budget were a shock. (\$7 million increase in Wildland Fire; \$4 million decrease in FSF and \$3 million decrease in FS R&D) Half the Board is based in DC. No one seems to know why the FS has made this change; a clear answer of why has not been provided. The response has been heartening. John Hayes said NAUFRP members will be on the Hill tomorrow; is there information that can be provided to help with the discussions on the Hill. John Cissel can send a one page Outcome Assessment and a 2016 Progress Report summarizing the projects. Jim Allen noted that the Forest Guild has a briefing paper that he recently sent to the NAUFRP listserve. David pointed out the increases for FIA and FPL in the FY17 budget, yet the FS overall is cutting back; priorities are changing. Randy said the changes to the JFSP were a surprise to everyone; the program has been working well. FS R&D is under stress; a number of strong internal voices have retired. Keith suggested NAUFRP reach out early on to the next FS Chief, assuming there will be a new one.

Diversity Report, Kamran Abdollahi: Kamran reported on the progress of the Diversity Logic Model. He asked Steve to provide the background to the Executive Committee. The plan has been for SAF to take the lead; the FS is providing funding but it took a while to get the dollars to SAF. Kamran pointed out in his written report several opportunities to engage in Diversity activities in 2016 including the MANNRS (Minorities in Agriculture, Natural Resources and Related Sciences) conference in early April to be held in Jacksonville, FL. Discussion: it was noted by one Executive Committee member that he knows his female colleagues are sometimes intimidated when attending NAUFRP meetings; Mary was chagrined to read Jim's email to the listserve about student experiences at last year's SAF Convention. Tim reflected on how instrumental Carolyn Brooks has been; we should consider a letter or resolution of appreciation for her efforts. She is not here because of the CARET meeting conflict.

There was further discussion about the annual conflict of this meeting with CARET and whether to specifically avoid the conflict in the future. We will try to avoid this conflict next year

Budget and Advocacy Committee (BAC), Tim White: Tim provided background on the BAC APLU committee. It contracts with the Cornerstone firm here in Washington. NAUFRP budget 'asks' for FY17

are in stride with the BAC's: \$35.5 million for Mc-Stennis, \$700 million for AFRI although there is no endorsement of the mandatory money. There is a new BAA budget process. Tim noted Jim Allen's letter to the APLU's highest governing board; it will lead to vetting for a forest health initiative. The APLU Committee on Legislation and Policy will do some of the vetting (it does policy vs. appropriations.)

ATR Report, Steve Bullard: Steve recommended that the NAUFRP ATR Representative be tied to the Research Chair. He asked Eric about plans for the next ATR meeting. Eric thought Catalino might be working on a plan for a "PD" (Project Director) meeting. The last ATR meeting was 2-3 years ago.

International Report, John Hayes: John is exploring the possibility of NAUFRP becoming a 'Professional Partner' of IFSA (International Forestry Students' Association). He has made several contacts but has had no response. Terry raised the question of why there appears to be so little interest in forming IFSA chapters. Discussion: students have too much on their plates; lack of resources to support; lack of student interest. Jim Johnson said at OSU, the interest grew from graduate students. Terry said most international groups are more broadly about natural resources. Steve noted our programs are becoming more international. Dan asked why not integrate into SAF student chapters? Janaki asked whether we had many 3+2 Programs, which help bring in international students. Jim would like to see more U.S. students participate in similar programs that allow them to study in other countries.

Board of Natural Resources (BNR), John Hayes: The forest health initiative is an attempt to leverage APLU strength – the idea is to advance an initiative thru APLU and advance 'our' position within APLU. It is timely and crosses over into urban and agriculture with influence from and on biodiversity and recreation. The implications are broad but something we can get our arms around. APLU has developed a new policy on moving this type of initiative forward; it fits into the land grant mission. John hopes for a coordinated effort that translates to operational on-the-ground. He noted Jim Allen's letter to APLU. The meeting tomorrow will flesh out timelines, structure, initial topics, identify structure and common strategy. We will want to have some conversations with partners to get this on their radar screens. Terry asked about the Roadmap for Natural Resources – did it raise our profile and did this initiative come out of that? Wendy said the Roadmap did raise NAUFRP's/forestry's profile among the Agriculture Experiment Station Directors.

Southern NAUFRP, Phil Tappe: Southern NAUFRP last met in Baton Rouge on November 3<sup>rd</sup>. Phil distributed the minutes from that meeting.

Northeast and North Central NAUFRP, Mike Messina: NAUFRP's Northeast and North Central regions have met jointly for the last few years. Last May they had a fly-in meeting in Philadelphia where they met jointly with the Forest Service. They were invited to be involved in the December Chief's review. Terry presented at it; Mike was a guest. The focus was heavy on urban stewardship. The region was supposed to be involved in Mike Rain's replacement but that hasn't happened. Mike thinks it has been advertised.

Western NAUFRP, Kurt Pregitzer: Kurt said Western NAUFRP had planned a summer meeting at OSU but will need to reschedule due to Thomas Maness' illness. Jim Johnson is the Acting Dean while Thomas is out. Kurt distributed meeting notes from their Fall meeting in Baton Rouge.

2016 Annual Meeting Plans: There has been discussion of meeting offsite with an interest in involving faculty but there is uncertainty whether off-site would be very efficient this year (Madison). A theme to consider is an update to the Undergraduate Strategic Plan; it's been five years since it was completed. Faculty could be engaged on this. Mary would like to see faculty involved with the McStennis Strategic Plan. Another topic for consideration is the Forest Health Initiative.

NAUFRP Webpage Redesign, Jim Allen: The webpage was moved from Mississippi State mid last year and is now hosted by a private vendor (GoDaddy) which Terri has access to. We have wanted a redesign the webpage for some time. Michigan Tech has an interest and expertise in doing this. They have submitted a proposal to the Executive Committee for review and discussion. Previously, NAUFRP had been paying Miss State \$2,500/annually for maintenance and updates. In 2012, \$3,000 was allocated for an Education Clearing House on the webpage. From the time of that discussion, there has been an interest to rework the site around the work of NAUFRP committees and regions. David has concerns with the 21-day termination clause in the written proposal; it seems strong. Terry did not think that would be a problem to revise. The contract would be directly with Hannah Abbotts, not Michigan Tech. We want to specifically include the Reviewer Data Base on the re-designed webpage. Are there analytics for current use or audience? We want to drive faculty to the webpage to use. Steve made a motion, seconded by Keith, to accept the proposal. Discussion: David wants to ensure the 21-day termination of contract is revised. Terry assured it would be. The motion was approved unanimously. Jim and Terri will work with Terry on this.

Society of American Foresters, Bob Alverts (Immediate Past President), Clark Seely (President), Matt Menashes ( CEO), Carol Redelsheimer (Director, Science & Education): Bob said it's been a great year and a great relationship with NAUFRP. He introduced Matt, Carol and Clark Seeley. Clark said the relationship between SAF and the forestry schools is almost a century old. SAF values it very highly. NAUFRP leadership is invited to their Board meetings. Fred Cabbage at North Carolina State University is the President-elect. Ed Shepherd is their Secretary-Treasurer. Clark believes we have a shared vision. Five years ago, the SAF leadership paused to ask where are we as a professional organization and where are we headed. They examined their core mission and values. The timing worked out with the change/transition in the Chief Executive. They are now looking outward and developing the next set of questions and areas for examination. The Berkeley Summit model may be something they want to emulate. Jim Allen said SAF has always been a strong partner but over the last year, he has felt especially engaged. Matt reinforced they are very interested in following up on the Berkeley outcomes/results. The April Board meeting will look at what is the future of forestry education. The universities get the students between 18-24; SAF gets them for life after that. David Newman is going to come to the April Board meeting and present on the future of forestry education which will be followed by a facilitated discussion of the Board. This is just one piece. Other areas they will be looking at include how is SAF advancing the profession, science and forest health. They look forward to hearing stakeholder feedback from NAUFRP. A specific task is the FS Research Strategic Planning work. The Endowment is working on FS Research at the academic and industry leadership level. FS R&D does not have a stakeholder group. SAF has an ulterior motive: building stakeholder relationships to assure the future. Matt underscored the importance the Board has on D&I issues. They are very glad to be working on this with NAUFRP. Matt referenced Jim's email per the student experience at the last convention that was mentioned earlier. There was also an issue at a plenary session – an inappropriate joke on stage. SAF is working on a D&I policy; a draft will be reviewed by members in the near future. The 'Evolving Forestry Initiative' is a way for SAF to begin a conversation about the future. They want to shift the frame and conversation of forestry of the past to what it looks like in 2046. What is the future and how do we get there? The survey results should be available in November and the initial results presented at the April Board meeting. David noted that a recent NY meeting did not go well; there was inference that natural resource professionals are not foresters. John Hayes says this is very similar to what he is hearing within The Wildlife Society (TWS) and other societies (e.g., Society of Range Management). Clark says they have neglected the other professions for too long. Terry noted that the meeting held four years ago in Denver involved the natural resource societies and was led by TWS and SAF; it had a lot of energy, which then died out. He asked where are we interacting with the other NR

societies. Many of our programs are a minority within NR. Matt asked what can we do together with NR? And what can we do together to solve problems? He feels the other professional societies are behind. The fundamental issue is what do we want to do on the landscape; SAF is not ready to answer that. Carol discussed the Logic Model. They have discussed it with TWS and SRM. They have received a report; John Barnwell and Carol have reviewed it and sent comments back to the contractor. There are still pieces coming out. They are willing to skype people in to discuss with the contractor. Janaki noted the diversity conference held at VaTech two years ago. It produced branding, insights and very rich content. Carol wanted to have a discussion about the value of accreditation. They've been doing it for 90 years but things have changed in that time. Do we need to look at the Standards? Jim asked about the status of SAF's accreditation by CHEA (Council of Higher Education Accreditation). Matt reviewed that CHEA is a third party reviewer of organizations that provide accreditation. SAF was denied accreditation on the basis of one issue – the ability to get institutions to post performance information, mainly related to the employment of their graduates, on their websites. SAF is pausing on this to let the Board decide if they want to go back to CHEA and well as waiting to see if CHEA revises their recognition standard. The SAF Board and Matt are committed to third party review but don't want to go through the process again until CHEA finishes. The schools should take down any reference of CHEA accreditation/recognition.

US Forest Service, Research & Development (R&D), Felipe Sanchez, Deputy Area Budget Coordinator/Lead, and Emilee Blount, Acting Associate Deputy Director, USDA Forest Service, Research and Development : (Powerpoint) The FS budget was the major topic discussed; fire is the driving force. The FS will come out okay in FY16; the fire run-ups have been re-paid. There is a \$17 million decrease in the other parts of the FY17 R&D budget due to increases in the FIA and Forest Products Lab (FPL) budgets. Felipe was asked who is pushing to increase FIA and FPL? The FY16 \$7 million increase in FPL is not for people; it loses \$8 million in FY17. Kurt asked if there is a message that the stations are not doing relevant research compared to FIA? Felipe said that is a question that Rich and John will be talking to NAUFRP about tomorrow. FY17 looks like there is a \$1 million increase overall for FS R&D but there is really a \$2 million decrease. Several questions were raised by NAUFRP: Is the FS planning to close labs and field stations? Is there a way to start a discussion about each of our capacities? Felipe said these are hard questions. What is the status of the FS Deputy Chief position? Carlos is still the Acting Deputy Chief. A package of names was sent to the Department for approval several weeks ago but there has been no word on a decision. There are also other key positions within R&D that need to be filled. Jim Johnson said as part of the McStennis Strategic Planning meeting, stakeholder interviews have been conducted. These stakeholders were asked to distinguish between university and FS research knowledge but they often could not do so. Terry asked, when defending the FS R&D budget, do you make the point of ripple down impact? (Example: JFSP) Dan said, since the mid-1990s FS scientists have been reduced by half (1,000 to 500); have there been comparable reductions in property? Felipe and Emilee agreed there have been reductions in staff but not so in the footprint. Emilee would love to work with the universities on facilities issues. Jim Allen said in Flagstaff, the FS is renting space to the FWS. Dan asked if the FS needs an inventory of universities with space to rent? Emilee hears several things to explore with NAUFRP: she can look at the FS authorities, facilities and compare list of scientists. Jim Johnson pointed out that the JFSP is on a modest budget; they have created a model – a network connecting management and research to stakeholders.

USDA National Institute for Food and Agriculture, Ali Mohamed, Director, Division of Environmental Systems: Ali discussed the FY17 budget; AFRI has grown to \$400 million. Terry asked what happened to the two proposals on bio-energy/biomass? NAUFRP was asked by Eric if we have met with the OMB Budget Examiner? There was discussion about FRAC's \$50 million funding recommendation for the

McStennis program; did USDA officials make a request for this amount? Wendy noted that the APLU water initiative went back and forth with USDA; it started generally but got very specific. Janaki expressed frustration about no feedback. Ali mentioned the possibility of increasing base funds received by McIntire-Stennis institutions from \$25,000 to \$50,000, which would help the smaller institutions. Catalino asked why don't we drop some of the reported matching funds that aren't directly linked to specific McIntire-Stennis projects? He is concerned that the match is extreme and not useful. Randy responded by asking isn't that a question for the ATRs? Catalino asked how can we modernize the allocations and try and help the small institutions? Randy said we are three years out from the next Farm Bill; that would be a good time to modernize a 50-year old program. Wendy said the current Congressional sentiment is still very strong for competitive vs. capacity funding. Catalino was asked how much McS money has been returned? He says about \$5 million. Wendy was asked if APLU has a strong stance for defending capacity funds. She says yes, but they also strongly support the non-land-grants as well. BAA is particular in favor. NIFA brought a one-pager 'think piece' for the next Farm Bill. David asked where is forestry in it? The closest identification is fiber, but that could be cotton or forestry.

Dave Tenny, CEO, National Alliance of Forest Owners: NAFO priorities are carbon, water, taxes and the Endangered Species Act (ESA). They are in the throes of finishing up on the issue of stormwater and forest roads – i.e., they are close to helping EPA realize they've done their job. By May, they hope EPA makes a determination. They are also working on herbicide as a point source; NAFO wants to "keep it the way it is." On taxes, they are working to ensure treatment of forest lands in the tax code doesn't change, as in go in the opposite direction. NAFO is feeling good about ESA and their work with Fish & Wildlife Service at the regional level (black pine snake and northern long-eared bat). He feels good about the convincing argument they have made for forest land management.

NAFO has utilized over and over again, NAUFRP's Carbon Principles and Scientists letter from November 2014. It has been very effective in working on carbon policy issues. The EPA Biogenics panel was tasked to come up with a carbon accounting framework. After several years of deliberation, the panel has submitted its work to EPA. The issues under consideration seem to be carbon stock, appropriate time frame, scale and economics. Dave thinks it might be useful and timely to resend the NAUFRP letter; maybe adding a simple cover letter to remind EPA Science Advisory Board (SAB) about the original letter or send a refreshed letter. Janaki asked about sending it to others. David Newman noted that Science magazine has a news article today on the Woods Hole letter. Dave believes the Woods Hole letter is a response to an amendment to the legislation before the Senate Energy Committee (by Senators Collins, King, Stabenow) regarding forestry biomass; the Woods Hole letter opposes the amendment saying it is legislating science. NAFO's position is "we have a lot of science but need policy now and if one branch won't do it, the other should". Copies of the NAUFRP letter and principles should go to the EPA Administrator, Secretary of Agriculture and the Hill (Chair and RM of Environment & Public Works and Energy Committees, ME, MN and MI Senators). Randy noted to Dave that we have had a lot of discussion about the FS R&D budget and JFSP. How can we get NAFO to be supportive of forestry research programs? Dave says NAFO remains a very focus-driven organization; they have just renewed their 'vows' after 8 years since they were first organized. An example of focus for them is 'fixing the fire problem'. If NAUFRP can provide the focus, Dave says they can provide support. NAFO supports FIA but he still struggles to educate NAFO members about the value of other research. Dave says the driving issues are water and carbon; he does not think that will change, even with a new administration. Mary agrees with Dave that carbon and water are the drivers; can we not package support around them?

Zia Haq, Lead Analyst, Mark Ellis Bioenergy Technologies Office, and Bryce Stokes, Senior Advisor, Allegheny Science & Technology, Contractor to DOE, US Department of Energy (DOE) Mark spoke about the bioenergy conference this summer in Washington, DC. Their website has detailed

information on it. Zia discussed the mission and core focus areas (Powerpoint) of the Bioenergy Technologies Office (BETO). They have a limited budget and rely on USDA. The Bioenergy total is \$200-225 million. (There is a big earmark for ALGAE of \$30 million and \$12-15 million for terrestrial) National lab reports are on the website. The issues are: low prices, coal, electricity. A big issue is pellet exports to Europe -- what's the best use? Kurt asked about policy analysis around the issue of deforestation and cited the forest carbon issues NAFO is working on. Bryce has tried to work with EPA on carbon accounting but backed off to keep the focus on science. They will have listening sessions expanding bio fuels economy roles of different organizations; they had to go thru elaborate (OMB) process to do this but now it is a valid, multi-agency effort. He will send information on this to Jim/Keith. Bryce was asked if OMB/OST are hooked in? Randy asked about the \$200 million bioenergy budget, how much goes to universities? Bryce estimated 4-5 percent. Universities can work directly with national labs. Bryce asked about the Deans' Tour – he'd like to see one happen and be part of it. He was asked what they would show NAUFRP. He said the Idaho Lab.

Forest Service Research Strategic Planning: Rich Guldin (Senior Research Fellow) and John Barnwell (Director, Government Affairs and External Relations) Society of American Foresters: John discussed appropriations, particularly FS R&D. They want to stem the tide of R&D reductions. R&D is at \$220 million; FIA at \$83 million. He heard concerns from yesterday's discussion about moving dollars around. All programs are down five percent. Jim Allen asked if SAF will weigh in on the JFSP? John says yes; he has already talked about this on the Hill. Randy asked where did the cuts in JFSP come from? John is not sure. Rich asked if NAUFRP would be willing to do some advocacy on the BLM and USGS budgets. Rich says the FS has a new strategic plan, part of which includes "to advance knowledge", but it provides no details on that objective/goal. This is a time of transition within the FS leadership. One-third of the senior executives have left. SAF is trying to make sense of where forestry is headed. Other reports are out of date. Steve asked why NAUFRP wasn't involved in the FS R&D Strategic Plan? Was that a disconnect? Was it internal? Yes to the last. John said SAF was not engaged with that process either. The perception is many R&D clients feel disconnected. A case needs to be made for relevance, accountability, productivity, transparency. The hope is to leverage the SAF leadership and they hope the listening sessions will connect FS leadership with their clientele. They will strive for clearer priorities that will then shape program implementation. They were planning to begin with structured interviews in different regions of the country but then had to pause. Associate Deputy Chief Wagner wanted to have a conversation on Conservation with the agency and its clientele and she wanted to see if that could be integrated with the R&D effort. Wagner wants to add questions to the R&D project, but they are conscious of client fatigue and want to be careful about redundant questions. S&PF and NFS will be treated as stakeholders. They have begun interviews and meetings with DC organizations. Nine day-long focus groups are planned: one in DC, eight around the country (Seattle, Sacramento, Boise, Albany, Minnesota, NYC, Jackson, Charlotte) between April and June. Currently, a list of invitees and trigger questions are being developed. Mike asked who initiated this, SAF or R&D? Rich said both. Jim Johnson offered some observations on stakeholders: relationships take time to build. Step A is to identify them; Step B is to build or rebuild, trust and accountability. John Barnwell said the 2-3 Station Directors most interested in this effort are interested in the networking relationships. Tim asked how FS R&D measures productivity? Rich said there is clearly good work at the Stations but it appears in limited circulation. They are hearing R&D does not have a way to inform the broader audiences/stakeholders – there is no meaningful corporate report. There is a need to create a process for this. Maybe a SAF Journal article asking the researchers to identify the implications of their research is one way to do this, or start to. Mary says she hopes the FS has on the table what to let go. These pieces can be picked up by others. Steve agrees and says this applies not to just research but to delivery. Red asked if they are talking about national or regional stakeholders? Most relationships begin at the local level. Rich says they want



wholesale and retail dissemination. They have found next to nothing disseminated to consulting foresters and very limited dissemination to extension. Rich prefers the terms 'client' or 'clientele' to 'stakeholders', also 'Producers of science' and 'consumers of science'.

Meeting Adjourned

#### Action Items and Approved Motions

Motion Approved: Acceptance of November 2, 2015 Executive Committee minutes with edits by Terry Sharik incorporated.

Motion Approved: Increase in compensation of \$2,000 each for Randy Nuckolls and Terri Bates

Action Item: Jim, Randy and Terri will work with the regional chairs to identify who has personal contacts with the NAUFRP institutions that have not been paying dues.

Motion Approved: Accept the proposed contract from Michigan Tech to redesign the NAUFRP webpage with minor revisions (e.g., the termination clause). Jim Allen and Terri Bates will work with Terry Sharik on this.

*Following the Executive Committee meeting, an Ad Hoc meeting, chaired by John Hayes, was held to discuss an APLU Initiative on Forest Health. Attendees included: Janaki Alavalapati, Wendy Fink, John Hayes, Jim Johnson, David Newman, Eric Norland, Kurt Pregitzer, Stephen Shaler, Andrew Storer, Phil Tappe, Tim White. A summary of that meeting is attached to these minutes.*

*Minutes Approved  
November 1, 2016  
Madison, WI*

NAUFRP Discussion  
Forest Health Initiative  
March 8, 2016

Discussion participants:

Janaki Alavalapati, Wendy Fink, John Hayes, Jim Johnson, David Newman, Eric Norland, Kurt Pregitzer, Stephen Shaler, Andrew Storer, Phil Tappe, Tim White

Topic: A discussion was on held on March 7 in Washington, D.C. to discuss the possibility of building an initiative to advance progress, coordination, and funding for national efforts regarding forest health. An anticipated step to achieve this is developing an initiative through the APLU framework to leverage APLU support and resources. Background and progress to date were presented in the BNR report to NAUFRP earlier in the day.

Discussion summary:

- The group participating in the discussion were enthusiastic about the concept and generally very supportive of advancing a national effort involving NAUFRP institutions focused on forest health.
- Forest health touches on a wide array of disciplines and issues that should resonate across programs. Developing an initiative that is broad enough to have high impact and resonate across programs and at the same time focused enough to have clear targets will be key to success of the initiative.
- Positioning the effort so that it has easily understood societal relevance will be important. Directly linking the program to clear, easily understandable benefits to society and individuals is a good approach to doing this.
- Perturbations, threats, and risks to forest health vary with location and temporal and geographic scale. In addition to impacts from insect and disease, wildlife damage, changes in climate, drought, changes in disturbance regime, exotic and invasive species, and other factors can impact forest health.
- A variety of possible structures for a program were discussed, and previous initiatives provide possible models. The group had a variety of thoughts on how best to structure the initiative. After considerable discussion regarding possible alternatives, the group agreed that proposing specific administrative and logistic structures may be premature at this point, and would best be done in partnership with partner organizations. Among the ideas discussed by the group were:
  - A competitive grant program administered by a federal agency with experience and infrastructure enabling such a program
  - Development of a national hub, organization, or network to enable coordination of efforts and communication across programs
  - A multi-agency structure akin to JFSP
  - An annual forum to present results of existing and new information on forest health generated through this effort
- Individuals on the NAUFRP steering committee are well positioned to take a leadership role in advancing the proposal, but content experts are likely found amongst the faculty across programs. Engagement of faculty interested in the topic will be helpful to develop an initial

prospectus in the coming weeks, but is likely to be most critical after the July APLU Joint COPS meeting (see next steps).

- There was considerable discussion regarding potential scope and description of ultimate goals and outcomes for the program. Broad, positively focused statement like “Saving the nation’s forests: Maintaining their value for humans and the environment,” “Reversing the declines in forest health,” or “Healthy forests for society” were favored by the group. One possibility would be to structure the project proposal under the overall framework of “Healthy forests for society” with four or five subcategories like: “maintaining healthy economies,” “maintaining clean and abundant water,” “maintaining ecological function,” “maintaining recreational opportunities,” etc.
- One potential overarching goal of the new program might be to develop a response strategy framework to address existing and new drivers and threats to forest health. Such a framework could conceivably be linked to developing and implementing an action plan to improve forest health. One outcome of such an effort could be alignment of public policy to achieve healthy forests, and to inform policy makers.
- It was recognized that there are a number of ongoing efforts and programs regarding forest health. The group perspective was that while some of these efforts captured portions of the broader goals being discussed, none effectively linked all the pieces together or was adequately comprehensive in scope. As the process moves forward, clear understanding of the suite of programs currently in place will be important, to strategically create an appropriate niche for this effort, to enable us to build on and partner with rather than duplicate current efforts, and to help position and market the proposed new program.
- Close communication with potential collaborators and partner programs will be helpful in creating an effective, well-supported effort.

Next steps:

Date: March, 2016.

Activity: Brief APLU Policy Board on our progress and direction.

Responsible Person: Wendy Fink

Date: March 2016

Activity: Schedule time for presentation/discussion at APLU Joint COPS meeting. If possible, we will attempt to find time on the meeting schedule for a brief presentation at their July meeting. An anticipated next step coming from this meeting will be APLU BAA (possibly in partnership with BNR) commissioning a white paper to outline the problem statement and initiative proposal.

Responsible Person: Wendy Fink

Date: March to April 2016.

Activity: Develop a list of key partner organizations that would be likely partners for our effort and identification of NAUFRP contacts to reach out to those organizations.

Responsible Person: Red Baker and John Hayes.

Date: April 2016 (or whenever next meeting scheduled)

Activity: Brief BNR on progress

Responsible Person: Hayes

Date: April to May 2016

Activity: Develop brief prospectus with 30,000 foot view of initiative to share with potential partners

Responsible Person: TBD.

Date: May to July 2016

Activity: Inform partners, solicit ideas, and build linkages with partner organizations

Responsible Person: TBD

Date: July 2016

Activity: Presentation to Joint COPS meeting (if scheduled)

Responsible Person: Hayes to coordinate.

Date: July to August 2016

Activity: Phone conference with NAUFRP leadership and interested participants; craft next steps based on APLU and partner input

Responsible Person: Hayes to coordinate