

**NAUFRP Executive Committee**  
**Washington, D.C.**  
**March 5-7, 2007**

Participants: Bob Edmonds (Univ. of WA), Peg Gale (MI Tech), Jim Sheppard (MS State), Keith Belli (MS State), Steve Bullard (Univ. of KY), Hal Salwasser (OR State), George Brown (AL A&M), Robert Taylor (AL A&M), Dick Brinker (Auburn), Bob Warren (Univ GA), Bob Brown (NC State), Nat Frazer (UT State), Chad Dawson (SUNY), Barry Goldfarb (NC State), Bob Swihart (Perdue), Steven Daley Laursen (Univ ID), Dan Keathley (MI State), Greg Biging (Univ CA at Berkley), Doug Piirto (CA Poly), Don DeHayes (Univ. of VT), Pat Reid (Univ AZ), Perry Brown (Univ. MT), Al Ek (Univ MN), George Hopper (MS State), Randy Nuckolls (Washington Counsel), Terri Bates

Guests: Ann Bartuska (USFS), Sam Foster (USFS), Colien Hefferan (CSREES), Carlton Owen (via phone), Larry Wiseman (AFF), Donna Harmon (AF&PA), Frank Boteler (CSREES), Michael Goergan (SAF), Nadine Block (AF&PA)

George Hopper, President: George welcomed all to 'Deans in DC' and encouraged open discussion by all present. One important purpose is setting funding requests for FY08 for McStennis, RREA and NRI programs. BAC's budget recommendations were noted.

Treasurer's Report: Tim White planned to be present but couldn't make it due to a family emergency. A written Treasurer's Report was distributed and reviewed. Don DeHayes discussed the CSREES grant held by UVM for the purpose of supporting McIntire-Stennis (McStennis) Strategic Planning. The original grant was for \$87,000 and was augmented by another \$30,000 for a total of \$117,000. It covered new efforts, planning (Summit and the Vision), portions of Terri and Randy's time and General Assembly expenses over the last two years. About \$22,000 remains but at least \$20,000 will be held back to cover the actual writing/editing services and production of the strategic plan. The FS grant of \$20,000, held directly by NAUFRP, was designed to support Summit and Outlook coordination. A list of the 8-9 schools who typically do not pay their dues was shared and volunteers (from those present) agreed to contact them. George will send a letter emphasizing the value of being an active member of NAUFRP. Establishing a 'rainy day fund' was discussed. The Congressional reception should cost between \$6,000-8,000; AF&PA has agreed to contribute \$1,000.

Extension Chair, Nat Frazer: It is important to have the same appropriations recommendations (for RREA) as other organizations. Nat is working to get all partners on the same page -- \$8 million for RREA. The ECOP Forestry Task Force still exists, and Nat and Steven Daley Laursen represent NAUFRP. Question to those around the table: who has extension responsibilities? Almost all indicated they did.

International Chair, Barry Goldfarb: A request to NAUFRP from developing countries from the IUFRO sponsors was shared. They are asking for a contribution to co-sponsor students/participants travel to the upcoming conference in the Washington, D.C. area in mid-April. Discussion about NAUFRP's relationship with IUFRO: NAUFRP is on the overall governing board and this upcoming meeting is a working group on research and management. Perry Brown is a coordinator and several NAUFRP representatives have papers being presented (Don, Perry, Peg are co-authors on a paper on the Summit Process). Sponsorship might be a way to ensure the Vision and Summit work is distributed. A motion was made and unanimously passed to contribute \$5,000 toward scholarships to the IUFRO meeting. Barry is to communicate this formally to the FS and SAF but we will convey this afternoon to Ann Bartuska.

Education Chair, Dan Keathley: The fundamental link among NAUFRP members is education. Dan has talked to George about pulling together an education Summit; there seemed to be support for this from the General Assembly last October. Dan needs help framing themes, structure, etc. The National Academy of Science (NAS) held a Summit, sponsored by agriculture, on teaching recently (the report is not out yet); CSREES was

involved. The subject matter was excellent; it would be good to draw on going forward instead of starting from scratch. Question: how well did it address forest and/or natural resource education? It did not. It was more general in approach; teaching based on how people learn. Topics to include: distance education (who offers, masters, topics, ...), what isn't covered in the classroom (interns, summer camp,...), ecosystem services. Other subjects to cover: how do people learn? how do we make teaching more important in the tenure process? Comments: Industry often seems ahead of the universities in terms of what is needed for the next generation of workforce. There is a need to teach general forestry/environmental coursework to the greater university community -- enhance environmental literacy towards 'what future presidents need to know'. New degree programs are needed that combine elements of business and our disciplines (30 million forested acres are owned by investors). There is a need to educate the family forester (i.e. innovative ways to generate second and third income streams). UWA developed a five-year masters' program and gave up their undergraduate program. The Pinchot Institute did a study on forestry education in 2000. The Southern Group of State Foresters has requested time on southern NAUFRP's spring meeting agenda to discuss concerns they have that the schools are not turning out enough foresters; this is a broader concern than just the State Foresters. Need to look at what the competition is. (Al Ek noted all his classes are full; just not with majors.) How do we effectively identify and recruit? The three California schools have formed a task group with industry and state government and concluded that there is a failure of letting the public know about job opportunities. They are looking at high school text books and finding very negative messages. Oregon State has had 2 years of very high enrollment and has surveyed potential employers of future discipline needs. NAUFRP looked at workforce planning a couple of years ago with industry and government; so did NASF. The undergraduate theme emerged at the Summit. The biennial forestry education conference will be in 2008 at Oregon State; there may be a good opportunity to link with it. Other discussion: Look at the mismatch of jobs vs. students. Don't leave out accreditation or OPM requirements. Need to target students who don't know they are interested in forestry. Need to look at what kind of workforce we want and make sure it reflects diversity. Be sure this goes beyond ourselves; bring in provosts and the movers and shakers on campus; network with agencies. Note the recent national education report targeting the need for an increase in science and math skills at all levels; do we have role to play to get students interested in science? It will be important to get outside views. Do we have core discipline teachers (forest management) vs. biotech? We need the NAS report to build off of as soon as it is available as well as the national education report (math and science skills needed). Comment that biologists are being hired when foresters are desired but not available. Dan sees a risk of losing control of standards for forestry/forest management. This is the situation on his campus where a 4-year university has a very weak curriculum. Dan will work with regional education chairs and solicited additional volunteers.

Diversity Chair, George Brown: At the last meeting in Pittsburgh, Marvin Brown, SAF President met with the Executive Committee and promised to put "Team Diversity" on Council agenda for December meeting. They had it on the agenda but somehow failed to follow through with an invitation to George. He will attend the next Council meeting in June. In the meantime, George has talked to the new SAF President Tom Thompson who is a supporter of diversity and has committed SAF to working with NAUFRP; he is confident that Council leadership will get going. SAF is in the best position to coordinate 'Team Diversity' among the other natural resource professions. The "Community for Diversity" website at NCSU is up and articles are being posted to it. Please send relevant materials to Celeste Richie there. Many thanks to NCSU for this support. Bob Brown discussed 'Environmenteers', a program mentoring high school diversity students in science. NCSU is the first university to try this and has split an assistantship with the Provost for a graduate student. They have 16 high school students, mainly women. Diversity and recruiting programs (K-12) need to be considered. Hal said their graduate school did a survey of applicants and the factors that led to their decisions on a particular school; the result, diversity was not a factor. Doug Piirto said CaPoly has focused on Hispanics and have a MOU with Tuskegee who has a relationship with Florida schools and Mississippi State University.

USDA Forest Research Advisory Council (FRAC), Dick Brinker: Pat Layton and Joe McNeel also serve on FRAC representing universities; Greg Johnson, Weyerhaeuser, is still chair. FRAC met in January and produced several products (hand outs). These included a report to the USDA Secretary requesting specific information on USDA's research strategy in several areas (ecosystem services, climate change in forest ecosystems and forest

bio-fuels and bio products) before their June meeting. The report also included recommendations that USDA continue research in nanotechnology and pine genome research. FRAC also sent a letter to USDA Secretary Johanns expressing concerns with the Administration's position for a competitive element within the McStennis program budget and the CREATE-21 (C-21) proposal. On the latter, FRAC urged caution because such a major reorganization would be predicated on funding goals and not program goals and concerns that reallocation would go to agriculture and not address all natural resource issue. A letter to Colien Hefferan, CSREES Administrator, was also sent asking for a detailed report on the 2007 NRI RFA \$60 million and how much is actually distributed to forestry. Dick noted FRAC has become much more proactive in the last years. There has been no response on any of the letters yet.

Budget Advocacy Committee (BAC), Dick Brinker: Dick replaced Pat Reid on BAC last December. BAC has finalized their FY 08 budget recommendations. Randy reviewed NAUFRP discussions (FY07) with the Hill about competitive dollars in McStennis. A question was raised about what it would take in terms of authority to have a competitive McS program? Randy says they think they can do it now with no changes. However, no one has figured out how to handle the state match. NAUFRP has said it would take at least \$5 million new dollars to have an effective competitive McS piece (\$25 base and \$5 million competitive. Discussion on this followed. In FY07, Hatch goes from \$180 million to \$322 million. BAC is prepared to go for a \$224 base program in FY08 with a competitive piece above that; they are following our lead. It's easy to confuse with these different messages. George suggested the NAUFRP position is \$30 million for McS in FY08. The question is do we compromise on about \$5 million for a competitive element. Randy clarified that on Hill visits with state delegations, individuals talk about the main numbers (\$30 million for McS) and not the nuances of a competitive program. NAUFRP will talk later and separately with Hill appropriations committee staff. Randy reviewed the appropriations history since last October. The CR FY07 was adopted in January with the stipulation that there would be no earmarks (there were about \$170 million in USDA agric earmarks). Cornerstone stepped in to try and retain the lost agriculture earmark money in the CSREES budget by proposing it be put into base programs. Earmarks will happen in the future but the appropriations committees are committed to one-half the previous levels. Discussion: Without a Congressional champion we should support NASULGC numbers. Is the cap on indirect costs for competitive dollars removed? The goal is to get the most dollars to schools with as few strings as possible but there is an accountability element that the Hill and Administration must impose that creates tension. The Executive Committee agreed on the FY08 recommendations: \$30 million for McStennis, \$8 million for RREA and \$256 million for NRI. Draft issue papers were reviewed. Comments and edits were incorporated.

ATR Liaison, Perry Brown: Perry circulated a draft of the McStennis Strategic Plan. He is working with Oregon State's communications people to develop it into a publication. Perry will seek final feedback from the ATR group. The history of the McStennis Strategic Plan's development was reviewed. It builds on the NAUFRP Vision in terms of how we visualize the program for the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Elements in the plan -- goals, rationale, actions needed, accountability, capacity building, graduate needs, multi-institutional projects, funding options -- all build off of Pittsburgh workshop. There is no state match required for a competitive program. Perry will go to Oregon State later this month to meet with the editors/designers. He hopes to have a final product by late spring. Everyone at this meeting will see the Plan again for individual comment. Perry wants to know if anyone has serious heartburn; he does not want wordsmithing. There is a question whether partners/1890 schools will be included in the competitive piece?

CREATE-21, Pat Reid: Legislative language for C-21 was drafted in January; it should be introduced within the next few days in both Houses. There have been changes since Pittsburgh. The name will now be the National Institutes for Agriculture and Food. Six institutes will fall within its umbrella of which one will be Natural Resources and the Environment. There are actually three (institutional) proposals out there: 1) C-21, 2) the original Danforth Report (strictly follows the NSF model), 3) USDA Farm Bill proposal which combines CSREES and ARS under the Office of Science (excludes FS and ERS). The last calls for \$160 million annually in mandatory funding, \$50 million for bio-energy. On the other hand, C-21 calls for \$200 million in annual mandatory funding. Ann Bartuska and Jim Reeves of the Forest Service were briefed as well as the Ag

Experiment Stations, SAF and FRAC. The FS and ARS are unhappy and resisting. NASULGC has a letter going to university presidents advocating they get behind C-21. The politics involved will determine the outcome. Perry says the McStennis strategic plan is compatible with C-21 or it can stand alone. The Hill is non-committal at this point. There is a Senate hearing on Wednesday. The motivation for all this has been to increase the real dollars going to agriculture research. There has been no support for C-21 from the forestry/conservation community; NAUFRP/Forestry deans did not have a vote. Randy doesn't think the FS part of this will fly based on conversations with Chuck Conner, USDA Under Secretary. Other discussion: a driving force is the Administration's push for competitive fund programs at the expense of base program funding. The Danforth effort came from NIH and NSF initiatives and successive experience. This was done in the 1990's at USDI (USGS) at the expense of lost capacity.

Ann Bartuska, Deputy Chief, US Forest Service, Research and Development (R&D): Discussion about C-21: one issue that will be difficult to resolve is the separate funding streams through the agriculture and interior appropriations bills. If the goal is to increase competitiveness then CSREES should be pushed to have a stronger natural resources component of NRI. Ann has seen no occasion where natural resources/forestry have been combined with agriculture that natural resources/forestry have done well. Discussion on the FY08 FS R&D budget proposal. \$19 million is for climate change (NASULGC proposes \$20 million to be competitive for climate change). Congressional budget hearings are underway; one has been held jointly on Forest Service R&D and S&PF. There is a lot of Congressional interest in the European ash borer, oak decline and southern pine beetle. The FY08 budget is down \$17 million of which \$9.5 million is in earmarks. There is a small reduction in core programs. Thirty-six scientist positions are on the block; Pineville, MS would close. Work units are consolidated into program units. There is an R&D increase of \$3 million in FIA but they are losing \$5 million for FIA in S&PF. National Program Reviews are underway by program areas; they have completed Forest Management and Invasive Species. Fire and Fuels is scheduled later this year and climate control probably next year. These will cycle every 2 years. The Pine Genome project is off-line. Ann has committed \$1 million from FY07 and 08 and the momentum appears to be building. Sam Foster has had good signals and all are very optimistic about NRI dollars. Nanotech Institute thru Forest Products Lab (FPL): role is small but it is a good opportunity for FPL. Capital improvements have begun at the FPL; they have a budget now. George asked what Ann's Vision was for future collaboration with NAUFRP? Ann wants to get to 20% of cooperative agreements and increase FS co-locations on campuses. With the decrease in scientists there is an increased opportunity for grad students and post doc's working on big science (nano and genomics). She is pretty 'jazzed' about experimental watersheds. Ann was asked about the implications related to 45% of FS budget going to fire suppression: it must gradually be eating up the agency's budget -- can R&D hold its own? Ann said fire has almost become an entitlement; within that constraint, R&D has to fight to stay healthy. If fires keep increasing as expected, the offsets will come within the agency. This is a major issue of Congressional hearings. An option seems to be to create a special fund. USDI is in same place. They need to get fire out of the agency's annual budget. If 55% of the budget goes to fire, the FS cannot sustain other functions. Sam Foster cites the decline in industry research (MeadWestvaco announcement); the FS and universities are going to be the only forestry research happening. The RPA mid-term report is about to be released; globalization is in it and a topic at FS Leadership (Policy and Analysis is trying to raise awareness of how FS fits into global picture). Question about FS co-locating on campuses. Ann says this is at the station level and more opportunistic than any national direction. Question about NEON: will it be easier to put in a NEON installation on an experimental vs. regular forest? Ann thinks an experimental forest because of the science link back to the stations. In California, CDF is now referred to as the CA 'Fire Service' and there are currently discussions of whether forestry should be split out; is this emerging in the FS? Question about OGC progress on the ethics issue? Ann hasn't heard anything on this for awhile. USDA is going to consolidate all the ethics agency people at the department level. Rich Guldin has acted as the FS point person on this. Ann says the Farm Bill may be an option if legislative authorities need to be changed. USGS doesn't have this problem because 'education' is in their organic legislation. Question about closing Pineville, plans for reassignment? Ann doesn't think the Administration's budget proposal of \$263 million is going to stick so Pineville should be okay. Question about the Outlook Process: the FS has a focus group coming in later this month which includes Steven Daley Laursen. As a show

of support for IUFRO sponsorship requests, George told Ann that NAUFRP has agreed to contribute \$5,000 for travelships.

Donna Harmon, AF&PA, Senior Vice President, Policy and Government Affairs: Donna discussed the changes in AF&PA's organization which were precipitated when CEO Henson Moore retired last year. Juanita Duggan replaced him and comes well qualified with association experience. Donna has been with AF&PA for five years and runs the policy and government affairs office. She has worked in industry (Champion). AF&PA's mission and focus were re-evaluated by members; public policy (lobbying, advocacy, policy initiatives) was rated highly by member company CEOs. AF&PA has reorganized around product areas (paper, recycling, manufacturing,...). The government and public affairs section is available to all the sectors; they also handle cross-cutting, industry-wide issues (e.g., climate change). Significant amounts of industry timberlands have been sold in recent times; the implications are interesting. AF&PA members have urged the TIMO's to join. Donna has done, and will continue, outreach to them. TIMOs operate differently and have different perspectives. They have a thinner level of management but are aware that what happens in DC can impact them. Policy and Public Affairs has 38 people including Nadine and Lori Perine; Bill Imbergamo (House Agric Committee) and Dave Tenney (USDA Assistant Under Secretary) will be joining AF&PA soon. Congressional issues for AF&PA this year are expected to be the Farm Bill, Renewable Energy and Tax Competitiveness. Issues that make a difference for industry: competitiveness, globalization. Question about the future of Agenda 2020? Donna says it is good and they are optimistic; new life was garnered last year with more focus on renewable fuels and technology. Check AF&PA's webpage for "Grow the Vote": tracks Congressional member votes on specific issues.

Carlton Owen, President & CEO, U.S. Endowment for Forestry and Communities, Inc.: (Via Teleconference) Carlton reviewed the endowment the foundation received as a result of the 2006 Softwood Lumber Agreement (SLA). At the time of the agreement there was \$5.5 billion in the fund: \$4.5 billion goes back to the Canada, \$500 million goes to the plaintiffs, \$500 million distributed among several entities to support "meritorious initiatives". The Endowments will receive \$200 million, the American Forest Foundation \$150 million, Habitat for Humanity \$100 million and \$50 million to the Bi-National Lumber Council. The Endowment has been chartered with two purposes: 1) educational and charitable causes in timber-reliant communities; and 2) educational and public-interest projects addressing forest management issues that affect timber-reliant communities, or the sustainability of forests as sources of building materials, wildlife habitat, bio-energy, recreation, and other values. An eleven-member Board was appointed last November and is chaired by Dick Molpus. They have three staff members and are headquartered in Greenville, SC and anticipate carrying out most of their work thru partners. They have received about 11% of their funds and think they will have the rest by the end of April. The late flow of the dollars pushed back their plans for awards. At best, they will have a very modest program in 2007. They expect a range of about 5% or about \$10 million annually. A list of about six programmatic areas of focus has been developed; these may be narrowed and will be on their website at about the time of the June board meeting. ([www.usendowment.org](http://www.usendowment.org)). Discussion: 'Research' is not defined but may relate to focal activities. It was pointed out that the definition of 'sustainable forestry' on the website is somewhat murky. How large can projects be? They want to see significant projects, but it might be clustering of projects. They do not intend to write a lot of little checks but will do fewer things but in a larger way. The program focus areas will be shared through the NAUFRP listserv when available.

Michael Goergan, Executive Director, Society of American Foresters: The Forestry in the Farm Bill Coalition has been successful. Hope to make progress on appropriations, especially regarding RREA. A recent SAF initiative is a 'small landowner certification program (through consultants). Michael has concerns about accreditation and wants to make sure its working for universities and employers. SAF membership is down; they are at about 15,000 members (19,000 when he started). The decline is two-fold: the profession has changed and what SAF can offer (the message) its members is not getting through. Discussion: The FS is not visible at chapter meetings yet they have 35,000 employees – there is disconnect somewhere. Michael says the new FS Chief Gail Kimbell is a very strong supporter of SAF. One problem has been the strict interpretation of USDA ethics rules; they prohibit/dampen active leadership in a fiduciary role. Comment: this contrasts to state

employee participation, but it seems to vary depending on the state. Michael says state employees run about 13-14% of membership and industry is 19%. Comment: accreditation is a very valuable service; SAF is encouraged not to loosen any standards. Discussion about SAF role in recruiting to undergraduate programs. Michael says they have tools for this: video, brochure but most important piece is to let people know who we are. Comment: there are two former TWS presidents present here and have experienced the same membership declines; have you gotten together with the other societies per recruiting? Michael says they meet monthly.

Larry Wiseman, President, American Forest Foundation (AFF): With the funds coming out of the SLA, there is an opportunity for the forestry community to pause and look at mutual goals in terms of advocacy, public streams of income, marketing and plan in an intelligent way. The AFF process will be to work with stakeholders to identify challenges and opportunities in terms of what's working and what's not. In the future, they will want to sit down and think through with us. Right now they are at the very beginning. It's an endowment that should mean about \$7.5 million annually. They will not use the funds to reinforce current programs. The Ford Foundation currently invests about \$7.5 million annually in forests thru the Forest Stewardship Council in the US. AFF's focus point is family forests. AFF will keep their existing programs healthy (PLT, Tree Farm,...). He expects to have a blue print late summer/early fall. Question: Will you broaden the Tree Farm Program in urban areas? Larry says yes but it will not be called Tree Farm. Comments: In reference to 'Band-Aids for broken systems', this seems an opportunity to create new things; we have discussed recruitment of students and the need for whole new systems (curriculum). There is a need to educate forest landowners who don't know they are forest landowners. Larry agrees this is a fundamental threshold. Larry reinforced the desire to invest in results not process; if research issues relate to projects, maybe they would invest in research.

Colien Hefferan, Administrator, CSREES: Colien thanked NAUFRP for efforts devoted to McStennis Strategic Planning and other support. There have been some 'temporary staff' adjustments at CSREES since Ralph Otto became Deputy Administrator. Dan Kugler is acting in Ralph's old position and Frank Boteler is acting for Dan and still overseeing his deputy area. Frank has an extensive background in natural resources. The President's proposed FY08 budget is a nod to past years and is overshadowed by the FY 07 enacted budget. FY08 is essentially flat although NRI would get an increase (it would incorporate the 406 integrated program). There would be reductions in McS and Hatch. BAC has voted to incorporate the 406 program in NRI making the water quality folks are unhappy. Only growth for these is NRI. The Administration's proposed 07 budget had parts accepted by Congress, but no changes in the formula programs. The university power was recognized. There are changes because of the moratorium on earmarks; earmarks have worked as offsets in the past. Without them, the agency has no flexibility and has to cut the tangible. CSREES was able to stay flat for FY07 because the amount in the earmarks pool (\$186 million which is about 15% of the base budget) went back into the Hatch and McS programs. Colien is impressed with how the university community responded. These increases won't be sustained. BAC's position is a competitive, multi-state component embedded in Hatch & McStennis; it's not a bad idea. The biggest challenge for the 07 budget is the short time period. McStennis cannot carry over more than 5%. CSREES has just sent out the allocations. The McS formula is very complicated; the data comes in later but the General Counsel's office is allowing last year's formula to be used. They are in the process of developing a letter describing the breath of flexibility in using the funds. Another challenge is the state match – there is not a lot of waiver, but talk to CSREES about it if it is a problem. CSREES does not actually have the money from Treasury yet and cannot allocate anything till they have it all. For Hatch, the increase applies to the 25% multi-state component. Randy pointed out that the wood utilization grant involves about 13 schools and is characteristic of a multi-state project. States who want to continue in this effort are encouraged to seek a designation. There were no increases in FY07 for extension or higher education. Randy asked what the expectations are for the special grants. Colien believes they will be restored, but maybe only 50%. The House appropriations committee is limiting the number of priorities members can have. "Rogue" special grants will be tougher as well. Restoration of special grants is feasible but of a higher priority that can stand more scrutiny. Colien says a substantial change in the portfolio is not going away. Congressional staff says no one ever comes to talk about formula dollars. The Strategic planning effort has been very helpful. Nine-percent of NRI dollars is real forestry research (about \$15 million); there is more going for

broader natural resources research. Colien apologized for the CSREES estimate that \$60 million is available to forestry; really only about \$35 million is available. She wants to see the forestry component of NRI grow; the strategic plan will help with this (i.e. CSREES is very interested in genomics). A big portion of the NRI increase is for energy; there is also a big piece for invasive species. And, in addition, a focus on recovery from natural disasters which is applicable to forestry. The FY08 budget is under development between now and August. Colien needs/wants feedback on a major science project or coordinating issues in forest problem solving. It can be one page of 2-3 ideas; identify critical priorities for collective work (don't write a RFA). Question about the NRI process. All agency program staff are invited to participate. The process is driven by 1) scientific advancement and prerogatives and 2) opportunities for immediate problem-solving thru collective work (i.e. avian flue in 03). It is fundamentally stakeholder driven but it gets caught up in staff-bias and justification. Some of it is what is going to give profile to agriculture-forestry so public can see its science driven (forest recovery post hurricane or fire). Frank says the rubber meets the road when the RFP drafters have to justify to the internal review committee. Randy acknowledges that NAUFRP probably hasn't been consistent with our commitment to following up on NRI projects; we have not been deliberate at putting things into the process. Colien reiterates her commitment to a minimum of 10% of NRI going to forestry; she will push but needs help. Question: how can we raise the visibility of the higher ed program? Colien says they have recently supported an agriculture education summit but is not sure they are going to get all they hoped for. CSREES has a catalyst role; she would like to hear the 'thinking' about forestry education – turning students' interest in the environment into something tangible. Comments: In terms of raising forestry's profile in NRI, it would be useful to look at the process. We do not have the same structure of stakeholders as agriculture; we are more likely to have something like the Summit participants. We don't have same structure to feed stakeholder input; CSREES needs to be receptive to both forms. Colien: really likes the collectivity as reflected in the Strategic Plan. CSREES supports very little poultry science because it's so vertically centralized; its not in the public interest to support 3 big suppliers. But forestry has public interest: issues like fragmentation, ....

Farm Bill, Steven Daley Laursen: Steven has been working on the Farm Bill for two years. We have been talking about McS and RREA and exploring what to add. General subject areas for forestry are: no net loss of forestland (sustainable forest policy), biomass/bioengineering (2025), disaster readiness and recovery, ecosystem services (government role), wildlife habitat incentives, landowner incentives. Discussion about NAUFRP Vision and sustainability. Randy suggests talking to 'Roll Call' and/or Congressional Quarterly for an op-ed piece. Hal, Don, and George to write a national piece modeled after Don's op-ed in Vermont paper. Randy is talking about a farm bill piece in terms of what Congressional Members are thinking about: conservation, energy, climatic change. Paragraph in last farm bill continued RREA reauthorization for 10 years at \$30 million annually. SFO -- not sure where Larry Wiseman is on this. 2025 has captured the imagination of Congress and the Administration but has not put universities on the board. Peg encouraged all to join. Pat says Board of Natural Resources came out in support. 2025 is 25% of nation's using renewable energy by that year. Randy says it has been criticized because their goals are not realistic in the short run but it's good to provoke conversation. More discussion on C-21: Randy says this is all still evolving so don't reject it offhand; there are legitimate concerns and questions.

### OTHER

The education summit in Portland, OR is March, 2008. The theme is "Teaching and Learning in Natural Resources"; they have neither agenda nor solicited papers. Perhaps in lieu of, slide this in. Suggestions: workshop format, visionary speakers. Dan K. says partners appear receptive to funding requests. He will organize a committee and plug in the regional education chairs who will lay out goals and objectives. Important to include and engage employers. Will develop a funding recommendation and work with Oregon State. Concrete recommendations/output in terms of curriculum, diversity and accreditation is desired. Comments: It seems we often talk to ourselves which reinforces the need to involve employers and talk to kids, maybe a survey. What are the boundaries? Accredited four-year schools? Dan wants to encompass forestry, environment, natural resource. Accreditation is part of the process; don't exclude but be broader. Frank

suggests a grant program to support; NAS has a subcommittee completing work on a agriculture education conference and thinks it will be out next month.

Peg shared a one-page briefing paper on the Pine Genome project. They are seeking \$10 million in FY08; the FS has committed \$1 million. Hope to get funds from NSF and DOE. Goal is then \$30 million annually for the next 4 years.

George Hopper asks that Al Ek and Mike Kelly focus on NRI. Barry and Perry to work on as well. Frank Boteler to provide names of NRI hierarcharcy

Frank Boteler called on NAUFRP to name investigators. They maintain a long list of names for a year. New concepts to CSREES: resilient communities, opportunities to frame

NAUFRP's final FY08 appropriations recommendations were reviewed: \$8 million for RREA, \$30 million for McS and \$256 for NRI. Randy advised on conduct of Hill visits: get staff business cards, follow-up is immensely important, invite them to campus.

Fall meeting is in Portland, OR. Regional chairs help on this: Peg, Chad, Steve and Doug with Doug the lead.

Nat asked for input on what the Extension Committee should be working on .

Bob Brown: CESU issue: no Washington leadership. Bob to draft a letter

Adjourned.

*Approved October 22, 2007  
Portland, Oregon*