



NAUFRP

National Association of University Forest Resources Programs

Creating Knowledge—Developing Leaders

NAUFRP EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

March 5-6, 2012

Washington, D.C.

NAUFRP Executive Committee: Tim White, President (University of Florida), Hal Salwasser, Past President (Oregon State University), Steve Bullard, President-Elect (Stephen F. Austin State University), Barry Goldfarb, Treasurer (North Carolina State University), Kamran Abdollahi, Diversity Chair (Southern University), Keith Belli, Research Chair (University of Tennessee), Janaki Alavalapati, Policy Chair (Virginia Tech University), Jim Allen, Education Chair (Northern Arizona University), Jim Johnson, International Chair (Oregon State University), Bob Wagner, Extension Chair (University of Maine), Red Baker, Southern Regional Chair (University of Kentucky), Jim Zazcek, (North Central Chair (Southern Illinois University), Joyce Berry, At-Large (Colorado State University), George Hopper, At-Large (Mississippi State University), Rob Swihart, At-Large (Purdue University), Randy Nuckolls, NAUFRP General Counsel, Terri Bates, NAUFRP Executive Liaison NAUFRP Members: Peg Gale (Michigan Tech), David Newman (SUNY), Joe McNeel (West Virginia University), Rose-Marie Muzika (University of Missouri)

Guests and Partners: Frank Boteler (USDA National Institute of Food and Agriculture), Eric Norland (NIFA), Catalino Blanche (NIFA), Ali Mohammad (NIFA), John Hayes, NAUFRP (University of Florida), Dan Robison, (North Carolina State University), Carolyn Brooks (Association of Research Directors of 1890 Land Grant Universities), Gwen Boyd (Alcorn State University), Enrique Nelson Escobar (University of Maryland), Dave Tenney (National Alliance of Forest Owners), Jim Reaves (US Forest Service), Rob Doudrick (USFS), Felipe Sanchez (USFS), Daina Apple (USFS), Rich Guldin (USFS), Wendy Fink (Association of Public Land Grant Universities), Michael Goergen (Society of American Foresters), Carol Redelsheimer (SAF), Rita Hite (American Forest Foundation), Jay Farrell (National Association of State Foresters), Nadine Block (Sustainable Forestry Initiative), (by-phone) Sharene Rakow (Green Building Initiative), Fred Hutchison, Cornerstone

A motion to accept the minutes from the November 1, 2011 Executive Committee in Honolulu, HI was made by Rob Swihart, seconded by Keith Belli. The only change noted was page 4 to correct the spelling of Morrell. *The motion was passed unanimously.*

Treasurer's Report, Barry Goldfarb: Barry reviewed the final financial report for 2011; there were three handouts. He noted that dues income in 2012 was projected to be higher than the adopted budget anticipated. This is because of the higher FY 2012 McStennis appropriation that correlates directly to what each institution is invoiced. Approximately \$112,000 was collected in 2011; based on institutions that paid last year, dues income in 2012 should run in the range of \$127,000.

Policy Report, Janaki Alavalapati: Janaki reported on the status of NAUFRP priorities in the 2012 Farm Bill. These are supported by APLU and the Forests in the Farm Bill Coalition. Randy noted that the current Farm Bill expires in September. The Research Title is not controversial but the Congressional budget agreement requires that significant reductions be made that will mostly impact the commodity programs. Hearings have begun. It may be difficult to extend the Farm Bill into next year. The mandatory funding programs such as the bioenergy research (BIRDI) programs are going to be in jeopardy going forward. It is the view of Congress that the USDA priorities have not matched up well with Congressional intent for the Farm Bill. This may affect cap grants. Frank Boteler

added that in reality, AFRI dollars (at the current level) have been captured in ongoing grants for the next several years; there are not opportunities for big projects without increases in appropriations.

Education Report, Jim Allen: Jim reported on NAUFRP education activities over the last year (handouts). Focus has been on implementing aspects of the undergraduate education strategic plan. This included the workshop held at the General Assembly last November 2nd in Honolulu, HI where small groups discussed and determined top priorities for action. These are summarized in a handout. Upcoming activities include a grant writing session at the biennial University Education in Natural Resources Conference (UENR) where NAUFRP will also lead a session “Developing a Framework for an Undergraduate Degree in Natural Resource Science and Management”. The UENR Conference will be at Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO on March 22-24. Tim commented that we are developing a closer working relationship with FAEIS (Bill Richardson) and trying to integrate Terry Sharik’s work into the FAEIS data collection. Also, NAUFRP has agreed to cover portions of Bill’s and Terry’s travel to the UENR. The Council of Environmental Deans and Directors (CEDD) has been identified as a partner to cultivate under the Strategic Plan’s Goal 3 (Strengthening Partnerships). Note that Joyce is currently president of that organization. Keith Belli noted that several southern institutions are partnering to apply for a NIFA challenge grant for recruiting and retention. These institutions are the Univ. of Tennessee, NC State, Stephen F. Austin State Univ. and Univ. of Kentucky and they are asking for \$650,000. Hal noted that OSU is engaged in something similar and described a mentor protégé program. Joyce believes it would be of value to have a presentation at the NAUFRP Fall General Assembly on the CEDD. It was founded in 2002. Forestry deans were invited at that time but have not participated all that much. Jim said there is more information on NAUFRP education committee actions on the webpage; he is also considering sending quarterly updates to the listserve. **Action Item:** Tim asked Jim, Hal and Keith to develop a clearing house on undergraduate education activities for NAUFRP web-page. Social media tools need to be included. Carolyn commented that there are conflicting messages on how much to invest in specific disciplines – they (1890’s) are told that their students do not need a degree in forestry -- that biology and/or chemistry will suffice. Barry said he has recently reviewed a listing of Forest Service positions and believes/found that individuals with forestry degrees predominantly have a competitive edge.

In anticipation of meeting with Michael Goergen the Executive Committee discussed the concerns and issues related to certification and accreditation. Tim has spoken at some length with SAF President Bill Rockwell who is pro-certification. Michael says certification is very expensive. Joyce believes it would be good to look at this. Peg has recently been on a review of Iowa State’s program and found the students there think certification is beneficial although the employers do not appear to care. Keith likes certification because it provides an opportunity to show outcomes. George Hopper says accreditation sets the standard. Barry believes there is great value in accreditation based on its long history. There was a question about what has generated this discussion? SAF has established a Task Force considering accreditation of Terrestrial Ecosystems. The questions NAUFRP should be asking Michael are why and what is the needed market. Tim asked if the Executive Committee agreed that the ideal of forestry program accreditation is valuable and sustainable? Janaki notes that VA Tech has degrees other than forestry – 75 percent of their students are in them. Rob asks if certification can do things better; they have 5 programs at Purdue, only one of which is accredited. Gwen says that at Alcorn State University, they and other 1890’s have a forestry degree that is not accredited, but find their students are hired. Tim acknowledged that there is not consensus at this point. **Action Item:** Tim appointed Kamran, Red, David, Joyce, Rob, Joe and Jim Allen as chair to move forward the discussion of accrediting terrestrial ecosystem management/natural resource management programs.

Extension Report, Bob Wagner: The second Strategic Plan for RREA has been completed and distributed. It includes a proposal for funding strategies. RREA funding in FY12 is \$3.7 million which is down from FY11, however the President’s FY13 request is for \$4.06 million. FY11 RREA Focus Fund awards went to the National Agroforestry Center (Forest Farming Community of Practice), Oregon State (Women Owning Woodlands) and NC State (Expanding the Reach of Extension with Webinar Technology). NIFA and the FS will fund an Expert Workshop at the National Academy of Science in 2013 on communicating climate change information to private forest landowners. Eric suggested exploring an extension component to the NAUFRP webpage describing what various institutions are engaged in. Bob will provide Terri with his written report.

Research Report, Keith Belli: Keith reviewed the NIFA visits late last year that included Dave and Rob. A report has been sent to the listserve. Visits are planned with National Program Leaders (NPLs) on Tuesday; those interested are invited to join them. Only \$8 million in funds across the disciplines will be available this fiscal year and only four Fellowships which Greg Smith wants to focus on capacity. Bob says they are currently writing up the northeastern review of forestry research capacity as a national proposal. **Action Item:** A message needs to go out to the listserve reminding scientists to sign up by end of fiscal year. The NPLs say they are using the list. Work and discussions are continuing with the FS on the issues of tuition and grant agreements. At last fall's meeting, Keith Rob, Janaki and Kurt were tasked with developing a proposal modeled after the fisheries and wildlife cooperative research units. This sounds like a radical change, but it really is not because the FS has people stationed at universities. A three-way partnership in this situation would be the state forestry agency, FS and university. The mission would be three parts: teaching, research and education. Universities would essentially get a FS employee that acts as faculty, housed by university and salary paid by the FS. States would get more focus on state issues vs. regional and/or national. Such a proposal may require legislation. Comments: there may be a problem with the FS teaching and there is concern it would reduce dollars for grad students. Tim believes there appears to be consensus on moving forward with this if Jim Reaves and Jay Farrell are comfortable with the idea; it will be discussed with them when they are here.

Diversity Report, Kamran Abdollahi: Kamran noted that the two action items related to diversity from the Hawaii Executive Committee meeting have been completed. He believes it would be of value to have some follow-up to the Diversity Summit held in Orlando, FL in 2009; specifically a scientific survey is needed. Kamran is working with the HBCs through the ARDs who are essentially the Research Directors at the 1890s (www.umes.edu.ard). They have established a subcommittee of the institutions now receiving McS funds and Kamran is the chair. There are thirteen 1890's receiving McS funds and their strength in forestry varies. They are very good at building capacity and partnerships but have a tendency to partner outside their states rather than within. Almost all their research directors are deans. Frank commented that grant proposals, especially CAPs, are strengthened by having a minority institution participate. A comment was that one of the bigger obstacles to partnerships between the 1890s and 1862's seems to be relationships below the administration level at the faculty level. Gwen says that even where there is collaboration the funding split is not well balanced. Randy asked what can NAUFRP do to move forward? Carolyn says we are on the right track. There is an ARD meeting in August; Carolyn is responsible the agenda and will ensure that NAUFRP has the opportunity to be involved.

Dave Tenny, National Alliance of Forest Owners: Dave noted that NAFO now has nearly at 70 members owning approximately 80 million acres. They have a staff of seven. The issues they are currently focused on our energy policy, water and taxes. He reviewed the status of the judicial challenge on forest roads; they expect a decision by the Solicitor General whether to recommend the case be heard before the Supreme Court by late May and from the Court itself by June. The issue revolving around the 'Tailoring Rule' at EPA was referred to a Science Advisory Board and it is "a mess". On taxes, Congress is talking about reform. Forestry enjoys a different treatment in certain aspects -- recognition of assets held for long time. NAFO will work to continue these. Dave thanked NAUFRP for help on the Tailoring Rule and Forest Service roads issues -- it added creditability to the NAFO case. Last year at this meeting Dave said 2012 would be the year of research. Since then the University of Georgia forestry school has become a NAFO member. Dave would like to explore ways of developing an explicit relationship with the universities. There was a question on the cost of membership? Membership dues/fees are tiered: for a state association or affiliation it is \$250/year. Dave says we would need to figure it out: a relationship needs to do something and have an agenda that will drive actions; UGA is paying \$10,000 annually and is on the NAFO Board. Another question was what would membership get a university? Dave is not sure, but is hearing consistently that NAUFRP wants to engage with NAFO members. Randy says there has been a good working and collaboration relationship with NAFO. He also reviewed the history of the AF&PA research committee and how we worked with them. Hal referenced an Oregon harvest tax for which the dollars go to research and a forestry education fund. Industry, which included NAFO members, intervened helpfully on this. Tim said that since NAFO members hire our university graduates it makes sense to have a joint voice on research resources and outreach. Dave reinforced that NAFO was created for one purpose and that is advocacy. There was a question about the outlook for the Tailoring Rule? Dave said another draft is expected before the end of the month and there would be another stakeholder meeting. NAUFRP may have a role in reminding key audiences about the fundamentals of forests in the carbon

cycle –another letter may be useful. Dave was asked if NAFO has a position on research? Dave says no. NAFO came in fighting fires on other issues that are still burning. He suggested that the Farm Bill may be the framework for going forward.

FRAC Report, Joyce Berry: The USDA Forestry Research and Advisory Council (FRAC) held a meeting last September. There was supposed to be an upcoming one in March but USDA has put a cap on advisory meetings and it is tentatively rescheduled for June. There has been a move to make the Forest Service the sole administrator for FRAC. Four positions need to be filled in the areas of ngos, industry and state. They no longer need to go through the Federal Register nomination process. Hal asked if there has ever been a review of FRAC's impact? Frank compared FRAC to NAREEE. Internally they are handled differently: NAREEE's recommendations are handed out to the agencies to implement; this is not the case for FRAC. Last year's FRAC recommendations included one to review the McS program and they are going through an internal process now. Frank said NIFA is responsible for informing FRAC on the McS Strategic Plan recommendations and what criteria they have adopted to carry those recommendations out.

The 15 minute video on McIntire-Stennis program history developed at Stephen F. Austin was shown. It is in final stages. There are plans to customize it to 30 second spots for the states. Further discussion is needed on a 'tool kit' for the NAUFRP website of mechanisms to celebrate McS. One objective is to find/identify a new Congressional champion.

Budget and Advocacy Committee Report, Tim White: The NAUFRP President has become the representative on BAC. This has been well worth the dues we pay. NAUFRP will take Cornerstone's position on appropriations recommendations for McS, AFRI, and RREA. Tim described the background of the APLU Board and distributed an APLU handout with FY13 requests. The 'ask' for RREA is \$4.07 million. The potential impact if there is a sequestration in January 2013 could be very significant -- \$1.2 trillion cut from the domestic budget.

International Report, Jim Johnson: IUFRO will be in Salt Lake City in 2014 in conjunction with the SAF Convention. Jim distributed an announcement for the SAF Gregory Award which provides an \$1,800 travel stipend for international students or professionals to travel to the SAF convention. Jim is trying to get an article into the Journal of Forestry about the World Forestry Congress and the value of undergraduate study abroad. He asked how many from the Executive Committee have international study programs, how many have a problem of critical mass and are there ways we can coordinate? NAU and Colorado State are doing this. Jim plans to pursue these questions. Finally, Jim reported that USAID has, or is about to, put out a large RFP to create university consortium.

Board of Natural Resources (BNR) Report, Hal Salwasser: Hal provided an update on the Roadmap for Natural Resources that is being developed to complement that of Agriculture. They have a grant in place and have solicited names of potential experts for a Delphi process. They expect to have 8-10 experts per topic area. Wendy added that they hope to eventually engage the agriculture side to determine areas of overlap. A white paper will be produced.

Agriculture Technical Representative, Steve Bullard: The President-Elect is the ATR representative on behalf of NAUFRP. A new McS manual is a work in progress. It may end up being wrapped into a larger formula fund manual. Steve would like to identify more actions to commemorate the McS 50th Anniversary. We have previously talked about a Congressional reception and/or breakfast and an ATR conference in 2013 which could be used to realign McS Strategic Plan with USDA priorities. The latter could be done in a workshop format. Eric clarified that McS awards are for a program of research, not a project.

Southern Report, Red Baker: Southern NAUFRP had a good regional meeting in Hawaii. They are pleased with the discussion with the FS Southern Station on partnering on students and financial awards. Currently they are collecting comparative data and have received survey back from about half their institutions. Their next meeting will be in late May in Florida in conjunction with the Forest Landowners Association annual meeting. They may add half a day to meet with the Southern Research Station and would like to bring in the 1890's deans. Will there be a Southern Leadership Tour? They have talked to Rob Doudrick about this but there are funding concerns at this point, but maybe in 2013.

North Central Report, Jim Zaczek: The North Central region is continuing work on a comparative survey. Their region has also been discussing the FS issue of tuition and fees. Coop models with the FS (ie co-funding faculty model). New institutional reps in their region are Paul Doruska at Univ. of WI, Rich Kobe at Michigan State and Sue Blodgett at Iowa State.

Western Report: Jim Allen noted their region hopes to have a summer meeting in California. Bruce Bare is working on the comparative survey for their region.

Action Item: Tim noted that the Executive Committee has discussed making an effort at a regional level to contact schools who have not been paying dues. We will plan to share who these institutions are with the regional chairs and coordinate follow-up with them.

The 2012 Annual Meeting will be late October in Spokane, WA. Further discussion with Michael Goergen is needed on recognition of McS at a SAF plenary session. Tim reviewed the format of our meeting. Action Item: This discussion will discuss via email a theme. A couple of possibilities are: certification and accreditation; future workforce.

Keith discussed a proposal that Rob, David and he developed for a 'new faculty mentoring trip' to meet with NIFA NPLs (handout). There would be a number advantages to this and a structure was outlined. Comments were that a theme identified in advance to target the discussion with NPLs would be useful. Carolyn suggested identifying a fifth region that equates to the 1890s and including a representative from this group. Eric volunteered NIFA to help coordinate on this. There was general agreement to move ahead on this and incorporate the 1890's. Keith will coordinate and work with Eric on this.

Jim Reaves, Deputy Chief, Forest Service Research and Development: Jim reviewed the FS budget national priorities (handout). They are now using 'Forest Disturbance' in the context of climate change. The FY13 budget proposal would reduce scientist capacity. There are no S&PF dollars for FIA which will impact the program. There is enhanced focus on Green Building and Green Technology. FS Key Events: Secretary's Report on Green Building, FS Planning, RPA, PCAST Report, Sustainability Report. Key Issues: Green Building and Technology, FS R&D jobs, invasive species, white nose bat, thousand canker disease, urban forestry. On the ongoing subject of Grants and Agreements (handout that Terri did not get), work on this issue from the FS side has not been completed. Tim referred to the CESUs. Keith outlined the idea of Cooperative Forestry Research Units that could work a variety of ways. Jim wanted to consider this in more depth before responding. Tim urged that we just keep moving it forward. Jim said all the Station Directors will be in Spokane at the time of the SAF convention and they want to plan a meeting with NAUFRP. FS will work with Terri on this. Jim said the FS is looking at diversity within the FS. They would like to get NAUFRP experience and perceptions. Action Item: identify 4-6 NAUFRP representatives to work with the FS on this diversity review.

Frank Boteler, Assistant Director, Institute of Bioenergy, Climate, and Environment, NIFA: Frank reviewed a report prepared for NAUFRP (handout). He urged everyone to be sure to apply early on NIFA grants. AFRI dollars for natural resources are running about \$8.2 million. IDC go up to 30 percent for competitive grants. Although they get few comments at the AFRI Listening Sessions these can be influential. Frank encouraged NAUFRP to submit formal input. Question about the best way to have input: email and/or website? Frank said yes so long as comments are well thought out and represent a group. The time frame for this is end of April. Action Item: Need to get NAUFRP comments on record based on McS plan priorities; they need to fit into foundation or challenge areas and include the Fellows Program. Roger Beachy left his position as NIFA Director almost a year ago. A successor is expected to be named shortly. There is a 23 percent increase in competitive grants proposed for FY 2013. AFRI would be increased to \$325 million. As discussed earlier, an internal review of McS is underway for FRAC; they are surveying at the state level for info and case history. The report is to go back to FRAC in 2013. There was a question about the reason for the review. Frank says it may work to highlight 50th Anniversary. Hal suggests it would be good to conduct a review of FRAC's productivity and value. Daniel Cassidy was the NIFA point person on the Roadmap; with his delegation to the Under Secretary's office, Eric will be lead. Randy clarified

that \$200 million of AFRI monies are already committed to multi-year projects; only about \$60 million will be available for new AFRI programs and focused in priority areas.

IUFRO 2014, Rich Guldin (Forest Service): A Project Manager, Jennifer Hayes, has just been hired to work full time for Rich on IUFRO planning and organization. Committee Chairs are in the process of being appointed. A student hotel has been identified. By April 3rd, they will have some ideas for excursion tours around Salt Lake City. The goal is have 8 to 15 one-day tours with particular focus on a discipline or problem. The short descriptions of these will be ready by late August for promotional materials. The FS has contracted out the design of a logo, website and promotional materials. The website is due to be up by late May. They want to include NAUFRP on the logo. Steve Bullard made a **motion**, seconded by Rob Swihart, to authorize the use of the NAUFRP logo on official and promotional materials. *The motion passed unanimously.* Rich pointed out the need to think about the timing of the NAUFRP meeting. IUFRO will kick off on Sunday evening, October 5th with a reception and close with a gala dinner on Saturday, October 12th. The SAF Convention will begin Wednesday with the Ice Breaker; field tours may be Wednesday. An **Action Item** for Spokane will be to discuss 2014 NAUFRP meeting plans. NAUFRP may want to host a formal meeting for academic leaders from around the world. This idea could be explored at the May meeting in Sarajevo. IUFRO will have 8-10 concurrent sessions. Terry Sharik has talked to Rich about creating a display booth. Rich is still looking for tours that NAUFRP members can help with – pre and post conference. The thinking right now is a southern tour of industrial forestry (lead would be Rob Doudrick) and a New England Tour (lead would be Michael Rains) that would be 3-4 days; nothing is set yet. Rich needs the Station and university teams to design and arrange the details.

John Hayes, National Association of University Fish and Wildlife Programs (NAUFWP): NAUFWP is reviving as an organization after 10 years thanks to the efforts of Jim Sweeney and Dan Edge. Eric Hallerman from Virginia Tech is the President-Elect. Ken Wilson from Colorado State is the Secretary-Treasurer. Their first meeting is next week at the Wildlife Management Institute Conference in Atlanta. Their goals are to reinvigorate and build out the Executive Council. John asked NAUFRP to encourage their mutual colleagues to become involved. They need to move to a sustainable budget model which likely means restructuring their dues and solidifying their relationships with external partners like the state fish and wildlife agencies and wildlife research unit coops. The US Fish and Wildlife Service is exploring avenues to increase diversity within its programs; there is a lot of interest in this right now. As the discussion of forestry research coop units goes forward, they would be very interested in being a partner. Randy is working for them and NAUFRP is a good model. Questions and Discussion: How many fish and wildlife programs are there in this country? A survey by The Wildlife Society using a very broad definition found about 250 programs (includes community colleges). Most states have a wildlife program. In reality, there are probably about 60 programs. Question: Are they going to include a regional structure in their organization? Although NAUFWP's By-Laws parallel ours, many of the regional chairs are vacant. John is not sure that is the most logical structure. Randy pointed out their bigger challenge is they don't have anything equivalent to McS which is a key factor in defining NAUFRP. Question: Does it include marine? Yes. Question: Why two organizations and would it help politically to just have one? Yes, there is overlap but it cuts both ways – would fit in some ways not in others. It makes sense to partner very closely. Tim said we have had this discussion before with Dan Edge and agreed it made sense to wait till NAUFWP got up and running and determined its goals. Question: What is the dues structure? It is two-tiered: \$500/year and \$100/year for associates. This is likely to change and go to something like \$700/annually. Hal said the Roadmap will force us to team up more strongly. An ongoing concern about merging the association is forestry would dominate. John says they have a lot to bring to the table. Barry suggested this may force us to rethink the NAUFRP structure—we could have more disciplinary committees to get them a seat at the table or perhaps joint committees. George says the APLU Structure of a Board of Natural Resources is very good. Randy notes that there are a log of agencies we don't talk to (NOAA, Interior, DOD) that NAUFWP can help us with.

Michael Goergen and Carol Redelsheimer, Society of American Foresters (SAF): On the policy front, Michael said SAF would be generating a letter to Congress on biomass energy. SAF has produced a comprehensive report (it has been downloaded 46,000 times). For the fall convention, SAF will get information out early on alumni receptions. Carol said they have met with the vendors who offer e-accreditation. The benefits are an opportunity to update things concurrently and increase the security of documentation. The Terrestrial Ecosystem Task Force was

established in 2009 and began its work in 2010. Carol started with SAF in August 2010. We all know the trends in enrollment. The Task Force wanted to consider what terrestrial accreditation would look like. A workshop was held in Hawaii. The feedback was they were on the wrong track. There is ongoing discussion now. A formal report will go to Council in June. Carol thinks they will recommend going forward and expects to reach out to NAUFRP at that point. Tim asked about the mechanism for NAUFRP's role and input? Carol reviewed the process and Task Force charter. The report will be completed in May. The Task Force will not make the standards; that goes to a different committee (the name?) which would then draft the standard. Carol sees that as a place for NAUFRP input. Carol asked the sense of the Executive Committee – is this a good thing or not? George says this is the first he has heard about it. The deans are responsible for allocating resources; they need a voice in this early on. Who's been involved? Greg Brown (former dean at Virginia Tech) is chair of the Task Force; Keith Blatner (Washington State) and Terry Sharik (Utah State) are members. Tim said the Executive Committee shares George's concern: once you put a standard in place, we have to implement it. NAUFRP needs and wants to be more involved in the process. Question: Is this a done deal? Carol understood Terry Sharik was a liaison. Tim said Terry is not on the Executive Committee. Barry asked what the goal is? It has not been articulated here today. Are employers calling for it? Tim says our goal here is to determine how we can set up a structure to ensure NAUFRP is involved – it is our institutions that are going to be impacted – and not after the fact. Michael says they have talked to other societies about this and will work with Tim and John Hayes on a process. The report will be shared before June. Hal asked if there is a recreational society and are they involved? Yes, there is a recreational society but not sure of their involvement. Jim Allen reminded the group there was a meeting of natural resources organizations late last summer and asked about its status? Tim reinforced this is about process, not the idea. The Executive Committee will appreciate it if SAF will identify a formal way to include NAUFRP and the NAUFWP.

Rita Hite, American Forest Foundation (AFF): Rita works on the government relations side and is not as engaged with the programmatic side of AFF. AFF is working to engage family forest landowners. They have several pilots underway including one in Mississippi. They want to see students coming out with skills and knowledge to work with family forest landowners and hence are partnering with Clemson Univ. to design curriculum tools towards this end. That product will be shared with NAUFRP. Question about AFF's ability to tap into the USDA Beginning Family Farm and Ranch Research program. Rita knows they submitted a proposal but that it was not successful. Keith asked if AFF has been asked to put landowners on AFRI panels. There was a question about the American Tree Farm Program and its sustainability. Rita says they have a Task Force and Stakeholder process that is mixed with State Foresters, landowners, industry and extension representatives. The April meeting will be used to present and determine the next steps. It may take a different infrastructure. On the Policy side, Rita is part of the leadership of the Forests in the Farm Bill Coalition (FFBC). Approximately 65-70 organizations have endorsed the four priorities that the FFBC is promoting. Rita noted the odd process the Super Committee went through last fall -- it was not a happy process for anyone. According to Congressional staff the Conservation Title did well. And there was nothing controversial in the Research Title to worry about. The Beginning Farmer and Rancher program was reportedly strengthened for forestry. There was good language for FIA to reinforce the direction and importance of the program, especially related to the value of inventory of biomass. A current issue is the Bio-Based Market Program. Although it is being promoted by the Administration, it does not recognize many traditional forest based products. AFF will be working with others for a legislative fix. Janaki said one of the problems is the groups who are talking about this issue are not homogeneous. It is not a case of aggie vs. forestry although it could go there. Tim says we want to help on this. Barry said the Congressional intent was for this program to highlight new products per labeling and branding (e.g. bamboo plywood). Rita said another policy focus for AFF is extending the current estate tax law and special conservation use. The Conservation Easement Tax expired last year. There are a lot of legislative co-sponsors but it will probably depend upon the elections. There is a new FS Community Forestry Program. It was inspired by the Forest Legacy Program and authorized in the 2008 Farm Bill but is only funded at a small amount. Rita left a handout and referred all to the AFF website.

Jay Farrell, National Association of State Foresters: NASF's first policy priority is appropriations, specifically S&PF programs in the FS budget. Their second priority is the Ninth Circuit Court Decision. Twenty-nine State Attorney Generals have signed a petition for the Supreme Court to review this. SAF recently sponsored a Hill seminar on water quality and forest roads. NASF's third policy priority is State Forest Action Plans. Collectively these serve has a strategic plan for the Nation's forests. Their Forest Markets Committee has issued comments on

US Green Building Council regarding the draft LEED 2012 standard. Jay also referenced the recent action by the Maine Governor who issued an Executive Order requiring wood be recognized as the preferred building material and this would include wood certified under the SFI and ATS systems. All State Foresters are trying to replicate this within their states. Jay recently participated in a White House Conference on Conservation which had significant focus on forestry and recreation. NASF has been involved in this from the beginning and has used it as a venue for promoting family working forests. They were a bit disappointed at the emphasis that went to recreation. NASF has been very active in the FFBC. The Nebraska State Forester is a member of FRAC. NASF' research interests are invasive species, FIA, economic markets. NASF has enjoyed interns from many schools, most recently from the Univ. of Vermont and Michigan State. They now have a rolling application process on their webpage but will still ask Terri to circulate notices. Keith mentioned the idea of duplicating the wildlife cooperative research units as a three-way partnership. The parallel for forestry would be the university forestry programs, State Foresters and FS. Jay noted that the Hawaii State Forester is the chair of their Forest Health and Research Committee.

Nadine Block, Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI): A SFI standard is to support research. SFI has sponsored millions of dollars in research development grants that run three years. There is a deadline coming up of March 14th. This year the focus theme will be water for the first time. The SFI annual conference will be Sept. 11-13 in Milwaukee, WI. Dick Brinker and Tat Smith are on their Board. Last year they began funding student scholarships for those in the region. SFI is very involved in Green Building and certification issues. They want to engage with universities with building green on campuses. Nadine introduced Sharene Rakow, Green Building Initiative who joined by conference phone to talk about Green Globes, an offshoot of European LEED. They have certified buildings on the campuses of Purdue Univ., Univ. of Arizona, Old Miss, Univ of Arkansas, Drexel Univ. This is a commercial system to certify sustainability in both new and existing buildings that can be done on-line by buying a software program. It takes less time to do than LEED – fewer people, lower costs. Peg asked Nadine about the FSC chain of custody and whether there had been any recent changes – Peg now understands that a logger has to be certified at additional cost. Nadine thinks there may have been a recent change in the FSC process but says SFI does not feel a logger needs to be certified. SFI does require logger training and some states do certify them

Fred Hutchison, Cornerstone: Cornerstone has represented APLU for nine years. Fred provided background on Cornerstone and the relationship with the Board of Agriculture BAC. Given the current budget climate, they are not going to ask for any big increase unless the President comes in with something big in NIFA. This year they are staying very focused. The budget climate leads to some pretty dire potential impacts, especially with the split between security and non-security; security is going to win. Sequestration could run 10 percent. The total Agriculture appropriations bill is two percent of all discretionary spending.

Randy urged everyone on their Hill visits to keep the focus on FY 2013. Don't get off track with questions on what is going to happen if there is sequestration. Discuss the importance of sustaining programs with examples from the states and the value of McS back home. NAUFRP 'asks' were reviewed: RREA at \$4.06 million, McS at \$32.924 million, AFRI at \$325 million. It would probably be useful to remind people that McS funds are now going to thirteen 1890 schools.

#

Spokane, Washington

*Minutes Adopted
October 23, 2012*

ACTION ITEMS

Action Item: Jim Allen, Hal and Keith to develop a clearing house on undergraduate education activities for NAUFRP web-page.

Action Item: Jim Allen (chair), Kamran, Red, David, Joyce, Rob, Joe to move forward the discussion of accrediting terrestrial ecosystem management/natural resource management programs.

Action Item: Listserve message reminding faculty/scientists to sign up as potential NIFA panelists on the NAUFRP webpage by the end of fiscal year. (Keith B)

Action Item: Barry, Tim, Terri to provide regional chairs with a list of institutions who have not paid dues in their regions and coordinate appropriate follow-up with them.

Action Item: NAUFRP 2012 Annual Meeting planning via email. (Tim, Steve, Terri). 1) A theme needs to be finalized. 2) A topic presentation on the Council of Environmental Deans and Directors (Joyce Berry) 3) Plans to meet with Forest Service R&D Leadership and 4) 2014 NAUFRP Meeting Plans in conjunction with the IUFRO Meeting

Action Item: There was agreement to move forward on the faculty mentoring proposal. Intend to include the 1890s. Keith will coordinate.

Action Item: Identify 4-6 NAUFRP representatives to work with the FS on their diversity review. (Done)

Action Item: Need to provide NIFA formal comments (e.g., Listening Sessions) from NAUFRP comments that incorporate McS plan priorities. These need to apply to foundation and challenge areas as well as the Fellows Program.