



# NAUFRP

*National Association of University Forest Resources Programs*

*Creating Knowledge—Developing Leaders*

## NAUFRP EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Spokane, Washington

October 23, 2012

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), Kurt Pregitzer, Western Regional Chair (University of Idaho), Mike Messina, Northeastern Regional Chair (Pennsylvania State University), Jim Zazcek, North Central Chair (Southern Illinois University), Rob Swihart, At-Large (Purdue University), Randy Nuckolls, NAUFRP General Counsel, Terri Bates, NAUFRP Executive Liaison

NAUFRP Members: Joe McNeel (West Virginia University), Ken Fulgham (Humboldt State University), Bruce Bare (University of Washington), Tom Maness (Oregon State University), Steve Tesch (Oregon State University), Terry Sharik (Michigan State University)

Participants: Frank Boteler (USDA National Institute of Food and Agriculture), Carolyn Brooks (Association of Research Directors of 1890 Land Grant Universities), Gwen Boyd (Alcorn State University), Carol Redelsheimer (Society of American Foresters), Paul Trianosky, (Director, Southern Forest Conservation, American Forest Foundation), Dave Tenny by phone, (President and CEO, National Alliance of Forest Owners)

After introductions, Tim White reported that several members of the Executive Committee met with the U.S. Forest Service Research Leadership Team Monday morning for several hours. Details will be shared at appropriate points on today's agenda. It was a very good meeting and Tim encouraged NAUFRP do this on a regular basis.

A motion was made to accept today's agenda by Steve Bullard; seconded by Keith Belli. The motion carried.

A motion was made by Barry Goldfarb to accept the minutes of the March 5-6, 2012 Executive Committee meeting; seconded by Jim Allen. The motion carried.

1890s Membership: Tim provided background on the proposal that will be considered and voted on by the NAUFRP General Assembly tomorrow that the 1890 institutions receiving McIntire-Stennis research funds become members of NAUFRP. The 2008 Farm Bill made them eligible to receive the funds; thirteen of the 18 institutions now do so. NAUFRP has previously sought ways to engage the 1890s; the proposal is result of these efforts. The Association of Research Directors (ARD) is an 1890 organization and Carolyn Brooks is the Executive Director. If the proposal is accepted, it will require changes to the NAUFRP bylaws and dues structure. The 1890s' dues would be paid in one lump sum by the ARD. Barry pointed out that the authority to amend the by-Laws lies with the General Assembly and the changes proposed would make the ARD Executive Director a

permanent member of the Executive Committee and authorize a dues structure for the 1890s. (The amendment to the By-Laws also includes several other updates such as making the Policy Chair a member of the Executive Committee). Barry made a motion that the Executive Committee recommend that the General Assembly approve these changes (By-Laws and Dues Structure); Kamran seconded the motion. Discussion/Questions: It was clarified that if each 1890 paid individually according to the dues structure in place, that amount would be about \$13,000; however, a discount was negotiated since the ARD will be collecting and paying dues directly to NAUFRP on behalf of the 1890 institutions. Actually, the net dues increase would only be about \$6,500 because Alabama A&M and Southern Universities, standing members of NAUFRP for some time, will fall within this agreement. Kamran gave an overview of the ARD organization. Strong support was noted for this proposal but there was also agreement that an engagement strategy needs to be developed. Tim believes this will follow with the ARD Executive Director on the Executive Committee. *The motion passed unanimously.*

NAFO Membership: Tim provided background on the proposal that NAUFRP become an association member of the National Alliance of Forest Owners. They are a new organization of 60-plus members whose focus to date is advocacy and legislation. Many of their members were previously members of the American Forest and Paper Association which advocated for forestry research programs. NAFO has not been thinking about research and extension although NAUFRP has been talking to them for several years about identifying their members' research needs. Steve Bullard made a motion that NAUFRP join NAFO as an Association Member for a cost of \$250 a year; a second was made by Kurt Pregitzer. Discussion/Questions. Randy gave further background on NAFO's founding and that they have not focused at all on research and in fact, surprisingly, they have little understanding of federal research programs. The hope is that this new relationship will lead to joint efforts to support research in the future. Among NAFO members are Plum Creek, Rayonier, Hancock, and TIMOs. NAFO is very strong in Washington, DC. Should NAUFRP consider joining other associations like the American Forest Foundation or the Forest Landowner Association (FLA) and what would the implications be? Is there a perception that we lose our objectivity by aligning with them? It was noted that the Univ. of Georgia School of Forestry and Natural Resources is a full member of NAFO at a cost of \$10,000 annually. NAUFRP's goal would be to educate NAFO's members on the relevance and value of university research. It was noted that FLA already advocates on university research. Randy said membership does not mean we endorse every issue they take on; we would be sensitive to differences on issues (i.e., example of the recent letter co-sponsored to EPA – NAUFRP did not sign but individual deans and directors did so). The goal is to get research on the NAFO radar screen and engaged. Steve reported on the proposal that NAUFRP is working on to survey NAFO members on research needs. Reviewing the NAFO webpage, their priority issues currently include bioenergy, climate change, sustainability and the benefits of working forests. There is a great deal of forest information state by state. Their mission reads "advancing federal policies that promote the economic and environmental benefits of privately-owned forests at the national level." Are there other ways to commit? There is sensitivity to the 'perception' of being a member. Tim pointed out that we have been talking to NASF about a MOU, or similar collaborative document. Is it the same if we want a closer relationship with NASF or AFF? Steve said in the South, each school pays FLA membership. Comments: If we join, we can always back away. The cost is irrelevant; we should have a closer relationship -- it's a responsibility to landowners. The idea of an MOU is good, but there is concern about being a member of an advocacy group. Terry Sharik noted that Univ. of Michigan has a close relationship with The Nature Conservancy. Comment: there is not an option of becoming a member of some of the groups mentioned. Bob suggested NAUFRP have a strategic plan to have a relationship with all forest land interest groups (federal, state, private, conservation,...) Randy said the Executive Committee has done a good job of engaging with other groups. NAFO is a new entity and we have been meeting with them. Comment: there doesn't seem to be a real difference per perception between a MOU and association membership. It would be good to look more broadly; like Bob's suggestion of developing a strategy. We are going to talk later about a research proposal to survey the NAFO members -- is the survey contingent on our being a member? No; this was Dave Tenny's suggestion. Steve thinks developing a strategy would be a good task for the Extension Chair. Bob agreed to do this with an ad hoc group. Hal thinks it wise to affiliate with NAFO and increase their awareness of us and seek their advocacy, but also wise to reach out to others like the Conservation Fund, The Nature Conservancy and Trust for Public Land. We don't need to do the latter before joining NAFO. Randy says it very important to keep NAFO close and engaged with us. We need to convince them of the value of our programs. They are a significant voice in DC. Comment: if we can't get them to advocate for us, then who will? A straw vote indicated comfort with the way the discussion was evolving. Steve amended his original motion, seconded by Kurt, to read 'NAUFRP will

engage an ad hoc committee to develop a strategic plan to broadly engage with a range of organizations of which would include NAFO'. Discussion: This is only an annual membership; we could decide to withdraw after a year. A MOU is not precluded. It is understood that NAUFRP would join as part of a broader strategic effort recognizing different organizations have different objectives. The key concern here is the 'perception' of losing objectivity. The vote was called for. The motion passed unanimously. **Action Item:** Bob was asked to lead the Task Group which would include Steve Tesch, Joe McNeel, Terry Sharik, Red Baker and Kamran Abdollahi.

Treasurer's Report, Barry Goldfarb: Barry reviewed the Treasurer's Report (handout) that included a text report on NAUFRP's financial position that closed out 2011 and covered 2012 to date. Income and expenses were lower than anticipated for 2011. There was a \$70,000 in carryover. Overall, NAUFRP finances are fairly stable, but with a slow decline in reserves. The FY12 budget essentially adopted the 2011 budget, but dues income increased because the McStennis appropriation, which dues are tied to, increased slightly. Expenses in 2012 are projected to be slightly less than the budget and thus we may have a slight surplus. Barry noted that we have been under-budget in the line item for Executive Committee travel thanks to those who have charged travel to their institution. The 2013 proposed budget was reviewed. Dues income from the 1890s is not included because it will not be voted on till tomorrow by the General Assembly, however it is footnoted. A motion was made by Jim Allen, seconded by Bob Wagner, to approve the Treasury Report and FY 2013 budget. Discussion: The NAFO membership dues need to be factored in. Edits are needed to update the NIFA and APLU acronyms. Note that increases are provided for the Education line-item and Executive Liaison position. The motion was adopted unanimously.

Diversity Report, Kamran Abdollahi: Kamran would like to see a scientific survey developed and conducted to address the diversity issues/needs as related to NAUFRP members in particular, and the workforce in general. Barry reported that an agenda topic from yesterday's joint meeting with the FS Research Leadership was diversity. The entire Forest Service is putting emphasis on increasing diversity; this is coming from Chief Tom Tidwell– it's the legacy he wants to leave. The agency's diversity numbers are not keeping up with demographic changes. The R&D initiative intends to hire 10 minority scientists using dollars from the top. There are changes in the federal Pathways program to note. The FS encouraged the universities to stay in touch with the Station Directors and let them know if they have prospective students; the SDs will find a place and resources for them. This includes internships. The agency has over 100-plus seasonal positions. There is also a heavy emphasis on hiring veterans, especially disabled ones. Tim reported that NAUFRP briefed the FS on our impending program with the 1890s. **Action Item:** NAUFRP and the FS agreed to set up a Joint Task Force with the objective of coordinating and communicating on opportunities. Alex Friend (SW Station) and Jim Allen agreed to lead. Kamran agreed to serve on it and asked Frank Boteler if NIFA would potentially be involved. Frank said yes and noted that Ali Mohamed should be the person from NIFA on this. Carolyn is willing to work on the Task Force with Kamran. Terry Sharik said a lot of things are going on in this arena: Virginia Tech is hosting a conference on Diversity in June 2013 which would be a good place to bring all this. Tim said that could be a possible outcome of the report of programs the Task Force will look at. The survey could be a part of that – this will be Steve's decision. John Kusano from FS R&D is to get back to us on details and plans for the Task Group by January. With Janaki as a link to the conference, it will help get the Task Force up and running. There are no resources to support the Task Group. Frank said there are opportunities to tap into the Hispanic network– there is a lot happening there. The TWS has had an effort with the Tribal colleges. Ken said that at Humboldt, the FS has had a serious recruitment and outreach effort gauged to the multi-cultural student population which has increased Hispanic numbers. Interestingly, now the university is seeing some. He suggested that the Task Force look at some of these obstacles. Janaki encouraged that the Task Force work with MANNRs.

Research Report, Keith Belli: Keith reported that the Review Panel data base on the NAUFRP website lists 273 scientists. He has surveyed them to determine if they are being contacted and asked to serve and if they actually did so. He received 171 responses: 13 percent were contacted in 2011-12; six served on panels in 2011, 7 as of the survey date in 2012. Frank said that because there have been fewer grants there have been fewer panels, but by 2015, NIFA anticipates having an increased number of AFRI grants/panels. Keith is trying to keep the list updated and get the names on there that should be. He asked NAUFRP members to encourage their faculty to sign up and that recognition is accounted for in annual reviews. Extension and teaching faculty are needed on the review panels in addition to those tenured. Tim said it is important to get the 1890s on this list. Carolyn said they

have something similar on their website. Another agenda item on yesterday's joint meeting agenda with the FS R&D was the concept of a cooperative forestry research unit model. The gist of that discussion was that it's been a successful model on the wildlife side – they are situated in universities, supported with federal dollars with operational assistance from state wildlife agencies. It was stressed that this is not a suggestion for an equivalent for forestry, but useful as a guide with benefits of increased flexibility for scientists stationed on campuses, leveraged expertise on both sides and used by state agencies. They talked about what works and does not. This is now on the broader FS R&D radar screen; they will discuss it further among themselves and let us know if they want to pursue. Barry says R&D does not have an “education” mission in their legislation and this could be problematic. We would need to get that addressed and also bring in the state agencies but not before the FS is ready. The FS may even want a state presence beyond and/or other than the state forestry agencies (i.e. state natural resource agencies). It doesn't matter who at the state level, just that there is a state presence. Rob noted that the Wildlife Management Institute (WMI) is also a partner in the wildlife coops. A concern voiced by the FS was that by partnering in this way, they might be perceived to lose their objectivity. Keith reported they discussed the issue of Tuition/Coop Agreements with the FS resulting in the establishment of a joint Task Force. It was felt there was some ‘thawing’ on this issue and that we improved the FS understanding that this isn't just ‘money grubbing’. A lot of communication needs to be had. A number of those around the table didn't share the same level of understanding. It would be good to bring grants people in from both sides to assure common understanding. Tim thought there was a very positive tone from the Forest Service meeting and that progress is being made. Keith reported on an initiative involving a survey of NAFO member research interests. At Tim's request, Steve put a proposal together for NAFO's review and consideration; we are waiting to hear back from them. Keith distributed a matrix of research priorities which will be the basis of tomorrow's break out sessions. This is an effort to update NAUFRP's research priorities for McStennis and he has also included FS, NIFA and the BNR priorities. The objective is to see if and where they intersect. The matrix represents Keith's opinion and tomorrow's purpose is to review to determine ‘Are we doing what we need to do in terms of our and other key partner priorities?’. At this point, he has not included anything from NAFO, TNC, and AFF. Tim adds this will be beneficial for reaffirming our research objectives within McStennis and tying them back to the BNR Roadmap.

Education Report, Jim Allen: The biennial University Education in Natural Resources Conference (UENR) was held three weeks after the March NAUFRP Executive Committee meeting. NAUFRP was there in a big way: NAUFRP sponsored scholarships for eight graduate students as well as travel support for Terry Sharik and Bill Richardson from FAIES. Terry was the key note speaker and led one of the workshops. A key item of discussion was the Terrestrial Ecosystem Management (TEM) accreditation proposal that the Society of American Foresters (SAF) is considering. Jim has been trying to provide NAUFRP input into the process. He sent a survey to the NAUFRP listserv to which 48 responded. The responses were provided to NAUFRP and Carol Redelsheimer (SAF). In June, SAF Council voted to go forward with a new accreditation for TEM. Jim sent the final report of the Task Force to the NAUFRP listserv. The next big step is here at the convention: this afternoon there will be a meeting involving NAUFRP members. Two-thirds of the Survey respondents said they would support, though with reservation. One of the concerns is about actively involving the other societies. Terry Sharik was on the Task Force and said it was a rocky road representing NAUFRP. He expressed concerns such as the need to sufficiently distinguish between TEM and forestry. Terry felt SAF was hesitant to bringing in others (societies). It will be good to hear from Carol today on where they are in engaging these other groups and disciplines. Jim Allen said this is an important stage: there are two times to interact with Carol. She will join our Executive Committee over lunch and then the meeting this afternoon is open to NAUFRP members. Meanwhile Jim is trying to move forward with other elements of NAUFRP's Undergraduate Education Strategy. He has a proposal to enhance the NAUFRP webpage to make it more of a clearing house for undergraduate education information and is working with Keith Belli and Terry Sharik. The proposal would be to hire part-time person to work with them and upload materials onto the website and make it more usable. A motion was made by Jim Allen, seconded by Keith Belli, for the Executive Committee to support funding (\$3,000) for the actions in the written proposal. Specifically, the proposal outlined that with initial funding the following activities would be undertaken: identify categories of FRNR-related information that will be included, initiate the collection and develop an additional page that expands the current ‘Education Resources’ section (serve as the clearinghouse). Discussion/Questions: Is this a one-time funding commitment? Yes, but the ‘clearing house’ will need updating; there may be a need to seek external dollars. It seems \$3,000 will be sufficient to start it up but not maintenance.

There is a need to think about how to oversee this – perhaps through regional education chairs. Is this a strategic investment for the NAUFRP budget? (Yes) *The motion passed unanimously.*

Agriculture Technical Representative (ATR) Report, Steve Bullard: The purpose of tomorrow's breakout sessions is to discuss the research matrix and realign priorities with the McStennis Strategic Plan as needed and ensure common language is used. Tomorrow could be a prelude to an ATR workshop or a new McStennis Strategic Plan. Frank was asked about the McStennis Manual Update and reported that it is finished in draft form – over 300 pages – and the current time frame plan is to have it published in the Federal Register in January.

**Action Item:** Steve will follow up with Catalino Blanche on the options for input on the Manual and the possibility of an ATR workshop next year.

Extension Report, Bob Wagner: Bob reviewed a written report that was distributed noting that there will be two recipients of the NAUFRP-NWOA Family Forest Education Award this year: OSU's 'Ties to the Land Program' and MSU's Southern Pine Beetle Prevention Project. Bob noted the Renewable Resources Extension Program Strategic Plan which was recently completed and the Climate Science Initiative that has been launched by the Association of Natural Resources Extension Professionals (ANREP) involving 80 extension educators. Also that the Climate, Forests and Woodlands eXtension Community of Practice has been reinvigorated.

Policy Report, Janaki Alavalapati: Janaki reported on the process and status of the Farm Bill (handout). The Senate passed a bill last June and though the House Agriculture Committee reported out a bill, no action has been taken on the House floor. Programs authorized under the last Farm Bill expired on Sept. 30, 2012. With Congress in recess till after the elections, the options appear to be a one year extension or a five-year bill adopted in a lame duck session or even no action till a new Congress is convened next year. Issues of interest to NAUFRP are a proposal to make the islands eligible for McStennis matching funds. The Senate bill would also make the University of District of Columbia (UDC) eligible (the university is a land-grant institution). Randy noted that UDC has a concerted effort to ensure they are eligible for any land grant program. He hopes that if McStennis eligibility is broadened that NIFA will not automatically bring in institutions without appropriate vetting. Other measures in the Senate-passed bill include removing the matching requirement for 1890 institutions if their allocation is below \$200,000, reauthorizing RREA through 2017, a 30% increase for indirect costs on research, education and extension programs, the addition of ecosystem services, invasive species management and innovative biobased products' to High-Priority Research and Extension areas.

Forestry Research and Advisory Committee (FRAC), Randy Nuckolls: Randy attended the last USDA FRAC advisory committee which met in June. Members include Joyce Berry (Colorado State University) and Keith Gilles (University of California-Berkeley). The FRAC report to the USDA Secretary included a recommendation that McStennis be funded at \$50 million. NIFA is currently developing an assessment of the McStennis program at the behest of FRAC. Randy noted an issue arising from the assessment is how to tabulate matching funds. For example, some schools count donated lands. Before the assessment is finalized, Randy would like NAUFRP to have a chance to review and comment on it.

International Report, Jim Johnson: Jim distributed two handouts. There has been a RFP to all forestry schools for pre- and post- IUFRO tours. He asked if anyone present and submitted one; Purdue and Univ. of Kentucky indicated they had. Dr. Niels Elers Kock, Dean at the Univ. of Copenhagen and current IUFRO President will receive SAF Honorary Membership at this year's convention. Study abroad was discussed at the March Executive Committee meeting; it is an ongoing struggle to get these programs up and running. Jim would like ideas and discussion on how to better utilize the NAUFRP webpage and listserv to more broadly advertise them. The second handout is a call for abstracts for the Third IUFRO Latin American Congress to be held in Costa Rica in June, 2013. Terry Sharik noted that there is an international association of forestry students but only one chapter in the US which is at OSU. The World Congress does a good job of getting students to it. **Action Item:** Jim to work with group (not specified) on improving the NAUFRP website in regards to study abroad opportunities.

SAF Terrestrial Ecosystem Management Accreditation, Carol Redelsheimer (SAF): Carol reviewed the background on this issue beginning with the establishment of a SAF Task Force charged to look at a new SAF

accreditation standard possibly warranted for degrees outside of forestry. The Task Force met over a 2-3 year period and completed a final report last June. She came to SAF halfway through that process. The report dealt with logistics. Model curriculum, timelines and process will be set by the Education Policy Review Committee. The time frame is ambitious. Carol invited NAUFRP members to attend the meeting this afternoon where they will discuss standards. This input will be sent back out to NAUFRP members for feedback. This will be SAF's fourth accreditation standard (forestry, urban forestry, and forest technology). Discussion: How many plan to attend this afternoon's meeting from this group? About six indicated they would. Question: what are the costs if you already have one or two accreditations? And if you already have the forest accreditation standard, could you have TEM as an option? Carol cited Virginia Tech as an example: they have forestry and urban forestry, but this is all still being discussed. Comments: This could be used by senior administrators to get rid of marginal programs. Carol indicated she had heard this concern but not in depth. Question: how does it differ from current forestry and range or even environmental science programs? Carol said TEM is not an environmental science program which is learning about science vs. learning *and* applying science, which TEM is. Ken Fulgham said his administration at Humboldt Univ. would jump on this to merge programs. Question: can you put a masters program through this? Carol does not see why not. SUNY ESF has agreed to go thru the TEM accreditation process in 2014-15. Carol noted that more discussion is needed on the composition of the visiting teams, accreditation committee, whether to invite other societies to be on the visiting teams or on accreditation committees. There are more questions than answers at this point. Question: How are the other professional societies viewing this? Carol said there has been no formal discussion but Michael Goergen had informally spoken to the Society of Range Management (SRM has an accreditation process) and the American Fisheries Society (does not have an accreditation process). The Wildlife Society has certification versus accreditation. Question: How does or will this impact SAF membership? They are not sure, but Carol thinks it is a question Council is discussing. Terry Sharik notes that forestry students make up just 17 percent of the natural resources students; 40 percent are in natural resources and environmental science programs. Carol reaffirmed that the intent of this afternoon's meeting is to look at the curriculum piece proposed by the Task Force.

Northeast Region Report, Mike Messina: Mike has not been as active as Northeast Chair because of organizational changes at Pennsylvania State University since he arrived there. The School of Forestry is no more. They now have a Dept. of Ecosystems Science and Management. They are losing wood products which is moving to agriculture. They will maintain their forestry accreditation and wildlife and fisheries degrees.

Southern Regional Report, Red Baker: The Southern Group met earlier this summer and invited the deans of the 1890 schools. A Southern Leadership Tour is planned for January; Alabama A&M will host. At their business meeting earlier in the year they formed two ad hoc groups. One is for a Southern Leadership Initiative where each southern university is to appoint a student to hone their leadership skills. They are currently working on support for this. The second ad hoc group is a New Faculty Development Program to get new faculty together and bring them to Washington, DC to meet with agencies, grants panels, etc... It will be modeled after a Mississippi State initiative led by Jim Shephard when he was there. Southern NAUFRP has initiated a website where they will archive minutes, comparative data survey results and more. The next meeting will be with the Southern Group of State Foresters next January in Savannah, GA.

APLU Board of Natural Resources Roadmap, Hal Salwasser: Hal reviewed the start and on-going process of the roadmap. A roadmap had been developed for agriculture which essentially left natural resources out so the BNR decided to do their own and the process has been underway for about a year and has used the Delphi Process. The BNR recently approved an outline for chapter themes to be written. Themes include climate, education, energy, sustainability and water. Currently they are seeking to identify teams with expertise in these areas and will try and incorporate research, education and outreach in all these areas. (The Agric. Roadmap only addressed research.) They are at the stage of soliciting nominations for writers within the next week to 10 days. Hal will try and ensure at least one NAUFRP member is on each team. **Action Item:** send the solicitation for nominations to the listserv within the next day or two with responses directly back to Hal. Rob noted that NAUFRP is working on this too; wildlife names are to go back to John Hayes or John Edge. Note that Tim as the Past President will now become the BNR Representative for NAUFRP but it was agreed that Hall will continue to serve as the representative on the Roadmap.

Washington Report, Randy Nuckolls: Randy noted that the elections are only 2 weeks away. Pivotal states for the Presidential race are Ohio, Wisconsin, Colorado, Nevada, Florida and Virginia. To win, Romney will need Ohio. It's possible that an electoral vote will result in a tie in which case the House votes and it has a Republican majority. The Deficit Control Act enacted in 2011 to reduce domestic and defense spending will require sequestration cuts if Congress does not act by early January. Certain programs are exempted such as Medicare, and Pell Grants. Congress went through the motions of a budget process this year. The House passed appropriations bills -- the House agriculture appropriation bill was below target implying USDA cuts however. Still, AFRI increased and McStennis was only down a miniscule amount. The Senate bill puts AFRI and McStennis at current levels. This is good and complements should go to NAUFRP members, APLU and Cornerstone for the agriculture committee support they garnered. USDI programs would have much deeper cuts. There is now a six month Continuing Resolution in place (FY12 funding levels through March). Randy predicts the House will stay Republican controlled. Until recently it was thought the Senate would go Republican (currently its 53-47) but several races have become more competitive with 8-10 seats up in the air. (Interesting races: CT, ND, PA, MO) Randy predicts continued dysfunction. Sequestration could entail \$109 billion in cuts at USDA which applied mean 8-9 percent across the board in all programs (line by line) in 2013. If sequestration continues in the out years, the agency heads will have more discretion in cuts beginning in 2014. It is feasible that the rating agencies will downgrade US debt. If Obama wins, he will have all the cards.

Research Capacity Survey, Bob Wagner: Bob has a draft manuscript for SAF publication that covers research capacity in the Northeast and North Central. There are no current plans to expand this because of funding needs and Bob has lost the graduate student working on this. Tim suggested Bob and Keith talk if there is interest in this going forward at the national level with discussion on how to proceed.

50<sup>th</sup> McIntire-Stennis Anniversary, Steve Bullard: Steve noted that he sent a letter and the McStennis DVD to all NAUFRP members. This included suggestions on how to generate events celebrating McStennis at the institutional and/or state level. The DVD can be customized. The U.S. Senate passed a Resolution in honor of the 50<sup>th</sup> and a similar one was introduced in the House of Representatives (resolutions may be introduced in the House but are not passed). Thanks to George Hopper and Bob Wagner for helping on these efforts. We are continuing to talk to USDA senior officials about events they can do. We would like to plan a tree-planting on the Capitol grounds early in 2013. The video has been shown to FRAC and ARD with plans to show it at one of the plenary sessions here at SAF. Virginia Tech hosted an anniversary event and Northern Arizona produced its version of the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary video.

NRC Nominations for AFRI Review, Tim White: USDA has commissioned the National Research Council to review the Agriculture Food Research Initiative competitive grants program. Frank says this is very timely. It will look at aspects of challenge versus foundation research (size and scale of grants). Sonny Ramaswamy is very responsive to stakeholder comments. The result will be very interesting for FY15. Frank suggested NAUFRP endeavor to find people with AFRI grant experience, and perhaps a PI, who are visionary, have expertise and a sense of future priorities, especially if the Administration changes. Shah and Beachy were both commentary on the 'new biology' paradigm. (It was determined that the deadline for nominations had passed but further communication with NRC staff indicated they would accept nominations from NAUFRP still (this week).) It was agreed that NAUFRP nominees would be Keith Belli, Research Chair, and Bob Wagner, Extension Chair.

Frank Boteler, Assistant Director, Institute of Bioenergy, Climate and Environment, NIFA: (Terri out for some of this) Frank reviewed his report (handout) and discussed in detail the FY13 budget, Continuing Resolution, possible sequestration and Farm Bill expiration impacts. Sonny Ramaswamy became the agency director last summer. Sonny is open, responsive and has experience as faculty and an administrator. Tim noted that a small NAUFRP group met with Sonny last summer. Janaki believes Sonny will focus and talk more about natural resources. The NIFA Grants Policy Manual has been undergoing revision and is currently being finalized. The timeline has January 2013 down for publication in the Federal Register with a 90-day comment period; publication in final form is tentatively August, 2013. Randy noted that at the joint meeting with the FS on Monday, they talked about a manual for all grants; the FS does not have anything comparable. Steve commented on the need to look at carry over policy.

Paul Trianosky, Director, Southern Forest Conservation, American Forest Foundation: Paul reviewed his background: he is a Virginia Tech forestry graduate, worked at The Nature Conservancy for many years and moved to the American Forest Foundation last year where his position interfaces with conservation and management of family forest lands. AFF is trying to develop new approaches to working with private landowners. Within the Tree Farm Program they are looking for new ways to do business and grow their base in the future. They are concerned about losses to their volunteer network which includes over 4,500 people. A new membership benefits package is being created with opportunities to engage landowners in new ways, for example, certification. AFF has unique opportunities for Research. Clemson is currently developing curricula for foresters who will focus on working with landowners. They are looking for ways to motivate landowners to manage for other things/resources like water and ways to translate relevant information to landowners. Jim Johnson says Tree Farmers own a lot of land which are a potential for research and working with owners. (To learn more about the Clemson curricula project contact Tammy Cushing.) AFF has a national leadership council for their volunteers ('volunteers' is almost a misnomer since they are mostly professionals) coming up next February in Philadelphia. This is an opportunity to provide this leadership group with technical information. Frank noted that with continuing extension cuts, their interface with landowners is limited. Jim Johnson says the key for universities is to work with AFF thru extension. Keith noted the Beginning Farmer and Rancher program has opportunities. They need Tree Farmers to serve on panels; would help focus efforts and influences.

Discussion of Executive Committee Winter Meeting Dates: The next Executive Committee meeting had been tentatively scheduled for March 4-5, 2013 but the question of meeting closer to the Wildlife Management Institute conference in Washington, D.C. was raised. Overlapping it would provide options to meet with NAUFRP and plan joint Hill and agency visits. The WMI meeting is March 25-30 in Washington, DC. Randy said that if there is a new Administration, normal timeframes will be slower. The CR is in effect through March 30<sup>th</sup>; there is no big downside to waiting but the Congressional calendar needs to be checked out to see when the Easter recess will be. Easter is March 31. Randy needs to explore this further. When is CARET and the FLA Fly-In? **Action Item:** Terri and Randy to canvas dates for the winter 2013 Executive Committee meeting.

Dave Tenny, President and CEO, National Alliance of Forest Owners (by phone): Tim reported to Dave that the NAUFRP Executive Committee voted this morning to join NAFO. Also, NAUFRP has submitted a proposal for a survey on NAFO member research priorities and asked Dave for an update on its status. Dave said it has been shared with their Working Forests Task Group and NAUFRP should be hearing from them soon. The NAFO Operating Committee is generally enthusiastic about synthesizing research priorities. There is genuine interest in this and the quality research that will inform on good public policy. The caveat is what are the priorities within the priorities? Dave said once priorities have been identified there will be a need to linked. He hopes the research will be useful, to the point and helpful to advocacy although it should not be advocacy. The response to the survey proposal has been very good and he looks forward to moving forward with it. It will be presented to the NAFO Board of Directors in November. Randy asked Dave what else is on NAFO's agenda? Dave said the policy priorities continue to be on 1) forest roads, (per the Dec. 3rd Supreme Court date for arguments, if this issue is resolved, it will free up time and resources to focus on other/new things); 2) Tax Reform: (the discussion will be how to reform provisions in the tax code unique to forestry --they are trying to prepare Congress on this topic.); 3) Carbon accounting (EPA is working on ameliorating the tailoring methodology – harvesting for biomass.) Advocacy needs to be politically relevant. Steve pointed out that the universities have a continuous need to convey their relevance. Tim volunteered NAUFRP to come to any of NAFO's meetings to explain the federal research programs related to forestry. Dave said he would work with Randy for the best opportunity. Their Board meets four times a year .

Discussion on SAF TEM Afternoon Meeting: Terry said a continuing question has been why the other professional societies have not been involved; they were involved in the earliest meeting. There needs to be agreement and reinforcement that professional accreditation be science-based. SAF has a stake in this; 17 percent of students in natural resource programs are forestry; 40 percent of students are in broader categories. There was a lot of discussion this afternoon that came back to the issues mentioned earlier. Barry said Kim Steiner made an introduction that led off that Council tasked this to broaden SAF membership. It was noted that SAF did not reach out to NAUFRP or employers. There was a difference in opinion as to whether this was SAF's role. This could be expensive. We need to look at the draft standard. The fact is we were not consulted at an early stage.

Greater consultation with key client group on issues like this is needed. We need to move forward: it is obvious SAF is determined to go with this. There will be one more opportunity to weigh in on the draft standard. Everyone is encouraged to do so. Discussion: Flexibility vs. core competencies? Ken asked if there was discussion about Provosts decision on accreditation? No there was not. Red reinforced its clear the train has left the station; if we want to affect, we need to be proactive. Steve believes it is good that SUNY will be the pilot because Dave Newman is engaged with NAUFRP. NAUFRP should consider a memo to SAF. Should it include others from the original Coalition? Barry suggests developing a letter that goes to the SAF President with two key points: 1) general statement about consultation and 2) strongly advocates inclusion of other societies. There was a question about the most constructive avenue for NAUFRP to take. Ken said the SRM director was very happy at the first meeting, but since has not been able to get a meeting with Michael Goergen. Can/Should we work independently with these other groups? Should there be a NAUFRP representative or committee to ensure NAUFRP by-in? Hal feels we need a face to face meeting with the SAF President. Red has misgivings on fomenting dissent; personal conversations might be best. We should get input from John Tanka on behalf of SRM. Keith says it is key that NAUFRP provide representation. Jim Allen notes that SAF is reaching out to NAUFRP now; the timeline mentions a NAUFRP committee in the future process. Keith feels they are not listening. There was discussion about NAUFRP's next steps on this issue. Consideration was given to drafting a letter stating NAUFRP wants representation and to be consulted but it was determined to first have an 'off-line' conversation with SAF leadership.

Adjourned

*Approved  
March 4, 2013  
Washington, D.C.*

#### ACTION ITEMS

**Action Item:** Bob Wagner will lead a Task Group including Steve Tesch, Joe McNeel, Terry Sharik, Red Baker and Kamran Abdollahi to develop a strategic plan aimed engaging a broad range of forest land interest organizations.

**Action Item:** NAUFRP and the FS agreed to set up a Joint Task Force with the objective of coordinating and communicating on diversity opportunities. This group would also try and move forward on the ongoing questions related to cooperative agreements, etc.... Alex Friend (SW Station) and Jim Allen agreed to lead. John Kusano is the FS staff contact on this. Kamran, Ali Mohammad from NIFA and Carolyn Brooks (ARD) are to be involved on the diversity aspects of this.

**Action Item:** Steve will follow up with Catalino Blanche on the options for input on the Manual and the possibility of an ATR workshop next year.

**Action Item:** Jim Johnson to work with group (not specified) on improving the NAUFRP website in regards to study abroad opportunities.

**Action Item:** Send the solicitation for nominations to the listserve within the next day or two with responses directly back to Hal. (DONE)

**Action Item:** Terri and Randy to canvas dates for the winter 2013 Executive Committee meeting.