



# NAUFRP

National Association of University Forest Resources Programs

*Creating Knowledge—Developing Leaders*

NAUFRP Executive Committee Minutes

March 4-5, 2013

Washington, D.C.

NAUFRP Executive Committee: Steve Bullard, President (Stephen F. Austin State University), Barry Goldfarb, Secretary-Treasurer (North Carolina State University), Tim White, Immediate Past President (University of Florida), Kamran Abdollahi, Diversity Chair (Southern University), Keith Belli, Research Chair (University of Tennessee), Janaki Alavalapati, Policy Chair (Virginia Tech University), Jim Allen, President-Elect (Northern Arizona University), Jim Johnson, International Chair (Oregon State University), Carolyn Brooks (Association of Research Directors 1890 Land Grant Universities), Joyce Berry, At-Large (Colorado State University), Bob Wagner, Extension Chair (University of Maine), Terry Sharik, Education Chair (Michigan Tech University), Red Baker, Southern Regional Chair (University of Kentucky), Kurt Pregitzer, Western Regional Chair (University of Idaho), 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), Andy Ezell (Mississippi State University), Phil Tappe (University of Arkansas), Gwen Boyd (Alcorn State University), Robert Taylor (Florida A&M University), David Newman (SUNY), Dan Robison (West Virginia University)

Meeting Participants: Daina Apple (US Forest Service), Frank Boetler (USDA National Institute for Food and Agriculture), Eric Norland (NIFA), Catalino Blanche (NIFA), Ali Mohamad (NIFA), Wendy Fink (Association of Public Land Grant Universities)

Steve Bullard welcomed all, especially Carolyn as a new member of the Executive Committee.

A call was made for a motion to approve the minutes of the October 23, 2012 Executive Committee meeting. Rob Swihart made that motion and Keith Belli seconded. Discussion: add Gwen Boyd as a participant of that meeting. The motion was approved unanimously.

Treasurer's Report, Barry Goldfarb: A written report was distributed. Barry noted that the mid-year 2012 projections presented last October had changed. Income was \$122,000 and expenses were about \$5,000 less than projected. Under the 2013 approved budget, a slight surplus is projected. If McIntire-Stennis (McStennis) is reduced because of the sequester, that will show up in next year's dues. (The 2014 dues will be based on the FY2013 McS appropriation which could be down up to seven percent.) Jim Johnson made a motion, seconded by Janaki, to approve the Treasurer's Report. The motion was approved unanimously.

Policy Report, Janaki Alavalapati: Janaki reported that the Farm Bill was extended through Sept. 2013. What happens then is uncertain. The bills passed by the Senate and House Agriculture Committee contain considerable savings that would be appealing to those wanting to reduce the federal deficit and thus may be viable for adoption. The driving force for the one-year extension was the need for farmers to have some amount of certainty for the current planting season. The impact of the sequestration on farm and research programs is also uncertain. Frank Boteler (NIFA) noted that the sequestration went into effect last Friday and

that NIFA has not yet announced what their policy is going to be. The McStennis 2013 funds have not yet been released. Randy does not expect to recoup any McS cuts resulting from the sequestration.

Education Report, Terry Sharik: Terry reviewed aspects of the NAUFRP Undergraduate Education report. The Pinchot Institute is planning to update their survey of 10 years ago looking at the degree to which the current curricula at US universities are meeting the needs of forestry employers and recent graduates. On the issue of TEM accreditation, Terry said an opportunity to bring in the other natural resource societies was missed, however, they will be included in the review process. **Action Item:** The regional chairs were asked to provide Terry with the names of regional education chairs. Terry will fill in the accomplishments. TWS has a Wildlife Blue Ribbon Report. The University Education in Natural Resources (UENR) Conference will be at Auburn University in 2014.

Extension Report, Bob Wagner: Bob distributed a written report and a draft Strategic Plan for NAUFRP Extension. He reviewed that he was asked at the Spokane meeting to head a task group on how to engage and collaborate with other organizations. This was launched as a result of the NAFO membership discussion and with the view that NAUFRP should have a plan of outreach and extension for its own association. The proposal presented is a straw dog for discussion purposes including the goals, objectives and approach. Bob included a potential list of organizations to reach out to and proposed creating educational materials about NAUFRP and specific objectives. What materials do we already have? Maybe these can be modified. Consider selecting 5 or so organizations to start with. **Action Item:** Provide Bob edits and comments and identify other organizations to include on the list. Mentioned here today: Pinchot Institute, Natural Resource Coalition, members of the Forests in the Farm Bill Coalition. Steve commented that he would like to add "Outreach" to 'Extension'. Barry suggested adding "research and outreach" to the goals.

Research Report, Keith Belli: Keith reported that the database has been effective at getting people with forestry background on NIFA review panels. It is a constant task to keep updated; he plans to review it this summer and convey it to NAUFRP and ensure the 1890s get the information. Keith reviewed that a NAUFRP representative group visits NIFA two times a year. Let him know if you are interested in participating. The breakout sessions in Spokane focused on priority setting for McStennis. The feedback from these sessions is summarized in a handout distributed. Keith needs direction at this point, especially in regards to #3, the intended audience. The buzzwords generally seem to be consistent with the BNR Grand Challenges. In particular, 'climate and sustainability', seem to have staying power. Joyce noted that emerging issues seem to be a driving force and not the disciplines. Kurt noted that the recent PCast Report focusing on Agriculture included no authors from land-grants; we need to keep an eye on this. Terry said he feels that 'sustainability' is moving to other areas of the university. Randy encouraged a slow pace with the update of priorities, at least till the budget, BNR Roadmap and FRAC recommendations are clearer. We don't want to end up inconsistent with these. Keith noted that the National Academy of Science is reviewing AFRI and he has been appointed to this panel. Keith is the only one with a natural resource background. Randy said that after the major issues in Washington are resolved there will likely be a period of reflection and that may be the time to bring all this together. Frank said there will be new AFRI dollars in FY2015. The President's Office of Science and Technology (OSTP) and NAS reports will inform Sonny Ramaswamy related to program focus, scale and model with emphasis on societal challenges; McStennis priorities may be appropriate at this point. Steve asked Keith to work with Carolyn to ensure the 1890 members are included in the database.

Diversity Report, Kamran Abdollahi: NAUFRP is waiting to hear from FS Research R&D (Alex Friend, John Kusano) on their new Diversity focus. Hopefully some of this will result in a paper for the upcoming Virginia Tech Conference. He has a proposal before SAF for a special session on Diversity at the next convention. Steve urged Kamran to get potential action items down on paper. Terry noted that the abstract deadline for the

Virginia Tech conference has been extended. Keith commented that the joint meeting with FS Station Directors last October in Spokane was very productive. National level action is needed from the agency and department.

1890's Report, Carolyn Brooks: The 1890s have made their annual dues payment to NAUFRP. There is a biennial symposium next month with 600 presentations and 400 of them will be students majoring in agriculture, environmental sciences, or natural resource sciences/management. There are new officers elected in the association every 2 years. The new chair person is Shirley Hyman-Parket at North Carolina A&T State University. The ARD website, [www.umes.edu/ard](http://www.umes.edu/ard) has a data base of 1890 expertise. It was developed at the behest of NIFA with 300 plus names on it to draw from for NIFA panels. (Please see <http://www.umes.edu/ARD/Directory/>) This website can be valuable to NAUFRP when seeking collaborations, etc. Robert Taylor noted before he joined Florida A&M, he was the former dean at Alabama A&M. The latter is the only 1890 school with SAF accreditation. He would like to see other schools earn accreditation and he would like NAUFRP support for this. Robert was with CARET last week when they were on the Hill and noted their advocacy for McStennis funding.

Tom Martin, President and CEO, American Forest Foundation (AFF): Tom reviewed AFF programs. Nat Frazer (Utah State) is on their Board of Trustees. AFF is a Co-Chair of the Forests in Farm Bill Coalition. A current AFF focus is their work related to estate tax impacts on parcelization of family forest land. They have two state pilots. The product will be a report and NAUFRP input is welcome. A place for NAUFRP's involvement is input on a program they are developing to better engage landowners. "My Land" will include mapping tools, webinars, etc. on key issues. AFF will be happy to work with the universities in disseminating this work. Project Learning Tree is hitting 30,000 educators a year; unfortunately it appears this is a one-time impact, thus an overall limited effect. AFF is beginning to look at other mechanisms to engage educators. Over the next 2-4 years, Tree Farm will have two types of memberships. Some states don't have any kind of certification program presence; AFF is going to work closer with State Foresters on stewardship, creating a target demographic, using social marketing techniques. Tom noted that university faculty often serve on PLT and Tree Farm committees. He is worried about the national level commitment to innovative research and believes the leadership within the US research infrastructure is fragmented. He cited the Canadian experience where industry has significantly re-invested in forestry research. Randy said that NAUFRP's Extension, Research and Policy chairs would like to be better engaged with AFF. NAUFRP has felt the research infrastructure fragmentation, particularly on the industry side. Randy suggested meeting with Jim Reaves/Forest Service along with conservation groups such as AFF. Barry asked if there is a venue for a NAUFRP representative within AFF? Tom said perhaps the Operating Committee – education and woodland management. In reference to the Canadian model that Tom spoke about, it was asked if AFF has a framework in mind? Tom says the first step is the Forest Service and urged NAUFRP to get them to talk about priorities and engaged with legislators and communities. Randy noted it has been seven years since the NAUFRP Research Summit. It was noted that the agenda for the Summit did not include any discussion for structural change such as has happened in Canada. There was another question about the status on Clemson's capstone project. Tom said they have agreed to make it available. Steve Bullard said he has been asked for input on it.

Nadine Block, Sustainable Forestry Initiative: Nadine reviewed the SFI conservation grants program which is in its fourth year. She will get the call for proposals to Terri for electronic distribution. March 18<sup>th</sup> is the deadline. Last year's grant was awarded to NASF and Virginia Tech for a study update on BMP effectiveness. SFI is beginning a five year review of its Standard. Workshops are planned for around the country; Nadine will get this information to Terri electronically. She noted that Tat Smith and Dick Brinker serve on SFI's external review panel. It is an independent body and a key avenue for input. The 2013 SFI Annual Conference will be in San Antonio and they will be trying to get graduate and undergraduate students there. Last year they drew students from WI, MI and MN. Nadine was asked about LEED and she explained that the US Green Building Council

(GBC) uses the Forest Stewardship Council's (FSC) certification standard exclusively. There is a sixth comment period to be voted on in June -- effective in 2015. They have not moved off their original stance. Nadine will get Terri a comparative description of the FSC and SFI. The 37 SFI implementation committees should be considered resources at the state level. There was further discussion of using non-Leed criteria. Kurt believes there is a role for NAUFRP here. Terry said most of the NAUFRP institutions have a university-wide sustainability council that we can provide links to. Nadine said SFI would love to have that opportunity; they are always looking for models and case-studies. SFI is working with state forestry associations for avenues like Maine and Georgia (the Governors have mandated the use of SFI). Similar efforts are under discussion in AL, MS, VA, FL, SC, NC....). Kurt encouraged SFI to partner with architects and architectural schools.

International Report, Jim Johnson: Jim discussed plans for the 2014 IUFRO World Congress to be held in Salt Lake City. He distributed a 'Call for Sessions Proposals' ; the deadline is April 30<sup>th</sup>. IUFRO will be in tandem with the SAF convention. The International Forestry Students' Association (IFSA) will host an annual symposium in August 2013 in Spain. The third Latin America IUFRO Congress is scheduled for this June in Costa Rica. More details on these topics are covered in Jim's written report. There was discussion and consensus for trying to plan an event(s) in Salt Lake City with NAUFRP's international university colleagues. This will be fleshed out at NAUFRP's Fall meeting. Steve Bullard noted that Rich Guldin, the IUFRO Congress General Chair, is seeking input and aid for the Scientist Assistance Program.

Budget and Advocacy Committee (BAC), Report Tim White: Tim reviewed the BAC role within APLU. The FY13 priority is basically to hold the line on the FY12 seven priorities (Smith Lever, AFRI, Hatch, McStennis, 1890, 1994 program funding). Wendy Fink added that everyone is waiting on the President's FY14 budget. If it is significantly different from BAC priorities, they may change their position.

Board of Natural Resources (BNR) Roadmap, Tim White: The BNR represents water, mining, wildlife, fisheries and forestry from within APLU. The BNR Research Roadmap, modeled after Agriculture's, is currently being written. Chapter titles include climate, environment, sustainability, water, education and they are to run 10-15 pages each. NAUFRP has an author assigned to each chapter including Terry Sharik for Education and Hal Salwasser for Sustainability. An additional name suggestion may be needed for the latter. The timeframe is to have a first draft by April 15<sup>th</sup>, an introduction and cohesive paper by May 15<sup>th</sup> and a final paper by August. **Action Item:** Identify reviewers to ensure consistency with NAUFRP priorities. There was a question about connecting this with the Agriculture Research Roadmap? Tim and Wendy said the Ag Roadmap will be referenced where appropriate.

Southern Report, Red Baker: The Southern region has begun archiving their regional information including the comparative data surveys going back 10 years. A summer meeting is planned June 3-4 in Savannah in conjunction with the Southern Group of State Foresters' regional meeting.

North Central/ Northeastern Report, Jim Zaczek: The two regions met jointly in Spokane. They had 12 schools represented and summarized happenings at the various universities including trends in recruiting, enrollment.

Western Report, Kurt Pregitzer: The NAUFRP Western Region met in Spokane on October 24, 2012, following the NAUFRP General Assembly meeting. Eleven western region universities were represented by seventeen individuals. The group had a roundtable discussion focusing on shared challenges and issues in our region, and ways to support each other to provide favorable resolutions. Discussions then focused on suggestions for a topic the region could undertake as a special project over the next few years. The group decided to push forward an idea along the lines of "sustaining the rural west. An ad hoc task force was created to address this

issue, and will report the results of their findings to this group at the region's summer meeting, scheduled for April 22-23, 2013, at UC Berkeley.

Other Discussion: Can the Southern comparative data survey be posted on the NAUFRP website? Is it sensitive? Red has it posted on Southern NAUFRP website but it is locked as an incentive to get responses. Red would like to talk to Carolyn about the 1890's participation in the Survey. Keith Belli and Bruce Bare have worked to make the southern and western surveys compatible. There is definite interest in this data. Jim Zaczek added that their region is planning a salary survey. He would like to get templates from the other regions. Steve urged the regional chairs to all work together on this.

Sonny Ramaswamy, Director, USDA National Institute for Food and Agriculture: Sonny discussed the uncertainty revolving around the budget sequestration. It looks like the impact will be an 8% decrease in competitive grants programs and 5% decrease to capacity (formula) grants programs. On January 1, the Farm Bill was extended through Sept. 30. Certain mandatory funded programs (i.e., BIRDI, Organics, Beginning Farmers) fell through the cracks. The capacity fund programs are operating under a Continuing Resolution through March 29<sup>th</sup>. NIFA is about to release the first two quarter funds for these programs; they cannot go beyond that so as 'to not impinge on Congressional intent'. A 5.1% reduction will be applied to these. No decision has been made on existing cap grants. The President's budget is expected at the end of the month or first of April. Sonny is comfortable with the FY2014 track. A recent P-Cast Report calls for research to be three percent of GDP. Three percent is allowed for NIFA overhead to run the agency including its grants review. They have not been able to invest in agency technology (problems currently exist with CRIST and funding distribution). Sonny discussed the AFRI review by the National Academy of Science. (Keith Belli is on this.) NIFA is organized around 10 portfolios; those are being reviewed. Internally, NIFA is developing a strategic plan; they expect to have it out for comment in early October, 2013. NIFA held listening sessions over the last year from which seven topics were derived: production agriculture, animal agriculture, natural resources and water, climate change – in no particular order. Going forward, NIFA has only about 30% in their budget for foundational research with the rest 'mortgaged' on very large grants. As of FY2014, NIFA will begin to have more flexibility till 2017 when they will not have any of these obligations. There was a question about the success of the outcomes of the big grants? Sonny responded that they appear to be a good return on investment. There will be a 4% reduction in administrative costs across the board resulting in a reduction in FTEs but this will go towards enabling technologies which they badly need. Question about the response from institutions on the FRAC survey? It was good – except for 12 institutions. The names of these institutions will be provided to Keith for follow-up.

Jay Farrell, National Association of State Foresters: Jay gave an overview of NASF. They have 59 members. State Foresters were in town in February for Congressional Hill visits. Two issues they focused on then were Green Buildings and wildfire capacity. Two years ago NASF conducted an informal survey of research needs and brought that to NAUFRP at their annual meeting (Albuquerque). Appropriations/sequestration/budget are also a top priority. NASF has contracted with Rick Cantrell to support their committee dealing with Green Building and Forest Markets per the LEED Standard. For information on State Forest Action Plans, go to [Forestactionplans.org](http://Forestactionplans.org). The NASF Fire Committee is working with the larger fire community on a cohesive policy; the FLAME Act is not being implemented as intended. The NASF Forest Science and Health Committee is focused on invasive species. APHIS funding is down. NASF's Forest Management Committee has partnered with Virginia Tech and S&PF on BMP effectiveness. There was a question about the impact of sequestration on S&PF? They are unsure, but anticipate somewhere between 5 and 9% in cuts; they hope they will be flat and across the board. Another question was about formalizing partnerships? NASF is open to this. Jay noted the joint letters we have all signed onto. NASF's next annual meeting will be this fall in in Virginia; all are invited to

it. Steve suggested showing the McStennis video at the meeting – its shows the relevance of university research.

Michael Goergan, Carol Redelsheimer, Society of American Foresters: Michael shared a handout SAF has developed to promote forestry as a career: it is aimed at science and math teachers as well as guidance counselors and it's been very successful. Michael noted the ongoing conversation over Terrestrial Ecosystem Management (TEM) accreditation. The Task Force Report's recommendation has been accepted by Council. A focus group met in Spokane where NAUFRP discussed it as a group as well. The next step is to get the standard to NAUFRP and the larger natural resource community for comments. The name is an ongoing issue. Question: is there resistance to the term 'natural resources' as part of name? Terry Sharik said that the term TEM does not exist – it was intended to be a place holder. Since then, it has been suggested that 'natural resources conservation' is a better fit. There was a question about current efforts to partner with other professional societies. Carol said there is a six-member committee that was changed to accommodate more members; they would like to see reps from NAUFRP, NAUFWP. Comments from NAUFRP members on this: it is important that The Wildlife Society recognize the accreditation (not just have a wildlife representative on a committee); there is a need to inspire those other faculty (i.e., fish, water, ...); it is important to connect with the National Association of University Fisheries and Wildlife Programs (NAUFWP) -- they are meeting at end of the month in D.C. There was a question about what has been done to reach out to employers? Carol said SAF has not done any outreach to potential employers. Michael said there were employers on the initial task force at the Denver meeting and they have heard that employers are very interested. Those potential employers have acknowledged that they hire students who know their subject material but not how to apply it. Michael wants to get their 'ducks in order' before reaching out -- SAF wants endorsement but not co-accreditation. Steve asked about the SAF Credentialing Task Force -- NAUFRP has been asked to name a representative. Michael says this is a reflection on who – what does SAF need to do -- to attract a broader membership. There was a question as to the percentage of NAUFRP graduates who join SAF? Michael said it's pretty hard to retain those five years out when their dues increase dramatically. David Newman agreed to serve as the NAUFRP representative on the Credentialing Task Force.

USDA Forestry Research and Advisory Committee (FRAC), Joyce Berry: FRAC met in February and will meet again in June. Joyce reviewed the Secretary's letter responding to FRAC's recommendations (there were eight). Joyce will forward this to Terri. She felt overall, that the FS took the recommendations to heart. Daina Apple discussed the June 2011 P-CAST report on Biodiversity and the Forest Service role. FRAC's 2013 recommendations will be developed at the June Meeting. FRAC has 10 vacancies to fill. Five exist now and 5 more individuals will rotate off soon. The hardest areas to fill are state, federal, experiment stations -- they need 2 forest industry, 2 ngo's, academics. Terri will forward the Federal Register Notice seeking nominees. Daina will send out summary of February meeting. Joyce said the topic of indirect costs came up at the last FRAC meeting. She would like NAUFRP input on how and if to proceed with FRAC on this issue.

Catalino Blanche, NIFA: The Manual for all formula grants will be completed by the end of the year. Education proposals are eligible for McStennis funding and can be research and education related. NIFA is trying to work thru the 1890 institutions for multi institutional research on urban forestry and agroforestry. Catalino noted the Manual will include the provision of allowing 100 percent carryover of McStennis funds.

Jim Reaves, Deputy Chief, Forest Service Research and Development: Jim noted the President's FY14 budget is not out yet. FS R&D is 5-6 percent of the total Forest Service appropriation. Jim would like to get this up to 10 percent which would be about \$400 million. In FY 2012, R&D operated on \$296 million with 2,000 employees. In his PowerPoint presentation (handout), Jim reviewed R&D's Priorities, 2013 program Impacts, FY2012 Key Accomplishments and potential impacts resulting from sequestration. They have had no instructions yet for the

sequestration but are planning on a 5 or more percent decrease and possible furloughs. They will know more by the end of March. If the CR is based on FY12 numbers they should come out okay. They have a great many vacancies at this time.

Rich Guldin, Forest Service Research and Development: Rich provided an update on the Pathways and other programs. This is a new moniker for past programs with tweaks. They can now hire students for seasonal work who don't have to be in a study program pertinent to the agency mission. A key challenge will be the 4-5 day application window and they are looking at how to help students prepare for this. The advertisements will be general and a large number of applicants will need to be screened. They will still be able to hire temps the old way. They will not be hiring STEP or SCEP and will need to figure out how to make them stand out. There is a new authority/category in the Graduate Recruitment Program which allows hires within 2 years of graduation. The third piece is the expansion of eligibility requirements for the Presidential Management Program. The FS hires about 10 a year and converts about 94% of them to full time employees. This is Rich's area of responsibility and he would like NAUFRP's input. Rich will get Terri a link to reference this presentation with highlights of the 3 programs. It can be put on NAUFRP's website. This is government-wide. IUFRO: Proposals for IUFRO sessions are being solicited; they expect 500 abstract proposals and will work to pick the best 200 by July. The selections will be put up on the web with a request for abstracts for specific papers due July-Sept. The Program Committee will evaluate abstracts and they expect 3,000-4,000 of these and 1,000 for posters. At the point of registration Rich expects 200-plus assistance requests and he will look to universities with this type of experience to help.

Hunt Shipman, Cornerstone: Hunt noted APLU got 90-95 percent of what they were seeking in the Farm Bill in the House and Senate bills. In the end, the House could not pass their bill and the standing law was extended thru September 2013. On appropriations FY 2013, the current Continuing Resolution (CR) expires March 27th. Congressman Rogers, Chair of the Appropriations Committee, has just introduced a new CR that will run March 28 -Sept. 30. If it passes as introduced, FY12 funding levels will apply and on top of the sequestration there will be an additional 1/10<sup>th</sup> of one percent reduction in non-security program spending. The Congressional Republicans are abandoning the position entailing a government shutdown but the sequestration is expected to continue till the end of the fiscal year. This complicates the beginning discussions for FY2014. BAC will reconvene after the President's budget is out. Hunt expects the focus will be on holding the line on priorities. There was a question as to whether the Rogers' bill has any flexibility? Hunt replied that they are still going thru it but does not think there will be any for NIFA and FS research programs.

ATR Report, Steve Bullard: Steve is NAUFRP's ATR Liaison with NIFA. He reported that the new Manual provides for 100 percent carryover (it used to be only 5 percent) for McStennis funds. NAUFRP would like to hold an ATR Workshop in 2013 in a central location and actively involve the 1890 institutions. NAUFRP had sought a \$10,000 grant from NIFA to go to Terri's time on McStennis 50<sup>th</sup> activities. Delays and other issues have resulted in altering the intent of the grant's use and it will now go towards travel for ATR meeting planning and related activities. Plans are to use \$5,000-\$6,000 to offset travel to this meeting. Steve noted that the tradition is for the NAUFRP president-elect to be the lead on annual meeting planning. The last ATR meeting was in 2006 (Pittsburgh) led by Perry Brown and Catalino Blanche. One option is to hold an ATR meeting in Charleston this fall in conjunction with NAUFRP's General Assembly and the SAF Convention. Terry Sharik asked whether the formula for McStennis program funds would be discussed (this was brought up at the last ATR meeting)? It is based on timber acres; it is arguable that non-federal, commercial forestland would not change it much and would be more applicable to other amenities of forests not reflected in the formula. Terry said at the last ATR meeting, the NIFA representatives said they were open to this discussion. It was asked whether the formula is in legislation and do we have access to the number? Steve said yes, that he had all the numbers for the Journal of Forestry article on McStennis. Tim says growing the pie is relevant and we may get FRAC support for this

discussion. It was noted that significant McStennis funding increases have come at the 10<sup>th</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup> anniversaries. There was a question as to whether it is a complication when the ATR is not the forestry lead at an institution. Steve believes there is consensus to pursue an ATR meeting. He also noted that there have been discussions about the 2014 meeting in SLC and the need to request rooms. NAUFRP has not requested breakout session rooms in anticipation that there will be too much going on for such a forum. There was a question whether NAUFRP can influence session scheduling like education? Steve believes we may be able to have some influence. He and Sam Foster are co-chairs of the IUFRO Strategic Planning Committee. Kurt expressed concern about institutions who are not reporting on McStennis noting there were 12 no replies. Should we apply some peer pressure? Barry said some of these are splits and maybe we can weigh in. Terry noted most of these are ATRs who are not the forestry leads. It was also noted we are talking about two different kinds of reports: impacts and ??? A potential future agenda topic to discuss with Frank Boteler is administration of the McStennis program (i.e., continuing issues). A handout of companies potentially identified for IUFRO sponsorship was distributed; help is needed to identify contacts for them. These are normal SAF sponsor/exhibitors. In additional input/help is needed for the International Science Meeting Quiz Bowl; contact Steve on this.

A Leadership proposal (handout) from Tom Davidson was discussed. Barry noted Tom is a graduate of NC State and has a business in leadership training and has recently worked with NC State on a project that teachers and students really liked. This seems to relate and should be coordinated with the Pinchot project (survey of graduates, faculty and employees looking at the gaps). We need to clarify which students – forestry only or all the students in a program. Tim feels it is important how we convey our approval and request to see how NAUFRP's name is used in the endorsement. It is also important that Tom is aware of the Southern Region's efforts. Consensus was to proceed on this with the request that Steve approve the use of NAUFRP's name and Red discuss Southern NAUFRP's work with Tom.

Other Discussion: Joyce requested NAUFRP feedback on the direction and general issues, including that of indirect costs (IDCs), to take to FRAC. Tim reminded the group that the IDC issue relates mainly to the Forest Service. Joyce will work with Steve and Keith Belli on the history of this at USDA, especially in relation to the Forest Service. Congress has imposed caps on IDCs which have been low overall. Where thirty percent is allowed for IDC within competitive programs, the Forest Service allows zero. Randy believes FRAC could help on this issue. Kurt said that without change this will impact graduate training and cause decline in the overall university research enterprise. Tim agreed with Randy that this is an action item for Joyce to take to FRAC. Thirty years ago this was okay but there is a new world at the university level today. It can be couched as 'schools are going to pull back and research capacity will go away' and/or 'graduate students will not be available'. Consistency and flexibility are desired. Since FRAC has historically focused on FS Research, this is a good opportunity to focus on two issues: IDCs and tuition. Steve has asked that Keith Belli and Barry Goldfarb work with Joyce and Keith Gilles on this issue as needed. Another issue/concern voiced by Kurt is that the FS Station Directors (SD) report to the FS Chief as opposed to the R&D Deputy Chief and the high turnover of SD and consequent new policies and agendas. Randy agreed this is an agenda item for this year. A subgroup of NAUFRP should plan to meet with the FS Chief with Jim Reaves. **Action Item:** determine when and where the next FS R&D meeting is going to be (like at Spokane). There was strong consensus to pursue a meeting and discussion similar to that in Spokane with Jim Reaves and the SD. Randy and Joe to follow-up on this. Diversity in the work force is a very strong motivator right now. NAUFRP needs to determine who within FS is now tasked with this.

Follow-up on SAF Discussion: Terry and Steve are going out to SAF on Wednesday to meet with Michael Goergen. Are there other issues/concerns to discuss beyond credentialing and TEM? Joyce was surprised SAF has not talked to employers about the latter. Further comments were that this is the same approach SAF took

with involving other professional societies. They seem to have no plans to do so. David says it is important to differentiate TEM from environmental science; with TEM, we are talking about a management curriculum. Terry believes that is deeply understood and that the biggest limitation is not talking to the other societies. Kurt says each of these societies has a long history; this needs to be collective.

**Upcoming Partner Meetings:** Are there messages NAUFRP needs to convey when meeting with partners? Example, Jim Johnson will be meeting with International Forestry as a NAUFRP representative. Others are invited to join him. Jim Allen is meeting with John Kusano of the FS; John has changed his position but is still involved with the agency's diversity effort. Steve sees a need at the national level for both networking and a clearinghouse on diversity. Terry says there is still the possibility for abstracts on this at the VA Tech Natural Resource Diversity Conference in June. Jim Allen will try and talk to Alex Friend about this too. Robert Taylor says that after 30 years of experience he views the problem (lack of diversity in science) as one of perspective. Minorities often don't have a culture of science; it needs to be created (Robert cited the example of the American culture of basketball and football that begins in childhood). Wendy said the Academic Program Section of the Board of Agriculture would be very interested in partnering and may be able to contribute funding. Other methods/examples: Virginia Tech paid a graduate student to visit high school throughout the state; they felt this was effective. In addition to the 1890 institutions, NAUFRP needs to reach out to others like Hispanic, tribal,.... Institutions. APLU needs to be involved in NAUFRP's diversity efforts and other issues like IDC; these issues can be elevated to the BNR. Steve, Kamran, Terry and others will be working to engage all partners in developing and refining a diversity logic model.

**Dave Tenny, National Alliance of Forest Owners:** Dave reported that NAUFRP's research proposal has been vetted through their members and is ready to go. Feedback from them indicated NAFO members are not as informed on research programs at the federal level, however they are more interested and informed at the regional and state levels. Dave believes this can be teased out. The main question is what happens next? Dave believes if this can be limited to a few priorities that NAFO members resonate with, they will be all over it. If there are too many issues/topics, and they don't resonate, their interest will be difficult to sustain. They have an Operating Committee meeting at the end of March; this is an opportunity to talk about the background of the survey and the Delphi-type process to be used. Steve said we will want to communicate with them about what we are or are not doing and look for opportunities to communicate to national partners. Dave said it would be wise to take input back around: this will allow NAFO members to 'discover' and lead to further refinement. Questions yet to resolve are about the timing and how to plug into a cycle. We need to run the final draft of the survey through Keith and others and then back to Dave. It will be beneficial to ensure the NAUFRP Ex Com and membership is informed on this. Barry said our goals are to communicate with NAFO members that the university research structure is different than that of FS. Faculty choose/pursue their own dollars geared towards what is relevant and viable. Dave says the current budget situation is painful, but good for prioritizing. His experience with FS R&D is that regional priorities take precedent --tenure is greater there and personnel top heavy. Dave would like to hear what and how NAUFRP thinks are the best leveraging options within FS and others. Overall, NAFO priorities are still focused on water, carbon (i.e. EPA Tailoring Rule), and taxes.

**Conference Call with Steven Daley Laursen, USDA National Agricultural Research, Extension, Education and Economics (NAREEE) Advisory Board:** NAREEE advises the Secretary of Agriculture and the House and Senate Agriculture Committees. They meet twice a year and are increasingly getting attention from Congress. Steve's term is through Sept. 2013. He represents forestry and natural resources. He believes a new model for agriculture and natural resources research infrastructure is needed and he would like NAUFRP's input on anything specific to forestry.

Adjourned

*Minutes Approved  
October 22, 2013  
Charleston, South Carolina*