

DRAFT

NAUFRP Executive Committee

March 6-7, 2017

Washington, DC

NAUFRP Executive Committee: Keith Belli, President (University of Tennessee); Jim Allen, Past President (Northern Arizona University); David Newman, President-Elect (SUNY-ESF); Katy Kavanagh, Texas A&M University (Secretary-Treasurer); Dale Greene, Southern Regional Chair (University of Georgia); Phil Tappe, At-Large (University of Arkansas); John Hayes, BAC Representative (Colorado State University); Mike Messina, Northeast Regional Chair (Pennsylvania State University); Janaki Alavalapati, Policy Chair (Auburn University); Terry Sharik, Education Chair (Michigan Tech University); Red Baker, Research Chair (University of Kentucky); Andrew Ezell, Extension Chair (Mississippi State University); Linda Nagel, Western Regional Chair (Colorado State University); Mark Rickenbach, North Central Regional Chair (University of Wisconsin-Madison); Bob Wagner, At-Large Member (Purdue University); Steve Shaler, International Chair (University of Maine); Mary Watzin, At-Large Member (North Carolina State University); Randy Nuckolls, NAUFRP General Counsel; Terri Bates, NAUFRP Executive Liaison

NAUFRP Members: Dan Robison, West Virginia University

NAUFRP Guests: Wendy Fink, Association of Public Land-Grant Universities (APLU), Rae Tamblyn (North American Forest Partnership), Tina Terrell (Acting Associate Deputy Chief Business Operations, U.S. Forest Service), Catalino Blanche, USDA National Institute for Food and Agriculture (NIFA); Ali Mohamad (NIFA), Rae Tamblyn (NAFP)

Introductions were made.

A motion was made by Jim Allen and seconded by Janaki to approve the minutes from the November 1, 2016 Executive Committee meeting in Madison, WI. Discussion: there were several questions and edits suggested. The minutes were unanimously approved subject to the corrections noted.

Treasurer's Report, Katy Kavanagh: The final 2016 financial report was reviewed (handout) noting that income was \$17,000 above what had been anticipated in the 2016 budget. Rob Swihart (Purdue University) had previously developed a list of NAUFRP Benefits and Keith shared (handout) this asking if there were additional values to add. It was suggested that the President send an email to NAUFRP institutions that incorporates these. There was discussion about reordering the sequence of the bullets and changing the reference to BAC to the BNR noting that NAUFRP's representation on the BNR provides a voice on policy and budget recommendations within APLU. How can we make NAUFRP membership more compelling or convey what is missed by not being an active member? Benefits include job postings, FAEIS information data base, General Assembly workshops and internal communications (listserve) and for Southern NAUFRP institutions, their comparative survey data. Send other thoughts to Keith and Terri .

Policy Chair Report, Janaki Alavalapati: Janaki reviewed a written report he provided. In it, he detailed letters of support NAUFRP signed to the Senate and House Budget, Appropriations and Agriculture Committees on various policy issues. He also discussed NAUFRP's engagement with the Forests in the Farm Bill Coalition (FIFB) and Forest Climate Working Group (FCWG). The FIFB has begun laying a foundation for the 2018 Farm Bill reauthorization and identified five topic areas to work on: fire and forest health, forest dependent wildlife, retaining working forests, growing jobs and economies through forests and improving and streamlining current forest conservation programs. On behalf of the FCWG, NAUFRP has provided university expertise to develop the "Roadmap for Forest Sector Carbon Resilience and Productivity", March 2017. NAUFRP is also involved with APLU's Policy and Legislation Committee on these issues. Janaki personally wrote an Op-Ed "EPA's Biomass Climate Mess" opposing EPA's announcement that it would regulate forest-derived biomass no differently than coal, oil and natural gas. Randy added that the Senate has had its first hearing (Kansas field hearing) on the 2018 Farm Bill. The new Administration's views are not yet known. The nominee

for Secretary of Agriculture, Sonny Perdue, is expected to be confirmed in April. Randy was asked about the continuation of Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) given it drove big policy issues during the Obama Administration. Randy has heard very little about the future role of OSTP.

Education Chair Report, Terry Sharik: Terry followed his written report. He is still exploring becoming a partner of the International Forestry Student Association (IFSA). Although he has had a tough time communicating with them he still thinks it would be an advantageous relationship. He is also still trying to increase the number of IFSA student chapters. Terry reviewed the student surveys he has conducted at the 2014 IUFRO Congress and SAF convention regarding their perspectives on enrolling in undergraduate forestry programs. The findings have been presented at several meetings including at the 2016 SAF Convention in Madison, WI. Terry has conducted analyses of NAUFRP institutions to determine if there is any relationship between the proportion of women and minorities in the natural resources student body and the content of their websites. The results of this were presented at the 2016 SAF Convention and will be submitted for publication in the *SAF Journal of Forestry*. Terry served on an ad hoc committee that organized a special session on diversity and inclusion at the 2016 Convention. He has been working with the new administrators at FAEIS (Food and Agriculture Education Information System) at Virginia Tech on data management related to natural resource programs at NAUFRP institutions. A conference call is planned with them tomorrow morning to discuss the issues with the data since 2012. Terry asked the Executive Committee who knows who is providing input to FAEIS from their institutions? Only Terry did. He reviewed that we tracked our own data to 2009 when we began to merge it with FAEIS since they were tracking similar and additional trends. Terry was asked what the trend for the last few years has been? He said it has been flat to increases. He served on an Advisory Committee for the Global Outlook on Forestry Education (GOFE) Project sponsored by IFSA and the International Union of Forestry Research Organizations (IUFRO). Terry currently serves on the Blue Ribbon Panel on Forestry and Forest Products and provided a report on “Enrollment Trends in Natural Resource Degree Programs in the U.S.: Implications for Research Capacity in the Profession” for incorporation into their larger report.

Extension Chair Report, Andy Ezell: Andy visited with several regional extension groups; details are in his written report. In particular, he tried to gauge their understanding of the McIntire-Stennis (McStennis) program, especially among the younger faculty. He plans to get the announcement soliciting nominations for the 2017 Family Forests Education Award out in April.

Research Chair Report, Red Baker: Keith passed out copies of the National Alliance of Forest Owners’ (NAFO) research priorities summarized in their 2017 Strategic Plan. These were timber taxation, forest carbon and renewable energy and environment. Another handout depicted top policy priorities for national forestry and forest products organizations in 2015 and 2016. Red noted we are not on or a part of this latter assessment. Dale asked whether we need to be or do we need to be plugging in directly? Keith said everyone here has a slightly different research focus. Let’s use this for dialogue with the different groups. We can talk to Dave Tenny (NAFO) about sending these materials to NAUFRP members. Maybe the bigger issue is determining where the science is lacking – that’s where we come in – we are not leveraging our expertise. Red said he is planning NIFA visits later in the year. Tomorrow afternoon Mary is going to join Red for meetings with NIFA program leaders. Red asked everyone to let him know if there are other agencies and partners that we should be talking to. He gave a recap of the McStennis Strategic Plan process and reviewed the goals, objectives, actions and strategies. A brief break-out session was planned later in the morning to look at the action items that were distilled from the Madison meeting. The breakout session’s task was to identify action items that are accomplishable within the next year and others for the longer-term.

Report Out:

Education: On the supply side, get the data base up to date; on the demand side, it’s a challenge to work with employers. Get FAEIS data up to date. By next General Assembly, get a handle on international student trends, partners (1890s and 1994s), professional masters. Jim followed up on Dale’s suggestion about gathering input from stakeholders on their needs for specific types of expertise. Jim and Dale are willing to help with a stakeholder survey.

Extension: Identify key private sector and landowner leaders and create model for advocacy. Ensure faculty and students know what McStennis is. Long-term: utilize the forest-CARET (Council on Agricultural Research, Extension and

Teaching) model to advocate for McStennis dollars; develop MOAs with key partners; create an ad hoc communications committee; explore opportunities with the North American Forest Partnership (i.e., feed them McStennis stories); develop a McStennis 'brand' and template for a McStennis Impact Report and PowerPoint. Note to Red: is there a third report missing here???

International Chair Report, Stephen Shaler: Steve provided a written report. He met with representatives from the University of Alberta in February to discuss possibilities for greater collaboration with U.S. schools and associated research programs as well as gain a better understanding of the general education and research climates in both countries. There is an Association of Canadian University Forestry Schools (www.aufsc.org); John Innes, Dean at the University of British Columbia, is the current Chair. There are seven institutions with undergraduate degrees accredited by the Canadian Forestry Accreditation Board. Steve suggested inviting Dr. Innes to our fall meeting. There will be an IUFRO meeting in Vancouver in June. The Canadian deans meet in June in Ottawa and are interested in exploring potential interactions including graduate student exchanges and collaborative research programs. Is there a comparable organization in Mexico? It is not known. Wendy said APLU has added Canadian and Mexican schools and is hosting a meeting this summer; they don't know who will be there. Wendy suggested contacting Wendy Fink (wfink@aplu.org) from APLU – as she is involved with international programs.

Diversity Chair Report, Kamran Abdollahi: Kamran reported on the status of the "Diversity Logic Model". The first phase has been completed. There will be more discussion on this later today with representatives from the Society of American Foresters (SAF) and U.S. Forest Service (USFS). There is proposal for a joint NAUFRP/SAF/USFS diversity session at the 2017 SAF national convention. Upcoming meetings related to diversity include the MANNRS meeting in late March in Pittsburgh, the American Indian Higher Education Consortium (AIHEC) in March in Rapid City, SD and the Agriculture Research Directors (ARD) Symposium coming up in April in Atlanta.

Budget and Advocacy Report (BAC), John Hayes: John provided background on BAC which comes under the auspices of the Board of Agricultural Assembly at the Association of Public Land-Grant Universities (APLU). NAUFRP is a dues paying member. BAC meets monthly and there has been a lot of discussion over the last 3-4 months on how to structure the 'ask' for Fiscal Year 2018 appropriations. The result is the one-pager John distributed which depicts the same percentage increase for the six priority programs. John is pleased with the McStennis recommendation. Randy said it is unknown what will happen with the Trump Administration. Their budget is expected to be released next week and it is not known where the money is going to come from to fund any of the increases they are expected to ask for. Wendy said APLU is hearing the agriculture budget is not going to be pretty; this is probably not the best time to roll out a new ask for an increased budget.

Forest Health Initiative, John Hayes: NAUFRP has wanted to leverage APLU support for a broad forest initiative and has been working within the APLU framework for advancing such an initiative. Their structure is designed to link to various APLU boards and stakeholders. We were given the green light to move forward to develop an outline; it was vetted by a number of people with feedback (non-stapled handout). John provided four handouts pertaining to the Forest Health Initiative: chronology of activities, draft authorship assignments, draft proposed white paper structure and a draft white paper model. He encouraged the Executive Committee to review the white papers that have gone through APLU. The stapled document is the best model. John wants to try and both structure and sync the message around certain program priorities. He is not sure if he has captured the right ones and invited feedback. The authorship assignments are meant to be an initiative of the BNR. Wendy said the Steering Committee (editing team) needs to be filled out for the April APLU Board meeting. This is a two-year process. Keith said the original intent was to include invasives. Steve believes "community" resonates well – it personalizes. Janaki feels invasives should be more prominent as well as economic development. John wants more of this kind of feedback; he will come back with an updated version.

Larry Biles, Kansas State Forester: Larry is the formal liaison between NAUFRP and the National Association of State Foresters (NASF). At one time he was the forestry program leader for CSREES, the USDA agency that preceded NIFA. He provided a handout and described the two 'triplines' that NASF is running: one for FY18 appropriations and the other for the Farm Bill (handout). Their legislative priorities are: wildland fire budget; federal forest management, landscape

scale restoration codification, appropriations (green infrastructure). A Farm Bill issue NASF will be working on is to include liability insurance for prescribed fire in USDA crop insurance program.

Buck Vandersteen, National Council of Forestry Association Executives (NCFAE): Buck is the Executive Director of the Louisiana Forestry Association and is in town to participate in the CARET (Council on Agricultural Research, Extension and Teaching) meeting. They have been given the APLU one-pager of FY18 program appropriations requests. Buck has previously served on the USDA Forestry Research Advisory Committee (FRAC). CARET is a 25-person group advocating for the land-grant system, members are appointed by the dean. He is on the Executive Committee and is a past chairman. He has asked them for a liaison position with NAUFRP and they agreed if NAUFRP is willing. Buck is willing to serve in that role and fund it. Buck wants to help forestry within APLU and forestry generally. The NAUFRP Executive Committee was very supportive and saw no drawbacks. NCFAE has an upcoming meeting July 25-28 in Annapolis, MD. Most are foresters; Tom Martin, American Forest Foundation, is the current President. They are a good partner with NASF. Markets are a big issue. Keith pointed out that Red Baker represented NAUFRP at their meeting last year and he hopes to continue this. John proposed a motion "To create a liaison position between CARET and NAUFRP in which Buck Vandersteen would serve in that role", Kamran seconded the motion. Discussion: Randy said in hindsight we should have sought this relationship earlier. There was a motion to amend the resolution to "Authorize a member of the CARET Executive Committee to act as Liaison for NAUFRP and Buck Vandersteen to serve in that role." The amendment was accepted. Discussion: we do not want this to be mandatory. The motion passed unanimously. It was agreed that Buck would also serve as NAUFRP representative to NCFAE. (<http://ncfae.org>)

Southern NAUFRP Chair, Dale Greene: This will be the first year that UGA have handled the comparative data survey. They have had responses from 10 schools. Southern NAUFRP will meet in conjunction with the Southern Group of State Foresters June 5-7 in Rogers, AR.

Northeastern NAUFRP Chair, Mike Messina: The Northeastern region meets at the NAUFRP annual meeting. Only five schools are active; four are present here. The University of Vermont is coming back for accreditation. Mike is periodically invited to attend meetings at the Northern Research Station.

Western NAUFRP Chair, Linda Nagel: Linda is new to this position. Their region plans to meet June 26-28 at Salish Kootenai College in Montana. She will be getting details out. There are a number of department head searches ongoing in the West. Please let her know of changes.

North Central Chair, Mark Rickenbach: Mark has spoken to several of the North Central region heads. A topic of interest is forest health positions and sharing courses across institutions. Department Advisory Boards – useful ??????

Returned to earlier discussion on Forest Health Initiative. Dan asked who is the target audience? Is it structured correctly for this? Wendy said the long-term goal is to impact policy and ultimately fiscal dollars. Mary urged adapting the language to what Trump and conservatives are seeking (i.e., economic impacts to tourism and wood fiber production. Let John know. He will get topics list to Terri.

"Improving Lives" Dialogues – Partner-Led Initiatives, Rich Guldin, SAF Research Fellow: (PowerPoint presentation) The Forest Service (FS) and SAF have a Cooperative Agreement to 1) review emerging science needs with stakeholders, 2) identify opportunities for more and better cooperation, and 3) assess new communications and technologies. SAF is working to develop broad based support for FS R&D funding. One problem is that many NGO's have lost touch with FS R&D. SAF worked with a consulting firm, Metropolitan Group, to design 2 approaches for morning and afternoon dialogue sessions that addressed agency wide interests and R&D strategic needs. The morning session focused on the big issues we face -- how do these relate to natural resources and how can science and SAF help address these issues. The afternoon sessions asked participants to: identify the toughest problems to expect looking 10 years ahead; science areas to strengthen to provide the science needed; where is the FS R&D comparative advantage; and, how do you like to search for the science you need. Thirty people were invited; about 10-12 attended. A session in DC is yet to come. Rich believes 10-12 is the right size for this kind of discussion. Among those invited were groups 'we' haven't had prior relationships with. The concerns they heard were about creating jobs, maintaining existing jobs and businesses in rural areas, lack of a stewardship ethic, clean water, active forest management, invasive species in burned areas, erratic

climate conditions, citizens needing to understand consequences of actions, citizen science literacy. Where do people go to find science they can use? Google-It (Google Scholar & Research Gate), Treesearch (R&D program), Facebook, on line videos and webcasts but not webinars (too long), scientific meetings (important but budget for this is an issue), going to scientists via emails or phone calls. Question, was extension forestry cited as a means of disseminating science and were they involved in the dialogue sessions? The answer was no. The surprising things they learned: many mid-professionals have lost the ability to read scientific publications; agency resource managers struggle to find science on their issues and then how to synthesize and apply it; and, more synthesis of R&D results is definitely needed. Finally, they heard common interest from groups SAF has not worked with before and new perspectives on new issues. Contact Rich at guldinr@safnet.org for questions.

US Endowment's Blue Ribbon Commission on Forest and Forest Products Research, Rich Guldin: (PowerPoint presentation) A five member committee was created to review the state of research in the forest sector, basically a review of what has happened since the 2002 National Research Council Report. Data were updated and new data added. Keith Belli and Terry Sharik are on the Commission. Serious data gaps still exist especially regarding university R&D capacity. Four federal agencies fund forest sector research (NIFA, FS R&D, NSC, and DOE). Forest products and related research is the biggest category of funded research. FS intermural research remains the core of national capacity absent any data on university capacity. A slide depicted annual grants for forest sector research for the last 15 years. There is little collaboration for priority setting across the agencies involved in forest R&D. There is no syntheses of findings to provide 'state of the science' information. Progress that has been made includes synthesized and summarized available data and data gaps and uncertainties identified. Data were presented to the Commission in December. They are crafting recommendations that are still under development and refinement. The plan is to release two reports: one a short summary and the other more detailed with data. The significant Commission findings are: basic research is strong, but there is imbalance and weak links in the R&D 'chain of innovation'; applied research and development are weak; without innovation little investment is made and few new jobs created; without additional businesses, services and products in rural areas there is minimal income flowing to forest landowners. Rich expects the final report to be completed in late April or early May.

Diversity Logic Model: Carol Redelsheimer (SAF) reviewed the background on the Diversity Logic Model sponsored by SAF, FS R&D and NAUFRP. (Tina Terrell, USFS, Acting Associate Deputy Chief for Business Operations joined for this discussion.) The contractors, Innovative Concepts, looked at existing practices to determine where we stand. It was an informative process. One of the questions they asked was "what was the capacity for organizational change?" There is a proposal for next steps. The initial intent was to gather "Best Practices" but that did not happen. Tina did not get the Logic Model per se. She was in the Baton Rouge working group and has read the report. There were questions raised in Baton Rouge that were not addressed in the report. This issue has been discussed for 30 years. Keith acknowledged the frustration on this issue. Linda Nagel asked whether SAF and NAUFRP have articulated a vision for diversity and inclusion (D&I)? Keith said NAUFRP has not. Matt said we all know we want to do this but it is very difficult to articulate. SAF will finalize a statement in April. Terry said there is a need for fundamentally understanding different cultures and how to incorporate that understanding. Keith stated that we need to be deliberate as an organization, not follow a shot gun or piece meal approach. The Logic Model was intended as a process for organizing how we will get from part a to part b ('Best Practices'). Tina says consistency will be key. She loves the idea of Best Practices. She encouraged that a couple be picked to build some momentum. SAF needs to open up and collaborate. OSU developed relationships with Job Corps. Tina is on the east coast and willing to help. John complimented SAF on this effort and agreed with Keith's comments. His concerns are that we've been talking about this for 4-5 years. The goal for the Logic Model was to build a framework; he fears if we wait too long the outcome could be we do too little or nothing. Mary has worked on the SAF vision; she urged that we invest in just two bullets and work hard on those. Mary said there are a lot of data on cultural communities. Tina said her professors kept her in forestry; understanding the culture is important. Look at the mentality of the young (Facebook). Other comments were: we are in-fighting for students; we do a better job of recruiting than retaining; the pipeline does not stop with undergraduates. Wendy said APLU has a National Science Foundation grant that will push out a clearing house catalog through their president's office. Matt noted the impact the hiring freeze will have at the federal and state levels; there will be fewer jobs for graduating students – we will need to pay attention to hiring/freezing policies that impact filling jobs. Janaki believes there is an opportunity to institutionalize some things so faculty are forced to pay attention; he is thinking in terms of curriculum. Keith agrees we need to infuse

this through courses/curriculum. Terry believes these conversations will continue through the new SAF D&I Working Group.

Forest Service R&D Priorities and Budget Update, Carlos Rodriguez-Franco, Deputy Chief and Felipe Sanchez:

(PowerPoint presentation) The Forest Service agency-wide focus areas are wildland fire management, communities, inclusion, ecological restoration, and safety. The CR17 is in effect through April 26 at FY 16 levels. Funding for the Forest Products Lab (FPL) is up \$7 million from FY15. The CR directs \$75 million to Forest Inventory and Analysis (FIA) which is an increase of \$5 million from FY 15. A reduction of \$17 million impacts all other research programs. Priority Research Areas are watershed management and restoration, FIA, forest disturbance, bioenergy and bio-based products, urban natural resource stewardship and nanotechnology. Several PowerPoint slides show: 1) Agency Discretionary Budget FY14-FY16 for the agency, R&D, NFS and S&PF; 2) the R&D Budget 2012-2017 compared to other funding sources, and; 3) FY16 Enacted and FY17 CR Budget for Strategic Program Areas and Priority Research Areas. The number of grants and agreements stood at 577 in FY15, down from 746 in FY14. R&D grant funding was \$42.6 million in FY15 --- it has been relatively stable over this time frame. FS R&D has been participating in key agency issues: sage grass, US/EU wood pellet discussion, upcoming carbon negotiations billion ton report, white nose syndrome. Key R&D accomplishments are RPA, National Carbon Assessment Report and an expanded FIA program. They have recently released a report on Effects of Drought on Forests. New people in R&D: Tracy Hancock and Deborah Butler, Chief of Staff. FS R&D produces a monthly newsletter. Felipe said Congress is considering no-year carry over – that will make it difficult for them. Keith acknowledged the appreciation NAUFRP has for R&D's collaboration. Carlos would like to see us identify and work on a joint project together.

Matt Menashes, CEO, and Fred Cubbage, President, Society of American Foresters: Madison was an exceptional convention. The students who attended were very involved and engaged and Matt attributed this to the unusually large job fair. There were 1,750 attendees of which 600 were students; 125 students were hired on site (114 by the Forest Service). Fred Cubbage, SAF President, acknowledged he is a NAUFRP alum. There are many opportunities for cooperation between SAF and NAUFRP on advocacy for research. He is working on an update of the 2002 Sustainable Management Report by providing data on capacity. SAF is beginning a Working Group in D&I. It should be approved within three weeks. SAF wants to work with the fed, state and private sectors. Carol discussed new developments related to accreditation. The new accreditation handbook has combined the standards for the BS program in Forestry, Urban Forestry, and Natural Resources and Ecosystem Management with the standards for Forestry 2-year technical programs. Carol is happy to have feedback on it. On the Logic Model additional funding is needed for next steps; we didn't get far in the earlier discussion with the Forest Service in asking for it. There has not been an increase in accreditation fees in xx years. There is currently a \$24,000 gap in that budget and they plan to increase fees next year. Question: what is driving the gap? Matt said the direct costs are obvious; indirect not so much. An example is external review of the SAF accreditation program. Carol believes it is one of the most efficient and quality SAF programs. Matt said, if passed around, the increase would be about \$300/program. Carol will be developing a proposed model. Dale advised to keep up with the costs – the value of accreditation sets apart the school. Keith asked if SAF has looked at the demand side of accreditation to employers (i.e., State Foresters). Carol said some states require degrees from accredited schools (example NY, CO). Keith recommended Carol document this. She was asked how many programs have Natural Resource Management. She said there will be five by the end of the year (first was in 2014). Of the students hired by the FS in Madison, how many were forestry requirements? There were 39 BS, 3 Masters only and a BS in Urban Forestry. They are thinking of an additional fee for multiple programs.

Will Novy-Hildesley, Executive Director, North American Forest Partnership (NAFP) by conference phone (Rae Tamblyn of the NAFP Washington Office was present in the room). Will provided a brief background on the NAFP. The grand strategy is to develop a brand for aligning stakeholders on the same page and move forward together. NAFP includes the World Wildlife Fund, the Forest Stewardship Council, Packer Foundation, Quick Silver? to name a few. They are currently developing a grand strategy tool kit. The goal is to figure out how to tell the "whole" story of the forestry sector and go public with it on April 11. Key Audiences are policy and environmental customers. They will have 'Walk in the Woods' on their website and social media Further, they want to engage beyond the sector and meet the audience where they are. To date, they have been working to identify a community of people already in the sector who are ready to move forward. Will encouraged NAUFRP to help provide list of who those may be. Red asked Will if he was

familiar with the McStennis forestry research program; Will was not. Red described the program and Strategic Plan process that found many within the sector/community unfamiliar with such a core program. Red thinks NAFP can help. He will follow-up with Will. Dale said UGA joined NAFP last fall. The general population's view of forestry is a significant issue. We bump up against that even with students. Can the material be shared with the group? Will said certainly. Mary said her communications director is engaged. She sent stories forward and believes this could be leveraged even more. Question: what is the strategy to share with the community? What kind of stories and where are they going? Will said it is key to keep giving them raw stories. David said SUNY tried to join but found the NAFP website not very user friendly; they couldn't do. Will said they are working on that; their job is to be seamless. Terry asked if the NAFP membership is on the website. Will said yes; it will be available for the April rollout. Rae to send NAFP membership list and Benchmarking Perceptions research to Terri. (received)

Rita Hite, American Forest Foundation (AFF): Three years ago the AFF Board challenged the organization to look at their Woodlands Work and measurable impacts it has or could have – she said it's been a long path! Two years ago they began analyzing real on the ground issues at the family level. They have had three regional assessments to understand what's happening and what the biggest threats are at the regional level. There will be a fourth covering the mid-west to come later this year. In the west, fire in critical watersheds is the biggest threat. This helps to focus resources. In the South, the important issues include at-risk wildlife – forests are not the problem but development and agriculture are. The Fish & Wildlife Service has doubled the speed of listings from 200-400. Forestry is a solution. In the Northeast, the forests are in a mid-life crisis. The idea is they can figure out where they can work, concentrate and focus to move the needle for forest landowners. They are working in 15 landscapes – working with new partners and making forests part of the solution. Terry asked if they are interacting with extension, State Foresters, S&PF. Rita said absolutely. AFF is playing a catalyst role and S&PF is the largest funder of this work. Keith asked about numbers – impacts on jobs, the economy? Rita said there are 11 million forest properties and 22 million landowners. Other important issues AFF is working on are policy and taxation. There is a lot of uncertainty right now. Farm Bill reauthorization has begun. Forests in the Farm Bill first organized in 2002; as of December 2016 they have a whole set of new and different players who have joined. The Coalition is organizing around five areas: 1) fire & forest health, (invasives, protecting forests from forest fire and disease), 2) forest dependent wildlife; 3) retaining working forests 4) growing jobs and economies through forests, and 5) improving and streamlining forest conservation programs. What about water? Rita said it is integrated into all – as is research. Rita was asked about the impact of the election on the Farm Bill process and the environment. She said there is clearly a divide, particularly related to public lands and noted that 5-6% more rural voters voted Republican. The question is how do we position ourselves with rural voters – it is the only population really changing. Terry asked about policy and taxes at federal and state level. Rita said they don't have the capacity to be involved in state policy. Barriers to wood? One and a half years ago EPA put out a policy with little guidance that required the federal government to purchase FSC certified wood. ??? US Green Building Code codifies and reminds FS to do their job. The Timber Innovation Act reinforces that; the concrete industry opposes.

Pat Stephens Williams, Stephen F Austin State University: Pat asked if 1) NAUFRP could carve one hour (two would be great) out of the Albuquerque meeting to discuss the NAUFRP leadership's vision for the future of forestry education, (The last time this was done was in 1963.) and, 2) what needs to be addressed in the future (curriculum, climate change, etc). This is her McStennis project. Terry will help Pat frame the message to NAUFRP. Linda cited the recent Berkley Summit and JOF issue and asked if Pat's work will build on it? Pat said yes, but she hopes to capture a broader audience. Kamran asked if Pat could send questions in advance and she agreed. Keith believes this will help us determine where it will fit into our meeting and how much time to allow for it.

Food and Agriculture Education Information System (FAEIS) by conference call: Terry is trying to fill in the FAEIS data gaps for NAUFRP institutions for the last few years. In 2012, 67 out of 72 NAUFRP institutions submitted data; only 27 have done so since then. We really need to look at the data for these years. The gaps are a result from Bill Richardson's death and a change in staff at FAEIS. Terry will send a list of university FAEIS contacts to the Executive Committee to try and identify the correct ones for each institution. Pete Ziegler and Andrew Meeks joined by phone. They are about to make a full effort to track down the gaps and contact information. Katy, looking at her institution on the FAEIS website, noted that their department does not have "forestry" in its name and it may be difficult to find them. Pete and Andrew are about to go out to each NAUFRP institution and 1) look at their degree programs 2) pull out CIP codes in forestry

and cross walk between FAEIS and NAUFRP, and 3) send to NAUFRP and ask for review. They will provide a list of data by institution and a list of contacts.

Sonny Ramaswamy, Director, USDA National Food and Agriculture Institute Update: Sonny said the USDA Secretary nominee Sonny Perdue is waiting for a confirmation hearing. They don't yet know who will replace the Deputy Secretary. The pace on the Farm Bill is picking up. The FY17 the Continuing Resolution (CR) is in effect until April 28. The bad news is the sequestration on mandatory dollars means a 6.9 percent decrease by their calculations although they have not heard this formally. They have heard they may have to take an across the board cut somewhere between 2 and 10 percent on April 29. Other agencies like EPA and NOAA are looking at significantly more reductions. Sonny hopes NIFA/USDA will not be as impacted. Passbacks on the FY18 budget they submitted were to have come 10 days ago. They have heard there may be significant reductions. Sonny was just with CARET where the Georgia folks say Sonny Purdue is very supportive of higher education coming from his farm background. The TEconomy study on capacity grants was completed 3-4 weeks ago and submitted as a draft. There were revisions and it was submitted again as final late last Friday and is going through the USDA approval process. He will keep us posted and share as soon as it is released. It is a very comprehensive report and has some excellent comparisons between competitive and capacity programs. He hopes it will be very useful. Sonny wants to use it for support from Congress. Sonny tried to dissuade APLU from the appropriations approach they took; he wanted them to be more strategic. If Congress was in mood to fund over \$200 million then it should go to AFRI. The APLU one-pager does not have a good rationale -- \$200 million needs to be a compelling argument. We need to be on the same page. The TEconomy report is going to make that argument. Jim asked if the report will be held up until the new Secretary is in place. Sonny is hopeful it will be released this week. USDA is going about business as usual; the Trump Administration has not imposed anything different. Randy confirmed this report will be good ammunition for us on the Hill. Sonny went on to say they are doing a lot of stakeholder engagement on "Tactical Sciences" which is relevant for natural resources. NIFA hosted a conversation at the University of Maryland on invasive species (EAB, LHB). Seventy people crafted a shared vision. As a result of their infrastructure study they have developed a budget placeholder in competitive programs for the most decrepit facilities; they have a \$9 billion backlog. He is hoping for program like Sitalines to address the infrastructure needs of land-grants. Keith said that without capacity dollars we are limited in applying for competitive grants. Leveraging is a big plus for capacity, as much as 10:1. Catalino says it is actually 5:1.

Catalino Blanche (NIFA) said they have implemented a new process for grants called EasyFed. Catalino will be reviewing financial reports. Randy asked if there have been any post-election inquiries about McStennis. Catalino said not that he was aware of. John Hayes agrees with Sonny's comments that the APLU one-pager could be more strategic. A better case could be made. It's a shaky coalition for dollars. John is concerned if the coalition should unravel. He doesn't know if someone dropped a ball, if Cornerstone didn't vet or APLU and Sonny's office changed direction. Janaki says another argument for McStennis is the program is the backbone for 22 million forest landowners. Sonny's comments that the buying power of McStennis is significantly reduced sends the message that AFRI is more important than capacity programs. Keith asked how we can be proactive. Dale would like to call capacity programs "scientific infrastructure", this includes human research. Dan asked what are the 5-10 accomplishments we've done with McStennis dollars? That's in the brochure and can be teased out. Keith said we are the workforce; what would happen if McStennis went away? Red believes it is appropriate for the new Ad Hoc Communications Committee to specifically address and identify top McStennis accomplishments and what would happen if the program went away. We can cite 9,400 master's degrees and 3,000 doctorate degrees. Randy asked what were the deliverables in this timeframe? This could be really valuable. Perhaps survey the top reasons why McStennis is important/valuable -- what are the economic impacts? The IUFRO one-pagers could be useful for this purpose and also to Catalino. The Ad Hoc Communications Committee is Mary (chair), Mark, Phil, Steve and Red. Referencing Rita's five-point framework and the Forest Health Initiative, Katy believes McStennis accomplishments would help these efforts. Keith would like to bring this to the General Assembly. Bob says what we don't have are real stories. Randy referenced Carlos' invitation to work on a project with us and urged that we come up with one. Mark pointed out that Carlos also indicated a likely decrease in external dollars. John heard Carlos say he was looking for a strategic vision for forestry research at the national level, like the Roadmap. Red referenced FS facilities, personnel divesting and talk about joining forces on campus. This is similar to the Wildlife Coop Units. Randy noted we tried to talk about this several years ago but got no traction with them. Red thinks Carlos will be more receptive, especially with an emphasis on efficiencies. Mary says think about how

universities work in concert with federal agencies to conduct vital research. We can work better and smarter for the future in partnership – the infrastructure is only a part of it. Mary suggested a different format, for example the Univ of Vermont and Northern Research Station under Michael Rains, shared 3 positions 50-50. John said this might be a vehicle for Forest Health – modeled after the Joint Fire Science Committee. He supports having the discussion that Mary suggested. Do we want to move forward and if so, how? Rich's presentation suggested we need to examine capacity. Katy suggested meeting with Carlos & Station Directors, or at regional meetings. Mike Messina was invited to participate with the Northern Research Station on different things when Michael Rains was there but he has retired and its now Tony Ferguson; he doesn't know what to expect. David thinks they are open but don't know a path forward so nothing happens. Bob said they are trying to preserve their culture. Andy would like to know whether it is a national dictate about teaching being forbidden for FS scientists. Keith and others feel it is the prerogative of the Station Directors but it would be worthwhile to try and find out. Randy wants to follow up with Carlos and request a meeting with the Station Directors. Andy would like to know what the FS can and cannot do for collaboration; what are the constraints and barriers?