

Draft

National Association of University Forest Resources Programs (NAUFRP)
General Assembly Minutes
Portland, OR
October 3, 2018

Introductions: see separate attachment for list of NAUFRP representatives

Welcome by Keith Belli (Clemson University), NAUFRP President

2017 General Assembly Meeting Minutes from Albuquerque, New Mexico: The draft 2017 minutes were previously distributed by email and posted on the NAUFRP webpage for membership review. A motion was made by Jim Allen (Northern Arizona University), seconded by Andy Ezell (Mississippi State University), to approve the draft November 15, 2017 General Assembly minutes. Terry Sharik (Michigan Tech University) has provided Terri Bates (Executive Liaison) with comments and edits which will be incorporated. The motion was approved unanimously.

Treasurer Report, Katy Kavanagh (Oregon State University): A written financial report for 2017 and 2018 was distributed. Katy reviewed the close out of 2017 covering dues and grant income versus expenses which included a communications workshop in Atlanta last August. The latter meeting was covered by the last of the grant funds that covered strategic planning for the McIntire-Stennis (McStennis) program. Katy then reviewed the 2018 budget and projections through the end of this year. The Executive Committee reviewed the proposed 2019 budget yesterday and made one change increasing Terri Bates' (Executive Liaison) compensation to \$31,000 annually from \$28,283. It is anticipated NAUFRP will host a reception at the ATR meeting next March which would likely come out of the President's budget. A motion was made to adopt the proposed 2019 budget by Red Baker (University of Florida), seconded by Adrian Leighton (Salish Kootenai College). The motion was adopted by unanimous vote.

Overview of NAUFRP Activities, David Newman, NAUFRP President-Elect (SUNY): David reviewed (PowerPoint) the NAUFRP organizational structure. Keith discussed the committee structure and urged representatives to get involved including their faculty so they can learn what NAUFRP is about and bring fresh blood to the organization. Please step forward and recruit colleagues and faculty. Major accomplishments were reviewed including the revised NAUFRP webpage. David would like to see new photos for it and requested they be sent to Terri. Another significant effort has been the McStennis Communications Strategic Plan led by Mary Watzin (North Carolina State University). She will talk more about this later. Note that McStennis is largely why NAUFRP exists. David reviewed activities of the standing committees. These need to be reinvigorated by adding new people to them. It is an opportunity to develop leadership abilities. Keith encouraged those who have faculty involved in LEAD21 to have them attend the March Executive Committee meeting in Washington, DC. Let us know who that may be and we can reach out to them. Rich Guldin asked about the relationship between NAUFRP and the National Association of University Fisheries and Wildlife Programs (NAUFWP). Keith asked for a show of hands of who is a member of both organizations (quite a few). Randy represents both organizations. Keith said that in the past we have flirted with merging but ultimately backed away from the idea. We have stood together on certain issues (i.e. funding for coop units). Rich said there is an opportunity to advance our interests with alliances like this.

NAUFRP New Efforts: Keith noted the upcoming 2019 March ATR meeting will be a good opportunity to discuss issues related to McStennis. It may be time to revisit the 2011 Undergraduate Education Strategic Plan in the coming year. The USDA National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA) is currently hosting Listening Sessions. Last year Keith put a communication out urging NAUFRP representative to attend or send comments in. As a result forest health and ecosystem services were in the top 10 priorities – we had an impact.

Keith encouraged representatives to submit comments this year for your priorities and/or your institution's – have your faculty do so as well. We have been advised to put comments in your own words. Luis Tupas (NIFA) added that there will be an analysis – the more NIFA hears about an issue, the more it will be elevated and gain momentum. Information on the sessions can be found at <https://nifa.usda.gov/nifalistsens>

Washington Update, Randy Nuckolls, NAUFRP General Counsel: Randy met with Sonny Ramaswamy (former NIFA Director) before he left office and Sonny advised NAUFRP representatives to better engage and to seek out NIFA program leaders and involvement in peer review panels. Randy encouraged NAUFRP members to advocate for McStennis and other programs on campus. The McStennis law designated that the Governors determine who the ATR is at an institution as well as the funding split if there is more than one academic program in the state. Randy advised all NAUFRP representatives to know who the ATR is at their institution. A meeting of the ATRs will occur in Washington, D.C. next March and a large attendance is hoped for. Randy discussed the status of federal appropriations in Washington as of last week. The Agriculture Appropriations bill has passed both the House and Senate with the House increasing McStennis funding to \$36 million from \$33.9. AFRI is at \$415 million in the House and \$405 in the Senate -- up from \$400 million in current year funding. Funding for Coop Units is at \$19.2 million in the House and \$17.6 in the Senate. The Farm Bill expired on September 30th; both the House and Senate have passed bills but have not been able to agree on a couple of fundamental issues that relate mainly to the SNAP (Food Stamp) program. Funding for operations has expired; 39 programs are impacted, but not the discretionary funding NIFA programs (McStennis, AFRI, RREA). NIFA says it will have no problem getting funds to NAUFRP institutions for the first and second quarters. Randy says there is uncertainty as to what to expect from the upcoming November mid-term elections. Pollsters say that 50 races in the House are in play; many moderate Republicans in the House are retiring. Prior to September 13 (the Kavanaugh debate) polls indicated there are 10 key Senate races; 26 Senators are up for re-election of which 10 are running in states won by Trump. Randy was asked about the proposed NIFA move? He responded that the matter has the full attention of the land grant community. NIFA's building lease is up and they have to move somewhere regardless. The philosophy of the Trump Administration is decentralization. The Department of Interior Secretary Ryan Zinke is talking about doing something similar for BLM, USGS and FWS. NAUFRP signed a letter sponsored by the land grant community laying out concerns and questions about the move. The Executive Committee discussed this yesterday and decided to wait and see what the state proposals are. USDA Secretary Perdue sent a five-page letter to the House and Senate in response to their concerns which addressed some but not all their questions. Reportedly up to 70 percent of the professional NIFA staff say they will not move (about 300 employees would be affected); that would be a real loss. On a different issue, Eric Norland (NIFA) said his team is going to make public which institutions have McStennis money at risk of being returned to the US Treasury and prior to 2020, they will write to the Governors to reconfirm the ATR designation at each institution and request a five year funding plan. They want the Governors to have the financial information about what money goes unspent.

Dave Lewis, President and Terry Baker, Chief Executive Officer, Society of American Foresters: Dave Lewis introduced Terry Baker as the new CEO and provided his background. Terry spoke about looking for ways on how we can engage, work together and not duplicate efforts. The schools are the first line of engagement for foresters. Dale Greene asked if they could share the SAF slides shown yesterday to the Executive Committee? Paul Winistorfer (Virginia Tech) noted SAF is the largest forest membership organization in North America and asked how can it be more of a convener for other organizations. They are doing this in his state where they hold an annual Virginia Forestry Summit. Can SAF do this at the national level? He believes SAF has the horse power and would like this group to meet in DC with all the other groups – it would gain the attention of policy leaders and have a powerful voice on forestry issues. Mary Watzin referred to the SAF PowerPoint from yesterday saying that students are in so many different programs that the emphasis on certified foresters might discourage them from becoming SAF members. Jo Ellen Force (University of Idaho) asked if SAF is going to address the transition between students and full members? Diversity of age is not a new problem but new ideas are needed to help with the transitioning. Dave Lewis said the Board spent a lot of time in May looking at this;

it's definitely on their radar. Terry Baker spoke of an informal poll he took among his friends about the value of SAF and he came to the conclusion that SAF offers a unique sense of community and he wants to figure out how SAF can better support that. He met with student representatives this morning who clearly said they have a group that wants to be asked to do things and we need to do take advantage of that thoughtfully and with intent. Randy said studies have shown millennials want to have an impact but they really don't value institutions as necessary because they can come together thru social media. There is a need to convince them to be continuously involved. Randy asked Terry and Dave about the Forest Research Summit. He understands FS R&D has provided a \$100,000 research grant to SAF and has heard that the dollars are being used otherwise and would like to talk about how that money is going to be used because we thought it was going to the Summit. Terry Sharik asked about SAF's commitment to diversity? Terry Baker said it stares him in the face every day. He has worked on many efforts and the main lesson he has learned is that it is not the students but the community that influences them in following a forestry/natural resource career. We are going to have to connect with their communities which means going to the churches and not job fairs. Katy says another obstacle is meeting registration and travel costs. Give people a role and reason to participate.

USDA National Institute of Food and Agriculture: Randi Johnson noted NIFA will be moving, but whether it will be locally or out of the Washington, DC area, is unknown. Randi urged NAUFRP members to look carefully at the AFRI RFA 2019 Budget Explanatory Notes. Bioenergy is primary for forestry. She discussed the relationship of the number of proposals received and review panel composition and encouraged agency visits; consider meeting with program leaders in other areas such as crop production. They are turning into 'One USDA'. All employees will have an email change. Consolidation is for efficiency. Scott Angle is Sonny Ramaswamy's successor as agency director. Ali Mohamad noted that the Workforce Development Program has a RFA coming that may be of interest. The Office of Inspector General audited the McStennis program last year. NIFA is not the only USDA agency with funding for forestry. Look at the Rural Development agency programs; they have funding for natural resources. For example water programs are funded at \$4 billion whereas in NIFA they are at \$1.6 billion. Randy agrees and says if you have economic development or business faculty have them look at this agency's programs. It could mean funding for tech transfer for faculty. Daniel Cassidy said the McStennis RFA has passed clearance and should be released this Friday.

Mary Watzin (North Carolina State University), McStennis Strategic Communications: Mary reviewed what steps she has taken since last year as the Ad Hoc Communication Chair for NAUFRP. She tried to convene a group of NAUFRP institution communicators but that was not successful. Since then she has worked closely with her own communications person Sarah Corica. She reviewed the goals and challenges for NAUFRP Communications (PowerPoint). One of the significant challenges is how few people know the value of the McStennis program. Sarah googled McStennis and found only four sites that reference it and only one was an institution (Univ. of Vermont). Mary was asked if this was only McStennis or does it include the Hatch program? She said the agriculture community is much more effective in their communications and advocacy. She displayed the example one pager developed for the NC State tree genetics program which is McStennis funded. This could be used as a template that all NAUFRP would use and build upon. It is intended to be short text, a photo, shared collaborations around McStennis -- the same format would be used by each school illustrating a co-branded federal and state partnership. Mary was asked why NIFA wasn't depicted. She said that needs to be talked about. Tom DeLuca was very supportive of what Mary has developed and said every institution has a website and should be mentioning McStennis. Mary said we can have a robust debate about some of the language; the communicators can help and she cited an example of how the term 'landscape' means different things to different people. Terry talked about the key messages and concerns from yesterday --- society vs forest products. Keith Gillis (University of California-Berkley) said 'working' forests doesn't work for them. Andrew Storer (Michigan Tech) said watershed, recreation, aesthetics are the words that work for them. Randy said Mary deserves tremendous credit for the work she has done. We need to think about the language, but there appears to be consensus on the concept and next steps. Mary will send the template to be populated with instructions. Keith emphasized the need to use our communications people. The audience is the general

public and legislative staffers. We want to keep it simple. McStennis is about innovation and applied research as well as training future scientists – that’s what we need to convey. Eric thinks this is a terrific template that NIFA can use. Jay Sullivan (Virginia Tech) asked Mary to send the PPT with template so the communicators have the background.

ATR Meeting, Daniel Cassidy and Eric Norland, NIFA: Half of the ATRs are non-foresters. For the March 2019 meeting they want the actual ATRs, not subs although they will welcome a contingency. The Planning Committee for the ATR meeting includes David Newman, Sue Blodgett (Iowa State) and Mary Watzin. They expect to devote half a day to science issues and half a day about program administration. The date is set for March 7 in DC at a location to be determined. The ATRs are those who are held accountable by NIFA. Daniel said a lot of new ATRs have asked about training. Let him know your interest and they can set something up. Randy noted that USDA is working on a common set of Guidelines/Manual for all programs that should be completed by the March meeting (currently there are separate manuals for the different programs). The agency staff are proposing that by FY 2020 institutions will be allowed to only carry over 50 percent of their McStennis allocation to encourage spending down the funds. This would also apply to Hatch. Eric said this 50 percent is not a line in the sand; extensions can be requested. As mentioned earlier, McStennis was audited last year. The auditors were asking questions about original regulations so NIFA is now asking for budget plans. Keith Gillis says the budget needs to be relevant. Daniel will send the “Essentials of Budget Proposals” to Terri for distribution. In FY 2020, they will begin using a new OMB form that requires budget forecasting. Jim Allen recommended allowing time at the ATR meeting to discuss the McStennis Strategic Plan.

Forest Research Summit, Rich Guldin: A national research summit emerged as a recommendation from the 2017 Blue Ribbon Commission Report on Forest Products Research & Development in the 21st Century. The report posited increasingly major changes to the forest sector and articulated a need for a forum involving leaders of influence and maturity to describe a path forward. The goals for a summit were laid out in the funding request: 1) determine consensus on research challenges (national and regional); 2) develop recommendations for a more effective structure to meet those challenges and 3) recommend a coordinated system to review, recognize and update challenges. The US Endowment is starting to bring people together. Forest Service R&D has committed funding as has the Endowment. A proposal has also been submitted to NIFA which they are waiting to hear back on. The Endowment is working with the National Science Foundation, Department of Energy and USDA to identify the right people. Once the funding is committed they envision 8-10 months to put the Summit together – that is enough time for a thoughtful discussion about who are the right invitees who will be forward looking. Rich says a set of briefing papers will need to be developed for the participants.

Regional Report Out On Research Priorities:

Western NAUFRP, Linda Nagel (Colorado State University): Fifteen people participated in their discussion. Priorities include: 1 - fire and fuel management 2 - markets for future wood products 3 - system based analysis (balance management/ecosystem services) 4 - forest health and resilience in context of climate change 5 - managing watersheds for sustainable water supply and quality. The West had an addendum: relook at increasing the indirect return rate allowed by the US Forest Service.

Northeastern NAUFRP, Mike Messina (Pennsylvania State University): 1 - low value trees/bio-economy (new products) 2 - international trade issues 3 - labor force shortages 4 - forest health (invasives, climate change, deer....) 5 - Changes in ownership patterns (keeping forests in forests) 5 - ecosystem services

North Central NAUFRP, Bob Wagner (Purdue University): Responses were from seven institutions: 1 – sustainability and restoration of oak-hickory/northern hardwood forests 2 - managing invasives for forest health 3 - climate change adaptation 4 - using forests to enhance urban and rural communities 5 - water

quality enhancement and watershed management 6 - utilizing emerging tools/technologies like big data and identifying tools needed (may not be research)

Southern NAUFRP, Dale Greene (University of Georgia): 1 - invasive plants and animals/forest health 2 - forest markets (competition) 3 - water quality and quantity 4 - ecosystem services 5 - climate change impacts.

Keith sees patterns among the regional groups. These are water (4 of 4); markets (encompasses international and bio economy) (3 of 4); forest health (4 of 4); ecosystem services (3 of 4); climate change adaptations (3 of 4). Send Keith the detailed results and also regional priorities. Katy noted T&E did not come up: based on her experience in the south she thinks it would have if there were more managers in the room. Ted Howard (University of New Hampshire) asked if the groups missed anything? Were we really thinking ahead because this exercise seemed too easy? Perhaps we were not thinking outside the box. And this all seems supply-side driven and does not necessarily assess what Society wants nor encourages their education. These thoughts did not occur to him until he saw the uniformity in the regional responses. John Hayes (Colorado State University) agreed; this may reflect the lack of diversity in this group. Our agendas are shaped by filters Keith points out that our faculty and students are fed by us. Jim Allen asked what is NAUFRP's role in the Research Summit? Keith said we want to be involved in the planning process and provide a point of contact -- both part of the process and part of the Summit. David feels we need to push to be more involved. John suggested we stake a position that a specific numbers of spots be filled by NAUFRP. Keith said Red, as Research Chair, is the point person. They are talking about 40 people being participants.

Forest History Society (FHS), Steve Anderson: The Forest History Society has seen a lot of change since its founding in 1940. They preserve the archives of SAF, AF&PA, NAPFSC/NAUFRP and recently Weyerhaeuser who has sent 31 pallets of materials. Steve showed pictures and described the new building. They are going from 5,500 to 17,000 square feet. Over \$300,000 in wood materials have been donated. The total cost will be \$7 million; they have raised about \$5.6 million to date with a balance of \$400,000 yet to be brought in. They bought 18.6 acres from Duke University. Steve asked the group about material related to the history of forestry education. Terry Sharik referred him to Pat Williams at Stephen F Austin University.

2018 Family Forest Education Award, Keith Argow, National Woodland Owners Association: Keith Argow presented the 2018 award to the University of Kentucky for their comprehensive education program. It was accepted by Jeff Stringer, Department Chair. Keith Argow said the NWOA magazine has 45,000 subscribers. He asked for institutions to support the magazine by advertising in it. Keith asked that Terri send a media kit he will provide out to the NAUFRP listserv. Keith Belli thanked Andy Ezell (Mississippi State University) for his service as NAUFRP Extension Chair. That chair is moving to Jeff Stringer.

Resolutions: Keith Belli read a Resolution presented to Terry Sharik on behalf of his retirement and many years of service to NAUFRP. David Newman presented a plaque to Keith Belli and read a Resolution of appreciation for his leadership as NAUFRP President 2017-2018.

Keith described the process of how NAUFRP elects officers; he feels this needs to be more broadly discussed. The process is outlined in the NAUFRP By-laws. The last real election (between two people) was some years ago. Since then we have essentially only been putting up one person. Katy has agreed to be nominated as Treasurer and Janaki Alavalapati (Auburn University) to be nominated as President-Elect. All other Executive Committee positions/chairs are appointed by the President. Elections are for the positions of Secretary-Treasurer and President-Elect. Keith opened the floor to nominations other than Katy. None were made. Keith moved to close nominations, seconded by Andrew Storer. Katy was elected unanimously. Keith opened the floor for nominations for President-Elect other than Janaki. There were none. Keith Blatner moved to close nominations, seconded by Jeff Stringer. Janaki was elected unanimously. Keith again emphasized the desire to bring fresh, new blood into NAUFRP and urged NAUFRP members to consider becoming involved. All

meetings are open. Jim Allen says he is exiting off the Executive Committee and suggested thinking about the agenda for the March meeting to attract those who might be coming to the ATR meeting as well as the CARET meeting. This would be a good opportunity to visit the agency leads.

Officers will change with the new calendar year.

Meeting adjourned.