

NAUFRP Executive Committee Minutes

March 2-3, 2020

Washington, D.C.

Executive Committee Attendees: David Newman, President (SUNY-ESF); Keith Belli, Immediate Past President (Clemson University); Janaki Alavalapati, President-Elect (Auburn University); Katy Kavanagh, Secretary-Treasurer (Oregon State University); Linda Nagel, BAC Representative (Colorado State University); Robert Burns, Northeast Regional Chair (West Virginia University); Andrew Storer, Education Chair (Michigan Tech University); Red Baker, Communications Chair (University of Florida); Dale Greene, Policy Chair (University of Georgia); Rich Kobe, North Central Regional Chair (Michigan State University); Jeff Stringer, Extension Chair (University of Kentucky); Bob Wagner, Research Chair (Purdue University); Adrian Leighton, Diversity Chair, (Salish Kootenai College); Keith Gilles, At-Large Member (University of California-Berkeley); Steve Shaler, International Chair (University of Maine) and Chuck Goebel (University of Idaho) joined by phone for certain segments; Randy Nuckolls, NAUFRP General Counsel; Terri Bates, NAUFRP Executive Liaison

NAUFRP Members: Myron Floyd (North Carolina State University, Matt McBroom (Stephen F. Austin State University)

Guests: Joel Snodgrass, President-Elect, National Association of University Fish & Wildlife Programs, Virginia Tech; Buck Vandersteen, CARET Liaison for NAUFRP (Executive Director, Louisiana Forestry Association), Eric Norland, National Science Liaison for Environment and Natural Resources, USDA National Institute for Food and Agriculture (NIFA); Daniel Cassidy, National Program Leader for Forest Research, NIFA; Ali Mohamad (NIFA), Doug Steel (APLU), Caron Gala (APLU)

David Newman opened the meeting and called for introductions and acceptance of the agenda.

October 29, 2019 Executive Committee minutes: The draft minutes from the October meeting held in Louisville, KY were previously distributed for review. Two minor edits were noted: spelling of Leech Lake Tribal College and last name of Dr. Stacy Holmes. These were to be corrected. There were no further comments or changes. The minutes were approved.

Treasurer's Report, Katy Kavanagh: Katy reviewed the final 2019 budget in a handout. She noted concern that one or more schools (Univ of Minnesota) received spam dues invoices but no one appeared to act on them. Since there is a surplus in the bank checking and savings accounts there was discussion of putting some funds in a higher yield vehicle -- perhaps a roll over CD with a 6 or 12 month term. This will be looked into although yields are not expected to be high. The Treasurer's Report was accepted by voice vote.

Washington Report, Randy Nuckolls: Congress has been in flux since the impeachment votes. The Trump budget is out. Funding for the McIntire-Stennis (McStennis) program is cut as are many others; RREA is flat. The Association of Public Land-Grant Universities' (APLU) FY21 budget request for McStennis is \$39 million and \$460 million for the Agriculture Food and Research Initiative (AFRI). If the appropriations bills are not finished by the new fiscal year, Randy expects a Continuing Resolution that will carry over through the elections. The coronavirus is an unknown and hanging over everything. An \$8 billion aid bill is expected to pass this week. The federal budget deficit already exceeds a trillion dollars; Congress will have no qualms about increasing appropriations for the virus. NAUFRP representatives need to be talking to their campus government affairs offices – telling them to include McStennis on their university request lists. Randy noted he used to arrange Hill visits for those who attended this meeting but campus government affairs offices have proliferated over the last 25 years. Keith Gilles said from his experience as an Agriculture Dean and member of CARET, NAUFRP representatives need to be aggressive about McStennis to compete with the Hatch and AFRI programs. CARET stands for Council for Agricultural Research, Extension and Teaching and is an APLU body. Keith advised to check out who the CARET representatives are. It is constructive to learn the CARET process and identify good spokespeople that can be cultivated and named to that group.

Randy introduced Caron Gala; she has taken over Wendy Fink's position at APLU. Her boss is Craig Linton, APLU's chief lobbyist.

Policy Report, Dale Greene: Dale noted the McStennis one-pagers that NAUFRP institutions have been developing. He is using them extensively when he hosts Congressional staff visits on campus. They would be good to put into the hands of CARET representatives. Farm Bill implementation has been underway; there have been no significant developments. NAUFRP has renewed its support for the Forest Carbon Working Group (FCWP) platform. Congressman Bruce Westerman has introduced a 'Trillion Tree Initiative'. He is chair of the House Forest Caucus and has a forestry degree. NAUFRP endorsed the initiative. Katy has shared an article questioning the numbers and objected to signing on. Dale said this is about the only GOP acknowledgement that Carbon is a problem. The National Alliance of Forest Owners (NAFO) has been working on an op-ed piece around biomass. David has been in communication with Dave Tenny on this and Janaki has provided some comments. David thought perhaps NAUFRP could sign on but Dale believes Dave is looking for individuals and noted the precedent of the Carbon Fundamentals letter that NAUFRP supported. David is reticent to put NAUFRP's name on it. Keith Gilles believes the editor wants it to come back to an individual with standing. Dale said an option might be to have it handled at the state level. Randy said individuals may sign on but not NAUFRP; he wants to be careful how the NAUFRP name is used.

Education Report, Andrew Storer: Andrew discussed the current review of SAF accreditation standards. He is not certain when they might be out and/or finalized. He believes there is a 'Listening Session' scheduled at the University Natural Resources Education Conference (UNRE) hosted by the University of Montana in two weeks where Carol Redelsheimer will be the moderator. Keith Belli is concerned we are getting into the same rut: SAF making a decision and then coming to us for buy in and thinks we need an actual discussion in Rhode Island. This can be discussed with Terry Baker when he is here tomorrow. There was general sentiment that NAUFRP needs to be more proactive with a voice in the process. David asked why they are revising the standards. Andrew said it started with minor tweaking; it has been a long time since there has been a complete review. Technology and other things have changed since then. David asked do we want to ask SAF to put our Education Chair on the standards committee, even if as an ex officio member? Red noted we asked for the same arrangement on the Policy Committee but SAF rebuffed that. Adrian suggested the same request might be made for the Diversity Committee as well. David believes NAUFRP is a partner but they keep us at a distance; they don't have or necessarily want institutional representation. Randy suggested establishing a task force with Andrew as lead. Andrew turned to the workshop he lead at the General Assembly meeting in Louisville. The data is summarized and he will produce a report for internal use. He referenced Terry Sharik's recent email to the NAUFRP list on enrollment data and suggested this might be done every three years. At Michigan Tech it takes the person who pulls this information together approximately 40 hours and Andrew questioned if this is a good use of time particularly since Terry and FAEIS want this data annually. Perhaps we need as a group to determine the value of this data to us. David is concerned if it is only every three years it will fall apart; there is value in national trends, especially on diversity. Jeff asked if there are some metrics that are more important than others. Andrew thinks that is a good question and will look at what is being collected more closely.

Extension Report, Jeff Stringer: Jeff will see that the 2020 Family Forest Education Award nomination announcement gets out soon. He wants to touch base with Keith Argow first. A new panel will be established to assist in reviewing submissions. The announcement of the award, assuming suitable submissions are obtained, will be made at the NAUFRP annual meeting on October 28, 2020 in Providence, Rhode Island. Jeff has represented NAUFRP with the restructured Southern Regional Forestry Extension group however he was unable to attend the annual Grey Towers meeting of the northern extension group. There is still interest in discussing an extension capacity program associated with McStennis but it will require detailed conversations with NIFA and this hasn't happened yet due to the Kansas City move. Eric Norland noted that there are National Focus funds available. These are competitive funds; about \$300,000 is available annually. He said there have been no applications from extension foresters which is disappointing and may be a factor for not offering the funds again. Jeff is concerned that no one knew

about it. Eric tries to send these things to the NAUFRP list but realizes most around the table would not have seen it. It was noted that RREA is not on APLU priority list.

Research Report, Bob Wagner: Bob is working on funding with Michael Goergen (U.S. Endowment) for the Research Capacity Summit. Funding will be run through Purdue University. They are tentatively titling it the 'U.S. Forest and Forest Products R&D Capacity Summit' and are considering a fall meeting time. The Steering Committee met last week via conference call where they reviewed goals and pre-work assignments. Alex Friend suggested organizing it around research future needs. They are thinking of organizing stakeholders and sampling them in advance -- perhaps engage a dean or former dean to do the interviews. Keith Gilles agreed to work on this. Bob will meet separately with Eric and Alex tomorrow. He would like to come away with a new mechanism for federal-state-university-tribal-industry to coordinate where research needs to go. Red, Linda and Andrew will work with Bob. Janaki suggested working with APLU and CARET; Bob agreed these were good suggestions. He is a bit frustrated on how to coordinate/collaborate with State Foresters. Suggestions for other groups to include were: university coop units, AF&PA, FRA, trade associations (i.e. hardwood). Bob asked if a Fall Summit should coincide with the SAF convention? Bob discussed a project he has been working on at Purdue (handout) around the question of what NAUFRP institutions have been doing in terms of producing expertise. The intent is to have an automated content analysis by identifying sub disciplines and looking for trends (pathology, entomology) and see how have these numbers may have changed over time. He asked for feedback. Comments were: this is insight into research capacity and SAF competencies and would be valuable for workforce planning; very useful for defining pool size; will help define research gaps; this information needs a place at the Summit. Janaki said if you added the word 'natural resource' the responses would explode. Linda mentioned Rob Swihart's work was published for F&WS metrics and asked if it is possible to get his data for forestry? Bob did not think so. Linda asked if forestry ranking data is available. David asked if Bob would talk to Rob to see if it is. Bob thinks he is working on a JOF article. Linda asked about the Endowment's Forest Innovation Research (FIRs) conference. Dale said it was at UGA last Fall and all of it was organized by the Endowment. There were about 100 attendees and a range of speakers.

International Report, Steve Shaler: Linda represented NAUFRP on Steve's behalf at the IUFRO International Council in Brazil last fall. There is a desire for a transparent nomination process for the Council. John Parrotta, US Forest Service (USFS), is the current president. He was invited to this meeting but is out of town. He plans to meet with NAUFRP this fall in Rhode Island. The NAUFRP International Chair has been on the Council with the alternate being the NAUFRP President. Steve's question for this group is about how to achieve transparency with the nomination process. Do we need to change the current process, if so, then how? David said historically, the USFS took the lead on this and we've been on the sidelines; we can't organize a vote like that. Steve said John Parrotta has suggested splitting it between the USFS and NAUFRP. David asked if Steve were willing to continue as representative and called for a vote which was unanimous. David said this is about as open and transparent as NAUFRP can be. Steve will communicate this to John Parrotta.

Diversity Report, Adrian Leighton: Adrian provided an update on the 1994 institutions. Leech Lake Tribal College is having a hard time. They lost a faculty member and Adrian is teaching a class for them remotely. Adrian is meeting with two tribal CARET representatives tonight. He believes a one-pager can show how the McStennis program has increased diversity and plans to generate one on Dr. Stacy Holmes. He suggested a survey on how McStennis has been used by the 1890s. The last Farm Bill authorized Native American Scholarship funding and the RFA is being written now. It is an opportunity to help minority serving institutions. Adrian is not sure on which direction to proceed; he needs to use his committee. Possible strategies are: partnerships with SAF (student fellowships), NAUFWP, utilizing the UNER meetings. The diversity needle just has not seemed to move very much in forestry and we need to figure out where it has. Maybe a survey? Robert suggested including veterans and those with disabilities. There are now D&I associate deans at Berkley, NCSU, SUNY ; VaTech is hiring one.

Communications Report, Red Baker: Red is taking over this role from Mary Watzin and asked who would be willing to serve on this committee. Jeff and Myron volunteered. Red would like to have McStennis state by state

summaries similar to what the University of Kentucky has produced. Developing a 'Reviewer Data Base' and building a communications component into the current NAUFRP webpage was discussed. We had begun discussions with Hannah Abbots last year but the process came to a halt because of the disarray tied to the NIFA move to Kansas City. Terri has talked to Hannah recently and she agreed to pick this back up and also build out the webpage to add the McStennis one-pagers. Hannah did not think this would be complicated or take very long. Her fee is \$50/hour. She had previously estimated the data review part would cost \$750. Dale Greene moved to spend \$1,500 (added to the 'Web Page Management' line) for developing a Reviewer data base online and a communications component to host the McStennis one-pagers; seconded by Keith Belli. Discussion: The target audience for the reviewer data base is the NIFA NPLs. What else do they need? Eric said the NPLs will be looking for scientists in a particular discipline to add to their panel so the list of disciplines is important as is rank. Red will send a request to administrators asking that their faculty sign up and will maintain a list by institution of how many faculty have done so. The faculty will self-populate but we need to provide the categories (they can always sign up in multiple categories). The motion passed unanimously. David thanked Red for taking this on.

USDA National Institute for Food and Agriculture(NIFA) Reports, Ali Mohammad, Eric Norland, Daniel Cassidy:

Ali Mohamad (Director, Division of Environmental Systems, Acting Director Division of Climate Change and Acting Director, Division of Bioenergy, Bioproducts and Bioeconomy) September 30th was the official start at the new location. Only about 20 percent of NIFA employees made the move to Kansas City. People are wearing multiple hats right now. The good news is they have been able to keep up the time lines, especially for the one year programs. Also good was the low amount of McStennis funds returned to the US Treasury. Ali reported that Monica Jerome has taken over Latosha Lyte's position; Monica is a graduate forester. They are going to continue keeping up regular reports on the drawdown; they asked NAUFRP to keep them apprised of changes at the schools (administrators, ATRs, ..). NIFA's priority has been to hire as many people in the award management and financial branches as possible. One search for National Program Leaders (NPLs) led to 574 applications. They are mainly coming from academia. Advertising is thru usda.jobs.gov and Eric sent a notice to the listserve. NIFA's structure is being reviewed; it may not look the same. Input has been sought from partner organizations. There has been no change in NIFA's mission and vision. Dale commented that the quality, service and performance of the agency compared to two years ago is great – it's night and day. Ali said the people who stayed are really committed. He noted the new Tribal Fellowship Program. Another new program is for research equipment; it will provide about \$5 million annually -- up to \$500,000. Funds would need to be allocated by Sept. 15. It will be for existing or new research; computers are not likely to be considered. Ali noted the continuing NAUFRP concerns about the lack of 'forest' as a word in comprehensive documents and programs, but there has been success. Red asked where the best place would be for a conversation about this issue. Ali said it would be Stakeholder input and encouraged NAUFRP institutions to look beyond McStennis for funding. He also encouraged NAUFRP to ask Alex Friend about the status of the USDA Forestry Research Advisory Council (FRAC); it hasn't met since 2016. Randy recommended writing to the Secretary and Under Secretary to encourage them to re-establish FRAC

Eric Norland, National Science Liaison: Eric reviewed the six NIFA National Science Liaison positions of which he is one covering natural resources and the environment. They are meant to maintain a science presence in Washington, DC and interact with partners and inter-agency working groups. There are about 30-40 NIFA employees, including the budget staff, remaining in DC; their offices have moved to Patriots Plaza 3 (3rd and E Street, SW). The intent is that they eventually move to the USDA South Building. Secretary Perdue will be introducing an initiative call One Neighborhood which is trying to bring back together USDA staff that are scattered and locate them in a more efficient manner. Eric said that being a Science Liaison is a work in progress – they are trying to find a way to represent science and, for now, covering their old jobs. He is hearing a lot about climate change and spending about 30-35 percent of his time on it. FRAC was established with the sole purpose of advising the Under Secretary on forestry research but that has not happened in this Administration. The Undersecretary for Research, Education and Economics (NIFA mission area) released a USDA Science Blue Print for 2020-2025. (It's on the NIFA website) The five themes are sustainable agriculture intensification, agricultural

climate adaptation, food and nutrition translation, value added innovations and agricultural science policy leadership. None say forestry or natural resources specifically – the understanding is that they fall under the umbrella of agriculture. The Blue Print calls for the science agencies to develop key performance indicators.

Daniel Cassidy, National Program Leader: Daniel said McStennis has over 600 ongoing projects which range broadly in scope. Funding is at \$36 million. He is going to try and send out quarterly reports of what NIFA shows McStennis institution balances are. There has been tremendous improvement in spending the money down as well as providing the associated impacts in the final reports. The one-pagers are immensely helpful. Funding for the Renewable Resources Extension (RREA) program is at \$4 million annually which is fourteen percent of its authorized level. It's doing phenomenal work yet extension only has the capacity reaching 10 percent of the nation's non-industrial private forest landowners which is surprising to Daniel. Discussion about the impact of RREA with so little money: some consultant foresters feel extension forestry competes with them; extension feeds them (consultants) the information they need; it would be good to have a NAUFRP representative on the meeting agendas for the Association of Consultant Foresters' (ACF) and similar groups to advocate the importance of RREA; this would be a good job for the Extension Chair. Daniel returned to the discussion of not seeing 'forestry' in AFRI. He is willing to go through the RFAs looking for places where he sees forestry would fit in. David and Randy think that would be very good and to get that information out to the membership. Randy thought Bob should be involved with this. When the new NPLs are in place we need to go to Kansas City to meet them. Keith Belli reminded the group that when NAUFRP realized they were not going to get forestry as a separate program within AFRI we decided to do three things: 1) create and maintain the reviewer data base and make it available to NPLs who are looking for reviewers 2) encourage faculty to submit quality proposals and make themselves available as reviewers and 3) recognize faculty efforts to be on panels in performance reviews so they were not being penalized for taking the time to do so as well as getting recognition for continuing to submit proposals. Randy noted we are going to have to be aggressive in educating the new NPLs about how and where we fit into their program areas. Randy added a historical note: when the original competitive grants program was started at USDA (AFRI's precursor was NRI) it was a combination of pooled money from the Forest Service and NIFA's precursor agency – the latter was to administer the program. As AFRI grew, NAUFRP routinely asked the appropriations committee to insert report language encouraging USDA to spend 10 percent of the funds on forestry and natural resources. Randy said we need to be mindful in relaying this intent to NPLs. At one point, Dan Kugler was searching through all the agency's programs to see where money might be going towards forestry; Daniel was involved with this.

Doug Steel, Vice President, Food, Agriculture and Natural Resources, Association of Public Land-Grant Universities: Doug has been with APLU for 14 months and has a broad portfolio. APLU is re-structuring a bit. Wendy Fink has shifted to a new position and Caron Gala is now a liaison with our group. APLU's Budget and Advocacy Committee (BAC) appointed two task forces yesterday. One is intended to seek ways to better align with NIFA budget line items and to set priorities (i.e., less lines and bigger top numbers). Doug would like to see a multi-year appropriations strategy. This is not a good year to launch new things because of budget restrictions and caps but they go away in 2022 and APLU wants to be ready to move on some new things then. Keith Belli asked for an overview of the kind of input APLU has provided to Dr. Angle. Doug said they want more effective and clearer communications with NIFA and provided some examples of frustrations. They would just like basic information such as what positions are being filled. Dr. Angle has agreed to move forward with an external advisory committee representing the land grant universities. Doug wants to make sure NAUFRP gets looped into this and has a voice there as they try to provide some guidance. 'NIFA Reimagined' turned out to be more about customer service and relationships than what a new agency would look like. After the Kansas City move, now is the time to start looking at a new agency structure. A joint meeting (Advisory Council) is planned for Kansas City the third week in July. Doug wants to see a major move on climate resilience. Randy asked who would be providing Scott Angle the names for the Advisory Committee. Doug said he would be the one handling the names and will look to the Board on Natural Resources. Randy agrees that it is important to have a NAUFRP representative and someone from the fisheries and wildlife side. Doug said he would defer to the chair or designee but isn't sure who that is. Linda has heard nothing from the BNR; she is the NAUFRP BAC

representative. Randy said we have relied on Wendy Fink to keep us in the BNR loop and noted that the BNR has not been consistently organized.

Joel Snodgrass, President-Elect, National Association of University Fish and Wildlife Programs (NAUFWP): NAUFWP has been reorganizing itself. They have added regional chairs to the Executive Committee as well as Research and Policy Chairs. Don Hodges (Univ. TN) is their Outreach Chair, John Koprowski (Univ. AZ) is their International Chair. Joel asked NAUFRP representatives to encourage their wildlife faculty to become involved with NAUFWP. They have begun a drive to increase membership which is currently at 31 institutions. He reviewed Articles of Organization and Dues structure. They are trying to bring in other groups. Their Strategic Plan addresses membership, increasing advocacy and outreach, strengthening partnerships (fed, state, societies). The website is being revamped. They will meet with The Wildlife Society in late August in Louisville, KY and focus on strengthening those connections. Diversity and Inclusion are also areas for focus. Another meeting will be held in conjunction with the American Fisheries Societies in Columbus, OH in late September. Their Executive Committee will meet here in DC April 6-7.

Forest Health Initiative, John Hayes via Zoom: John reviewed where we stand on the Forest Health Initiative (FHI). The text covering issue identification and the challenges has been completed and covered in the White Paper. For the next steps John feels like we are shifting towards areas where he does not have a lot of experience and asked Doug Steel to discuss this. Doug addressed the APLU process, timing and positioning. He thinks the groundwork has been laid and it is at the front of cue for a new APLU initiative. He wants to see everyone gain and he does not want this to become agric vs. forestry. He asked if there is a mechanism for funding? McStennis? Other vehicles? Is Farm Bill language needed? Although the next Farm Bill reauthorization is not due till 2023, the APLU process will begin working on it early next year. John assumes the BNR is going to move forward on this. Randy advised to be mindful of positioning this for appropriations short and long term -- where it might fit within USDA budget lines and where it might fit within the USDA Blue Print. Doug first thought this might fit well in RREA; it is a lot easier to find a mechanism that already exists to put money into. John is unclear how we get to the finish line due to his lack of familiarity with the next stage and asked who shapes the next section? The authors and text are in shape but we need to identify the next steps and funding mechanisms and exactly what we want to fund. Doug thinks this is the time to move towards implementation by developing a plan of advocacy and messages to use for seeking appropriations, clarify the difference it is going to make and why dollars are needed. David is not sure that McStennis is the way to go: AFRI might make more sense. Doug believes if you go the AFRI way it will be easier to do so thru the AFRI themes. Congressional champions are needed. Eric advised to use the word "integrated"; that is a key word so it will not get stuck in research. Randy says this needs to be finished and volunteers identified to move forward. Keith suggested talking to the subject matter people and asking what happens if nothing happens going forward? What will the resource look like in the future, what are some of the economic implications? Red said we have made progress in getting industry to take an interest in this and it is valuable in bringing them along. Tom Fox at Rayonier is a key contact. Along the way they will provide support and would be important for the advocacy piece. John wants to connect with Randy and/or David after the meeting.

APLU Budget and Advocacy Committee (BAC), Linda Nagel Linda now represents NAUFRP on BAC. She discussed the budget recommendations, process and criteria to get there. She suggested it might be good for NAUFRP to consider developing criteria we might use when we are asked to sign-on/endorse certain topics or advocate on a certain issue. Linda asked Doug to describe Buck Vandersteen's role on CARET and his liaison position between NAUFRP and CARET as well as what we can do to more effectively to interface with their activities. CARET is a voluntary advocacy group that is more than 20 years old. They have about 300 delegates in town right now. Buck has been a long time CARET forestry representative and was asked to liaison and communicate with NAUFRP. CARET has just added a second forester delegate who will represent the 1994's James Durglo of the Salish Kootenai Tribe

Northeast NAUFRP, Robert Burns: Robert named the institutions who are active in NAUFRP: SUNY, Penn State, West Va Univ and the Universities of Maine, New Hampshire and Vermont. He briefly described what is happening (see written/Powerpoint report) at the various schools.

North Central NAUFRP, Rich Kobe: Rich has taken over as chair from Mark Rickenbach (Univ of Wisconsin-Madison). He is trying to increase communication and collaboration among the North Central NAUFRP institutions and extension community. There are some opportunities to collaborate on specialized on-line courses (example MI Tech and MI State hybrid course). They have also discussed sharing best practices on diversity and inclusion. The forestry extension programs in the region have begun to communicate more. He is aware of a number of extension positions opening up throughout the region.

Southern NAUFRP, Matt McBroom: Matt is representing Southern Chair Hans Williams (SFA) who could not attend this meeting. Hans is putting together the comparative survey information; please send information if you have not already. Southern NAUFRP will meet in Nashville, TN in conjunction with the Forest Landowners Association annual meeting; the dates for that are June 14-16. Hans served as liaison with the SAF Ad Hoc Certified Forester Exam committee. The SAF Board tabled the pilot program to give the exam to graduating students. David said SAF is still figuring out where to go with this program; they are losing money on it and thought a real issue was most students would likely fail; they need the work experience first.

Western NAUFRP, Chuck Goebel by phone: Chuck took over from Linda as Western Chair in January. They were planning a meeting at the University of Montana this summer but with Tom DeLuca moving to Corvallis they will shift the meeting there with Katy's help. It will likely happen in July. He needs to communicate with the other western schools.

NAUFRP Reviewer Data Base: This is ready to go as soon as Hannah is able to get it set up. It will be organized around discipline areas; NIFA folks will be able to go to the data base and search for biologist entomologist, etc., ... as needed. With the earlier funding motion we have the go ahead on this.

Annual Meeting: David thanked Jeff for all his help with the Louisville meetings and reception. They all went very well. The dates for the meetings this year in Providence, RI are October 27 and 28. He solicited topics for the General Assembly. Janaki suggested a discussion about the institutions that do not engage with NAUFRP. John Parrotta (IUFRO) will be on the agenda. David would like a topic that will really engage people. SAF accreditation might be timely. Adrian suggested diversity if we do not pursue accreditation. David likes the idea but is concerned that Carol Redelsheimer might not be available given her time commitment to the accreditation reviews. Dale said SAF may not need to be in the room for this discussion; if they can tell us what they are thinking about we can independently kick it all around – it might even be good not to have them lead the discussion. Linda suggests engaging the respective committees in a dialogue; it might be more valuable than having just one or two people from SAF because you are hearing from the people who are changing and interpreting the standards. David thinks it might be possible to have the Standards Committee come in but the Review Committee will be off and working full time. Andrew asked for time on the General Assembly agenda to report out on last year's breakout sessions.

Ann Bartuska, Resources for the Future (RFF): Ann is glad to reconnect with NAUFRP over the Carbon Principles letter that was re-circulated last year for signatures. Her team includes Robert Bonnie and David Wear. Ann has been working to re-establish ties with industry and other organizations and trying to get a sense of the big topics RFF can help make a difference on, especially the analytical side. One topic she is working on is forest bioenergy. RFF has hosted a series of small workshops that culminated with the RFF live event which Janaki was a part of. It has led to a suite of products around the theme you can have conservation, products and markets at the same time and RFF will continue pursuing this. They have experts on wildfire, insects and invasives and it made sense to include disruptors of forest ecosystems and markets/products. Dale asked how RFF's work in DC makes it down to the ground to help us and/or private forest landowners? Ann says they do not have good mechanisms for that. They are increasingly developing communication tools like the RFF live events and they are also developing "Explainers" (i.e., Forest Bioenergy 101 and 102) but even those are geared to the informed

public and professionals. She acknowledged most of their effort has been geared towards Congressional members and staff. Ann has had conversations within RFF about better connecting with extension. Daniel noted that the Forest Service had embedded Bill Hubbard in the Pacific Research Station and that might be an idea to consider – a rotation of extension specialists for a fellowship/sabbatical. David discussed the Forest Health Initiative that John Hayes has been working on under APLU; we have the concept in a White Paper but not an implementation plan. She mentioned the Forest Service Western Forest Health Initiative that was developed under her in 1994; there may be some ideas for implementation there. Ann wondered about university fellows; they have had these over time but they have been primarily economists. She would really like to broaden out to have more natural resource professionals. A phone call or email to her is all that is needed. Katy asked if RFF has looked at life cycle analysis. Ann says yes, that is a major topic that has come back to them. Ann says many of the energy people they have worked with are now asking about how they get into the forest offsets market and what does that look like for them. RFF is talking about a workshop for those who want offsets but don't know anything about it; she thinks the LCA part would be helpful to include. Ann is looking for ways to bring the 'community' to RFF to help them be more effective and to help inform on what their direction is. Any thoughts are welcome; send her an email.

Scott Angle, Director, USDA National Institute for Food and Agriculture: Scott discussed the agency's relocation. Last year was very difficult but now, post-move, things are settling down. A priority is getting the money out the door. Scott discussed the NIFA Reimagine Process. Some of the formulas within NIFA are being re-calculated particularly on the agriculture side including Hatch funding. They were dinged some years ago by the Inspector General's office for misusing and misapplying the formula for certain funds. McStennis is not one being looked at but Hatch is. It is a reinterpretation of the formula. It will be at least a year before a change is seen. Randy said we feel that often AFRI does not overtly mention forestry or natural resources in the descriptions although our AFRI friends say it is just a matter of digging it out. A common theme we have had over the years is why it cannot be made clearer in the descriptions of the competitive programs. Scott says every commodity says this. AFRI is meant to be broad to allow flexibility; he has had this discussion with other communities (aquaculture) but when they took a closer look it was found there was much more research than they thought happening. Yesterday Daniel reported that he had tabulated about \$43 million beyond McStennis that could go to forestry and he has volunteered to go through the AFRI RFAs looking for where he thinks there may be a fit for forestry. Hatch and multi state programs also have forestry although there may not be a lot of money. Eric said Hatch is about the only place wildlife can seem to find a home. A USDA Science Blue Print has been published naming five areas for future research. These are sustainable intensification, environmental (climate change, water, biomass), food safety and nutrition, value added products (new or new uses), policy (using science to make good policy decisions. Keith Belli asked Scott to share the Reimagine Process with us and let us know what is legislative, then we can pursue that process if we decide to.

Dave Tenny, National Alliance of Forest Owners: Dave discussed climate change policy. NAFO is working with EDF, TNC, AF trying to find ways to engage our CEOs (our sector being those in the business of forestry) and a dialogue is starting to occur. Not long ago EDF, WRI and TNC convened and finalized a CEO Climate Dialogue (Shell, Dupont, Dow,...) on Principles and a Call to Action to do something on climate change -- this is the leaders of these companies. The traditional emissions sector is variable in their understanding of how to use the natural climate solution option. These companies are looking for a way to address carbon and willing to put up money (a lot) -- that means there are opportunities. How we get to them and find the connection so we become relevant to the solution is a great discussion piece for NAUFRP. And it would be helpful to NAFO who is trying to help do the connecting. The challenge is how do we get them to recognize the natural resource role, and sooner than later. Bob Wagner discussed plans for the Research Summit. He asked what is NAFO's role in helping to preserve that capacity over time and what role is industry going to play? Dave can answer better for research expertise. He sees companies like Microsoft going elsewhere with RFPs for carbon information – not us. NAFO is working on an environmental impact report this year that will take into account air, water, wildlife statements. What that will do is show up the gaps where information is needed. This is important because investors, shareholders, families want to know what a company is doing for the environment. Janaki asked what the

sentiments of Dave's stakeholders are on mass timber. Dave said it is becoming more of a topic than it was two years ago -- it is becoming mainstream. There are member companies in discussion about how to deploy and scale it up. Dave thinks it will evolve alongside of the effort to design carbon neutral and/or negative outcomes. David said we support the op-ed letter and appreciate NAFO's support for McStennis.

Terry Baker, CEO, Society of American Foresters: SAF is in the process of hiring several staff positions (general membership, communications, marketing and professional development). They are still using local CFE coordinators but will be transitioning to five national coordinators to improve consistency between states. They have been working with a marketing firm since last fall to aid in how we talk about the value of being a forester, a professional forester and a member of SAF and will have some products and campaign language to use and share. A letter of intent was signed for the SAF building at the end of last year with a Bethesda developer. They are looking at potential locations likely in the DC area. Challenges ahead include the continuing decline in membership. Last year they had three teams one of which looked at modifying CFEs; there is still some discussion going around that. The SAF Audit Committee is reviewing the CFE program and will be reporting out in May. There was discussion of a pilot program last year but the Board voted that down last December. Terry thanked the schools who were willing to be a part of the pilot but the team discovered, and the audit committee survey results indicated, a broader strategy was warranted. Everyone felt it would be good to take a step back to assess and build a strategy that includes the Certification Review Board, the CF program, how we support and engage folks. David thanked SAF for directly including NAUFRP in the process from the beginning. Terry discussed the status of the Accreditation Standards review process. He believes they have started to craft some of the language options around what potential new standards might be although no hard decisions or recommendations have been made. There is still discussion about inviting more input as well as consideration for another session at this year's convention. Terry was asked if there were specific issues that prompted the review. He said not really, it is more of a self-reflection effort and an open discussion about whether they are meeting the needs of SAF, universities, students and employers. Andrew said there are concerns that ethics and diversity are adequately defined, expressed and documented. NAUFRP as a group has discussed the desire for more direct involvement with the process. We have been variously involved in different input venues but that is very different than participating directly in the process. Terry asked how or what that might look like -- a representative to engage with the committee might be a possibility. David said that is exactly what we are thinking and suggested Andrew, as chair of the NAUFRP Education committee, would be a logical contact point with the Standards Committee. Andrew said he would be happy to do this and believes it helpful to be able to relay fundamentals such as timelines, where things stand, what is the motivation. Terry says they can make that happen and will have Carol Redelsheimer reach out to Andrew. David said we are interested in something similar concerning policy and cited the example where SAF places high emphasis on FS R&D appropriations but no support for McStennis and/or university forest research funding. There is a desire for NAUFRP to have an affiliated role in that type of policy issue in some way. Terry said these are two different things given how they operate. The Policy Committee focuses on position statements and that has not driven the policy that SAF staff focus on. But they have had recent conversations about changing that. They are reviewing their charters right now so that is a point of conversation. Terry thinks there are opportunities for more direct and intentional engagement. David said Dale as chair of the NAUFRP Policy Committee would be a logical point of contact as well as the president and Randy. David asked about Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA) and whether we are beholden to any accreditation body at this time. Terry said no but Carol is still looking at this matter. Danielle is stepping up to be the Policy Director and they are also putting in place a Communications Manager who will take over a lot of things she has been handling.

Alex Friend, Deputy Chief, USFS Research & Development: (Terri has Alex's PowerPoint) Alex introduced John Rothlisberger as the R&D Deputy Area Budget Coordinator. He reviewed the R&D mission, structure and priority research areas. For the past several years R&D's enacted budget (a fraction of the agency's overall) has been pretty stable. The Congressional appropriations committees have been good to work with. R&D's proposed budget for this coming fiscal year would be cut by an average of 18 percent; the non-FIA part is down by 25 percent. State and Private Forestry (S&PF) is hit even harder and International Forestry is zeroed out. These

proposed reductions are driven by the priorities of the Administration in terms of active forest management which places emphasis on the national forests. It is not a given everything will be restored but it is commonly done. Alex/FS will operate and plan on the premise of the continuation of the 2020 budget. Slide 22 of Alex's PowerPoint depicted the amount of funding going to the universities over the last seven fiscal years; it is fairly stable although ranged from \$24 to \$35 million. Alex was asked about the Joint Fire Science Program; he is puzzled about why it has been reduced/eliminated in previous budgets because it is such a success story – it is a rigorous process, accountable and multi-agency. Perhaps there is concern about FS passing money to BLM. He is a strong advocate for the program and has talked to appropriators about it and hopes it grows; it is a nice mechanism for fire research. Alex is concerned about the number of vacancies R&D has to fill. He thinks we are all pretty thin in certain areas (entomology, genetics) and would like to collaborate on these and invited a dialogue. Alex flagged the following issue which is coming from the Administration and includes vacancies. One of the things that has been asked for by the appropriators is budget reform. And one of the areas they are interested in reforming is to put all fixed costs (salaries) in one pool and everything else is going towards actual work in another. For research this would equate to \$35 million or one-tenth of what they get because most of what they have is fixed costs. The challenge is that a lot of the research stations have used vacant positions or used grants to fund salaries to free up money to fund special projects including university research. FRAC has been dormant for longer than it should have but it is moving now; Alex has a slate of nominations to send to the Secretary's office. Janaki asked about Mass Timber activities. Alex said research activities around it are testing (decay, fire, blasts, strengths). There is money going from both research and S&PF for technology transfer. Alex was asked about the President's budget recommendation to consolidate the PNW and SW research He said this is not the time for it; down the road maybe, after they have had a chance to stabilize. What Alex wants to focus on is standardization of what the research enterprise looks like at the various stations. Alex is also a strong advocate for co-location/presence of agency personnel and activities with universities. Keith Gilles said he has served on FRAC and as a Station Director and felt the lack of coordination. Alex said it definitely exists and it is what he is trying to get past by better standardization -- structure doesn't matter as much as functionality. Bob Wagner noted from his experience that a common issue when FS is present on a campus is there is no standardized agreement that clarifies expectations between the FS and universities. He has one that is 20 years old and it does not look at all like ones his colleagues have. Those who have F&W units on campus do have a standardized agreement that embeds scientists more efficiently and collaboratively with clearer expectations than what we have with our FS colleagues. NAUFRP has tried unsuccessfully to address this in the past. Alex committed to taking this on noting different agencies have widely different interpretations of embedded people on campus. Alex had a handout on indirect costs; it included a table of types of agreements and which of those can accommodate indirect costs and tuition. This is from 2012 but Alex committed to making this current so there is clarity. There are agreements that permit tuition and some that prohibit it; the same applies to indirect cost recovery. Let him know if there are problems because this is the heart of how we interact. Keith Belli said the heart of the frustration gets backs to lack of standardization across the stations and different interpretations (it really relates to the language on the back page on 'exceptions' because the station directors could interpret strictly, narrowly or broadly) so he supports what Alex is saying. Katy noted another issue is universities may be penalized in different ways for a low level of indirect cost recovery. Last year it cost them about \$200,000 in start-up funds because of FS low indirect cost rate. She would really like to work to identify where changes can be made. David noted the meetings between NAUFRP and the FS R&D Executive Team at the SAF Convention venues; we've done them for years but are not producing results and he would like to see something more substantive to come out of them. We could have several people to come into town for one of R&D's leadership meetings; we want to work more substantively on some of these topics. Please let him, Randy or Terri know if there are options.

Adjourned

Approved October 27, 2020

By the Executive Committee