NERA Meeting

The Mystic Hilton – Conrad Boardroom

July 11, 2011 [9:00am-12:00pm, 1:30-3:45pm]

Minutes

In Attendance:
Brad Hillman (NJ), Chair
Margaret Brennan-Tonetta, NJ
Tom Burr, NYG
Cameron Faustman, CTS
Stephen Herbert, MA
Michael Hoffmann, NYC
Diane Hyman, DC
Hiram Larew, NIFA
Tim Phipps, WV
Richard Rhodes III, RI
Dan Rossi, NERA
Fred Servello, ME
Adel Shirmohammadi, MD
Bob Schrader, MA
Kirby Stafford III, CTNH
Gary Thompson, PA
Jon Wraith, NH
Gloria Wyche-Moore, DC
Rubie Mize, NERA (Recorder)

1. Welcome and Introductions – Chair Brad Hillman
Chair Hillman called the meeting to order at 9:15AM.

2. Approval of Agenda – Chair Brad Hillman
    a. Joint NERA-NEED at 1:30-2:30PM – **East Center Ballroom**
    b. Joint NERA-CARET at 3:15-3:45PM – **Conrad Boardroom**

The ERA (Extension and Research) multistate projects will be discussed with NEED. If NEED will be more involved in the creation of ERA projects, then additional representation (1-2) to the Multistate Activities Committee will be needed. In the Western region, there are equal number of members from Research and Extension. The other three regions have increasingly used the ERA structure for integrated multistate projects. Funds can be used just for travel or can also be used for research activities if the project underwent the peer review process like standard multistate projects.

At the joint meeting with CARET, issues on federal funding cuts particularly special grants will be raised. This has drastically affected station programs, like the berries research in New Jersey. It is unlikely that they will be restored, but CARET should continue to advocate these funds as they target specific needs that may not be funded by the state. It is high time that sources of funds other than USDA are sought, from the private industry, foundation, and other federal partners.

3. Approval of Minutes from the March 2011 NERA Meeting – Chair Brad Hillman

Action: The motion made to approve the minutes was seconded and passed.

4. Executive Director's Report – Dan Rossi
    a. OED Report
    b. ESCOP Report
    c. Northeast Regional Aquaculture Center Report
    d. Northeast Water Resources and Climate Change Forum Report
    e. US-Canada Climate Change Think Tank Report

ED Dan Rossi highlighted the following items:

5. Criticality of Formula Funds for Research and Extension – Dan Rossi

6. Northeast Regional Invasive Species Forum – Fred Servello/Cameron Faustman

7. Multistate Activities Committee Report – Jon Wraith (MAC Report to be distributed at the meeting)
   MAC Meeting Agenda [http://www.nera.umd.edu/workshop/macagendajuly2011.html]

8. NRSP Review Committee Recommendations – Jon Wraith/Dan Rossi

9. NERA Planning Grant Update – Dan Rossi

10. Nominations Committee Report – Brad Hillman/Tom Burr

Tom Burr put forward the following nominations. The motion made to approve the nominations was seconded and passed.

2012 Executive Committee:
Chair – Jon Wraith (NH)
Vice Chair – Mike Hoffmann (NYC)
Officer-at-Large – Adel Shirmohammadi (MD)
Past Chair – Brad Hillman (NJ)

2012 ESCOP Executive Committee:
Brad Hillman
Jon Wraith
Mike Hoffmann

ESCOP Budget and Legislative Committee:
1. Tom Burr
2. Tim Phipps

ESCOP Science and Technology Committee:
1. Mike Hoffmann

2. Cameron Faustman

NRSP Review Committee:
1. NERA Rep. – Kirby Stafford III

Multistate Activities Committee:
MAC Chair – Kirby Stafford III
Member – Gary Thompson
Member – NEED Chair will be asked to make a recommendation

11. Resolutions Committee Report – Tom Burr
Tom Burr read the following resolutions of appreciation for Tom Brady, Cameron Hackney and the University of Connecticut for hosting the 2011 Northeast Joint Summer Session. The motion made to approve the three resolutions were approved and passed.

Resolution of Appreciation to Tom Brady

WHEREAS, Dr. Tom Brady has distinguished himself as Dean of the College of Life Sciences and Agriculture at the University of New Hampshire, as well as Director of the New Hampshire Agricultural Experiment Station since July 2007, and

WHEREAS, Dr. Brady served as the Association's representative to the Northeast Sustainable Agriculture Research and Extension Committee (NE-SARE) and the Northeast Regional Center for Rural Development Board of Directors (NERCRD) since 2008, and

WHEREAS, Dr. Brady represented the Northeast as a member of the Budget and Legislative Committee and the Science and Technology Committee of the Experiment Station Committee on Organization and Policy (ESCOP) since 2009, and

WHEREAS, Dr. Brady served as a member of the Planning Committee of the first regional forum organized by the Association, the Northeast Functional Foods Forum, held at Beltsville, MD on May 23-24, 2011, and was an avid supporter of regional initiatives that promote multi-institutional, private-public and multi-disciplinary collaborations, and

WHEREAS, Dr. Brady has garnered during his career as a Developmental Biologist, external grants totaling over $28 million dollars from agencies such as the National Science Foundation, the U.S. Department of Education, the National Institutes of Health, the Department of Defense, and the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, and

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Northeastern Regional Association of State Agriculture Experiment Station Directors at their meeting in Mystic, Connecticut, on July 11, express sincere appreciation to Dr. Brady for his dedicated service and many valuable contributions to the Association and the Land-grant system, and wish him success in his future professional activities and personal endeavors.

Signed on July 11, 2011
Bradley Hillman, Chair
Northeastern Regional Association of State

Resolution of Appreciation to Cameron R. Hackney

WHEREAS, Dr. Cameron R. Hackney has distinguished himself as Dean of The Davis College of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Design at West Virginia University, as well as Director of the West Virginia Agricultural and Forestry Experiment Station since 2000, and

WHEREAS, Dr. Hackney served as Chair of the Administrative Heads Section (AHS) for the Northeast Region in 2002-2003, 2008 and 2009, and served as chair, and a continuous member of the National AHS Executive Committee since 2002, and

WHEREAS, Dr. Hackney served as NERA Chair for two consecutive terms in 2002-2003, and

WHEREAS, Dr. Hackney represented the Northeast as a member of the Executive Committee, and the Marketing and Advocacy Committee of the Experiment Station Committee on Organization and Policy (ESCOP) from 2002-2009, and

WHEREAS, Dr. Hackney was involved in numerous national activities, and served in key positions in various committees,

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Northeastern Regional Association of State Agriculture Experiment Station Directors at their meeting in Mystic, Connecticut, on July 11, express sincere appreciation to Dr. Hackney for his dedicated service and many valuable contributions to the Association and the Land-grant system, and wish him much success in his future professional activities and personal endeavors.

Signed on July 11, 2011
Bradley Hillman, Chair
Northeastern Regional Association of State
Agricultural Experiment Station Directors

Resolution of Appreciation to the University of Connecticut

WHEREAS, the Northeastern Regional Association of State Agricultural Experiment Station Directors participated in an engaging and productive meetings at the Mystic Hilton and Avery Point, the University of Connecticut's campus by the sea, and

WHEREAS, the Directors also were involved in a well-organized joint meeting with the Northeast Extension Directors (NEED), Deans, Members of the Council for Agricultural Research, Extension and Teaching (CARET) and the Northeast Extension Development Officers on July 10-12, and

WHEREAS, the Directors were very pleased about the region's competitiveness and on-going collaborations among Land-grant institutions and the private-public sectors in three overarching areas that are important for the Northeast -- Renewable Energy, Climate Change and Local Foods/Obesity, and

WHEREAS, the Directors enjoyed the private tour of the Collections Resource Center and the reception at the Mystic Seaport, the sumptuous dinner at the Latitude 41 Restaurant, and the tour of the picturesque Avery Point Campus, and

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Directors acknowledge their appreciation to Dean and Director Gregory J. Weidemann, Associate Dean and Associate Director Cameron Faustman, Cynthia Bastek, Sue Schadt and Tom Curso for making the meeting a great success and a very enjoyable experience.

Signed on July 11, 2011
Bradley Hillman, Chair
Northeastern Regional Association of State
Agricultural Experiment Station Directors

12. Future Meetings:

- Joint COPs Meeting – July 18-21 at Hilton Boston Financial District, Boston, MA
- NERA Fall Meeting – Sept. 26, 3:00-6:00PM, in conjunction with the ESS/SAES/ARD Meetings at Estes Park, CO, on Sept. 26-28, 2011
- NERA Spring Meeting – March 19-21, 2012 at the Admiral Fell Inn, Baltimore, MD
- Joint North Central and Northeast Summer Joint Session – July 8-10, 2012 at Burlington, VT

12. Other Business

13. Closing Remarks/Adjournment – Chair Brad Hillman

Agenda Item 2.a

NEED-NERA Meeting
July 11, 2011
1:30-2:30 p.m.

Larry S. Katz, NEED Chair

Brad Hillman, NERA Chair

NEED Food Systems	Larry Katz
Joint Appointments in Extension	Larry Katz
Extension Research Committees (CC and ERA)	Brad Hillman
2010 Viticulture Follow-Up	Tom Burr
Other Items	Larry Katz

Definition of Multistate Research Coordinating Committees (CC) and Education/Extension and Research Activity (ERA):

The membership of a CC or an ERA is made up of an AA, NIFA representative, scientists, and as applicable, extension specialists and/or extension agents. A CC or ERA provides opportunity for scientists, specialists, and others to work cooperatively to solve problems that concern more than one state, share research data, and coordinate research and other types of activities. This is presently one of the most common mechanisms for functionally integrated activities such as the regional IPM programs. The format for requesting establishment of a CC or ERA appears in Appendix B of the Guidelines for Multistate Research Activities. These activities are reviewed and approved by the sponsoring regional association. (Appendices J and K are suggested as guidelines for regional associations).

The steps for development and approval of Multistate Research CCs and ERAs are described in Appendix N of the guidelines.

Guidelines for Multistate Research Activities -- http://www.nera.umd.edu/MRF%20Guidelines-Revised.pdf

Agenda Item 4.a

Report of the Office of the Executive Director

March 23, 2010 – July 10, 2011

NERA and Regional Activities

- Northeast Climate Change Working Group
  - Conducted the Northeast Water Resources and Climate Change Forum involving over 40 scientists from the region
  - Prepared a summary report from the Forum
- Eastern US and Canada Climate Change Collaboration
  - Assisted in the development of a Think Tank meeting program to explore alternative climate change adaption strategies for the Eastern US and Canada. The intent to the preparation of a policy paper that could be used in discussions with the Federal government in Canada and the US.
  - Participated in and supported the Think Tank meeting held in Montreal that included 20 leaders from the Land Grant System and the private sector
- Invasive Species
  - Hosted several conference calls to evaluate the need for, potential scope of, and strategies for regional multistate efforts in the area of invasive species
  - Prepared a proposal for a regional forum
- NERA Planning Grants Program
  - Supported 2010 and 2011 award recipients
  - Prepared a summary report on the 2008 – 2011 awards
  - Preparing the 2012 round
- 2011 Northeast Joint Summer Session
  - Supported the Planning Committee and a Program Subcommittee and assisted in the development of a meeting program on "Assessing Regional Competitiveness with a Focus on Renewable Energy, Climate Change, and Local Foods/Obesity."
  - Assisted in securing program speakers
- NERA Chair Support
  - Assisted in the development of the July 2011 NERA meeting agenda and compiled agenda materials
  - Assisted in the development of the July 2011 NERA Executive Committee meeting agenda
- Multistate Activities Committee (MAC) Support
  - Assisted MAC Chair in developing agenda and compiling materials for the MAC meeting
  - Assisted advisors and technical committee members in submitting their proposals and participation forms and coordinated peer reviews for the following projects:
    - NE_TEMP1861: Management of the Brown Marmorated Stink Bug [08/2011-2013]
    - NE_TEMP1741: Ecological Bases for Weed Management in Sustainable Cropping Systems [10/2011-2016]
    - NE_TEMP1821: Strategies to Evaluate and Mitigate Ozone Impacts on the Structure and Function of Vegetation [10/2012-2017]
    - NE_TEMP1781: Northeast Region Technical Committee on Integrated Pest Management [10/2011-2016]
    - NE_TEMP1761: Sustainable Wood Energy [10/2011-2016]

    - Assisted advisors and technical committee members in submitting the Requests to Write:
        - Nanotechnology Risk Assessment [10/2011-2016]
- Reports
    - Report to NERA on ESCOP Activities
    - Report to NERA on NRAC
    - Report to NERA on Eastern US and Canada Climate Change Think Tank meeting
- Service
    - Board of Directors of the Northeast Regional Center for Rural Development
    - Board of Directors of the Northeast Regional Aquaculture Center Mid-Atlantic
    - Food Systems Consortium Leadership Committee
    - Administrative advisor to:
        - NE-1029
        - NECC-63
        - IR-4 (NRSP-4)
        - Northeast States and Caribbean Islands Regional Water Program

National Activities

- Science Roadmap for Food and Agriculture
    - Developed a proposal for a Science Roadmap Implementation Task Force
    - Supported operations of the Task Force
    - Prepared a Task Force report for the July ESCOP meeting
- Multistate Research Award Program
    - Facilitated the ESCOP Science and Committee review of the regional Multistate Research Award nominations.
    - Forwarded to and facilitated the approval the Committee selection for the ESCOP Executive Committee
    - Secured and forwarded the winning project summary and associated picture to APLU for inclusion in the Award Program
- ESCOP Science and Technology Committee Chair Support
    - Continued to serve as the Executive Vice-Chair of the Science and Technology Committee
    - Prepared a committee report for the July ESCOP meeting
    - Prepared monthly reports for ESCOP CAC calls
- ESCOP NRSP Review Committee Chair Support
    - Continued to serve as the Executive Vice-Chair of the NRSP Review Committee
    - Planned and supported annual NRSP-RC meeting
    - Prepared a committee report for the July ESCOP meeting
    - Coordinated communications with several NRSP committees as a result of NRSP-RC recommendations
- ECOP 406 Task Force
    - Assisted in preparation of a subcommittee report on one alternative approach to protecting 406 Integrated Programs
    - Participated in a series of conference calls leading to a final report of the Task Force
- NIMSS
    - Serve as regional NIMSS Coordinator
    - Provided national level support for the operations of NIMSS
    - Oversee upgrades to NIMSS

    - Support NIFA Management Dashboard access to NIMSS data
- Dairy Program
    - Participated in a series of call with Research ED's and Tom O'Connell, President of Marketing Concepts, Inc. to explore potential partnerships with the private sector on important dairy projects including broader issues of sustainability
- Service
    - ESCOP Chair's Advisory Committee
    - ESCOP Executive Committee
    - ESCOP NIMSS Oversight Committee
    - National Multistate Management Committee
    - NIFA One Solution Stakeholders Group
    - BAA PBD Committee on Legislation and Policy
- Program Monitoring and Feedback
    - ESCOP Marketing Plan
    - Farm Bill development
    - NIFA budget developments
    - NIFA competitive grants programs
    - NIFA operational web and teleconferences

Travel

- March 23-24, 2011, Beltsville, MD – Northeast Water Resources and Climate Change Forum
- April 18-20, 2011, Washington, DC - National Multistate Management Committee Meeting
- April 21, 2011, Greenbelt, MD – Northeast Regional Aquaculture Center Annual Meeting
- June 27-29, 2011, Montreal, ON – Eastern US and Canada Climate Change Think Tank Meeting
- July 10-12, 2011, Mystic, CT – NE Joint Summer Session and NERA Meeting

Agenda Item 4.b

Experiment Station Committee on Organization and Policy Report

March 2011- July 2011

ESCOP Officers

- Chair - Orlando McMeans
- Chair-Elect – Lee Sommers
- Past Chair – Clarence Watson
- Executive Vice Chair – Carolyn Brooks
- ESS Rep to BAA Policy Board –
- Budget and Legislative Committee Chair – Steve Slack
- Communications & Marketing Committee Chair - Gerald Arkin
- Science & Technology Committee Chair – Bill Ravlin
- NRSP Review Committee Chair – Ralph Cavalieri

NERA Representatives to:

- ESCOP:
  - Tom Burr
  - Brad Hillman
  - Jon Wraith

- ESCOP Budget & Legislative Committee
  - Tom Brady
  - Tom Burr

- ESCOP Communications and Marketing Committee
  - Steve Herbert
  - Mike Hoffmann

- ESCOP Science & Technology Committee
  - Tom Brady
  - Mike Hoffmann

- NRSP Review Committee
  - Jon Wraith

Meetings

- ESCOP will next meet at the Joint COP's session on July 20-21, 2011 in Boston, MA
- The Experiment Station Section will meet on September 27, 2011 in Estes Park, CO
- The ESCOP Executive Committee will meet at the APLU Annual Meeting in November in San Francisco

Budget and Legislative

ESCOP through its Budget and Legislative Committee provides input into the BAA Budget and Advocacy Committee. The Committee is closely monitoring progress on and providing input into the FY 2012 USDA/NIFA budget development process. The Committee is also providing input into the 2012 Farm Bill development through the BAA Committee on Legislation and Policy (CLP). ESCOP is also working with Extension to develop strategies to retain 406 funding and programs that are in jeopardy. Among these are high priority initiatives including Water Quality, Food Safety and IPM

Communications and Marketing

The ESCOP Communications and Marketing Committee is providing leadership for a system wide proactive marketing campaign aimed at raising awareness of the Land Grant System among key stakeholders. The Podesta Group and Cornerstone Government Affairs had been engaged to coordinate this campaign. The marketing campaign has had significant success over the past three years. Yet, as the campaign evolved, it became clear that we have moved outside of our primary contact, John Scofield, and Podesta's core competencies. Our contract with Podesta was also up for renewal, and John Scofield was making plans to leave Podesta as well. Cornerstone was asked to identify potential firms whom they believe have the ability to better implement our evolved strategy that incorporates more social media into a targeted op-ed writing campaign. Cornerstone identified three firms –Xenophon Strategies, Powell-Tate, and K-Global. Through a series of interviews, K-Global was chosen as the firm best able to represent ESCOP. Their approach to the marketing campaign is a combination of trust-based local relationships leveraged with social media marketing and traditional media (e.g. op eds, etc.) capabilities when necessary and appropriate. Their creative approach in using locally employed trusted political contacts to convey our messages, reinforced with social and traditional media platforms, was particularly appealing and was the best fit with our Cornerstone lobbying efforts. Additionally, their team presentation clearly presented a more nimble, flexible and responsive team engagement in handling our account. The Committee recommendation was approved by the ESCOP Executive Committee and a contract will be prepared.

Science and Technology

The ESCOP Science and Technology Committee reviewed the ESS Excellence Multistate Research Award nominations from the regions and selected one to recommend to the ESCOP Executive Committee. The project, S-1032, "Improving the Sustainability of Livestock and Poultry Production in the United States" was approved by the Executive Committee and documentation was forwarded to APLU to be included in the Annual APLU Awards Program. The Chair of the Committee, Bill Ravlin, agreed to chair a joint Task Force on operationalizing the Science Roadmap. The Task Force includes the

chairs of the ESCOP Budget and Legislative, Communications and Marketing and Science and Technology Committees and the five ED's. It will develop operational plans and corresponding strategies for implementing and marketing the Roadmap. It will also develop strategies for the use of the Roadmap recommendations in the development of budget requests and advocacy efforts. The Task Force will help design a session at the ESS/SAES/ARD Workshop in September 2011 to obtain initial input from the SAES/ARD directors. It should be prepared to provide an update at the ESCOP Executive Committee meeting in November and a draft plan at the winter ESCOP meeting

National Research Support Projects

The NRSP Review Committee met in June by conference call and reviewed the proposal for NRSP-1 and the 2012 budget proposals for all projects. The Committee will recommend approval of the NRSP-1 proposal and the budgets for NRSP-1, NRSP3, NRSP-4, and NRSP-8 as requested. The approval of the proposal and FY2011 budget for NRSP-6 was on condition that the Committee develops a plan for commercial users to pay for the services. No plan has been received so the NRSP-RC deferred a decision on the FY2012 budget request. The NRSP-7 Committee requested a floor amount of $100,000 in the event that federal budget approval is delayed. This request cannot be approved as no money is released unless the federal budget is approved. The NRSP-RC approved funding up to $325,000 with the usual condition that the amount would be reduced by an amount equal to any alternative Federal special grants funding received. The Committee also deferred a decision on NRSP-9 as it is awaiting confirmation that NRSP-9 has secured matching funds for FY2011 and can provide assurance of matching funds for FY2012. The NRSP-RC was asked to provide feedback to a revised ipm-PIPE proposal but decided that it needed more time to review it. Finally the issue of placing sunsets and funding caps on NRSP projects was discussed. After considerable discussion it was decided that there is an opportunity to address these concerns when proposals for new projects or renewable of projects are reviewed. Abel Ponce de Leon will be nominated to replace Ralph Cavalieri as Chair of the NRSP-RC.

Agenda Item 4.c

Northeast Regional Aquaculture Center Report

NERA Representatives to NRAC Board of Directors:

- Richard Rhodes
- Dan Rossi
  (In addition, Adel Shirmohammadi represents the Dean of Agriculture and Natural Resources at the University of Maryland)

Meetings

- The annual NRAC Board of Directors meeting was held on April 21, 2011 in Greenbelt, MD.
- The next BOD meeting is not yet scheduled.

Grants Program

- Ten proposals were submitted in response to the RFA. These then were narrowed down to two through the review process.
- The two projects that were approved by the BOD for funding were:
  - Proposal 11-02 – Developing Improved Management Practices for mussel Farming in Southern New England
  - Proposal # 11-08 – Optimization of Hatcher and Culture Technology for Razor Clams
- A proposal for a small (seed) grants program will be prepared and brought to the BOD.
- Six problem statements were approved for inclusion in NRAC's upcoming RFA for pre-proposals.

Other Business

- An evaluation of previous project proposal success or lack of success will be prepared.
- The proposal review procedure was reviewed and revised.
- The process for approval on nominations to the BOD and other committees was reviewed and revised.

Agenda Item 4.d

Adapting to Climate Change in the Northeast: Water Quantity and Quality Challenges for Agricultural and Natural Systems

USDA Beltsville Agricultural Research Center Campus, Maryland
March 23-24, 2011

Background

The directors of the NE Agricultural Experiment Stations and Cooperative Extension held a joint meeting on July 12, 2010 in Baltimore with the theme of "Climate Change and Water Resources – Mitigation and Adaptation in the Northeast." Following the meeting they decided that a forum for researchers and educators was needed in the northeast. They felt that we have a number of very talented scientists and capacity, particularly in this area, to effectively compete in today's very competitive and evolving research funding arena. They envisioned a forum with the purpose of catalyzing and facilitating multi-disciplinary and multi-institutional research groups to form and develop new regional initiatives. However they also recognized that the forum had to be driven by scientists and not just administrators. A planning committee including the following individuals was appointed:

- Paul Bonaparte-Krogh – NH CE
- Larry Katz – Rutgers CE
- Mike Hoffmann – Cornell AES
- Adel Shirmohammadi – MD AES
- Dianne Lennon – NJ CARET
- Phyllis Carter – WV CARET
- Art Gold – URI & Northeast States and Caribbean Islands Regional Water Center
- Susan Riha – Cornell & NYS Water Resources Institute at Cornell
- George Loomis – URI and NE-1045 Chair
- Chris Obropta – RU & Northeast States and Caribbean Islands Regional Water Center
- Doug Parker – UMD & Mid-Atlantic Water Program
- Linda Kay Benning – NEED
- Dan Rossi - NERA

The committee identified the following expected outcomes from such a forum:

- New resources to support research and education in NE identified and secured
- Increased trans-disciplinary, inter-institutional collaboration
- A network of experts that will continue to communicate even after the Forum to work on proposal/projects and other cooperative initiatives
- Specific areas of potential collaboration identified
- Potential teams for regional grant proposals be formed

The forum was designed not as a traditional conference but as an interactive working meeting in an environment for project development towards action oriented outcomes. As such it was important that it

should involve a good balance of scientists and educators from various disciplines. The attached list of 40 participants demonstrates that this goal was achieved.

The forum started with three short presentations to provide a general overview in terms of research priorities, challenges and opportunities.

- "Adapting to Climate Change in the Northeast: Managing with Uncertainty" – Steven Shaw, Research Associate, New York State Water Resources Institute, Department of Earth & Atmospheric Science and Director, Cornell University

- "Navigating the Watershed of Climate Science and Service: NOAA's RISA Program" – Adam Parris, Regional Integrated Science and Assessments (RISA) Program Leader, Climate Program Office, NOAA

- "Climate Change Action for Agriculture, Forestry and Natural Resources" – Louie Tupas, Director, Division of Global Climate Change, Institute of Bioenergy, Climate and Environment, USDA-NIFA

These presentations set the stage for two rounds of break-out sessions. The first round asked the participants to help identify and prioritize topics that were important to the region, where there is common interest, and for which we have the capacity to be competitive. As a starting place, they were provided the following four general areas that were discussed by the directors last summer:

  - Climate Change Adaptation in Terms of Water Quality and Quantity
  - Climate Change Mitigation in terms of Water Use Efficiency and Water Quality
  - Ecosystem Health and Climate Change
  - Sustainable (Economic, Environmental, and Human Health) Agro-Ecosystem

Based on the results of the breakouts three specific areas where there are common clusters of interests – areas around which the participants could nucleate together to start drafting outlines for potential proposals were identified. These three areas then served as the basis for a second round of breakouts. During these breakouts, the participants were asked to begin outlining specific potential proposals in the three areas. More specifically they were asked to frame the issues, identify: some potential objectives; a research/extension approach; needed expertise and gaps in capacity; expected outcomes; and potential funding sources. If possible they were asked to identify a potential leader and volunteers who would be interested in working on a project proposal.

Breakout Results

Areas of Potential Collaboration

Group A

- Decision making – how do people make decisions and take actions
  - What do decision makers need to know to make informed decisions?
  - What information do they need?
  - Do we have the information that they need to know?
  - How do you do translational science?
  - What research and tools, (like modeling) need to be developed?
  - It is an ongoing process for decision makers; sometimes based on funding availability
- Frame
  - Evaluate decision making processes in states and communities around these issues
- Adaptation and mitigation
  - Responsibility as a developed country
  - NE example: using hybrid poplar trees – take up carbon, not a food
- Climate change and energy
  - Impact of climate change on Chesapeake Bay
  - Quality of water
  - Mitigation by pyrolysis (manure to fuel) reduce waste stream and increase green energy
  - Needs more research
  - Localized climate change models compared to national data (WV cooling according to local data)

Group B

- Brainstorming ideas
  - Who are our stakeholders?
  - What are their needs?
  - What are the options and opportunities for Adaptation and Risk Management?
  - Risk management: Human health, sustainability; ecosystem goods and services; economic vitality
  - What management recommendations for climate change adaptation will also yield additional benefits?
- Assessment and monitoring: integrative approach
  - Land use change
  - Groundwater: adaptation – improved understanding of groundwater resources and climate change
  - Monitoring – groundwater monitoring to assess climate change
  - Effects of sea level rise on aquifers in coastal plains – confined and unconfined
  - Water runoff from impervious areas
  - Biodiversity as an indicator
  - Monitoring contaminants from runoff and leachate
  - Human dimension
- Pollution abatement with the challenge of climate change
  - Improved wastewater disposal – adapting designs to climate change
  - Risks to potable water
  - Risks of salinity in freshwater resources – increased road salting

    - Agricultural runoff from animal waste
    - Deforestation
- Agricultural sustainability
    - Organic agriculture may need to address new challenges in pest and weed management
    - Competing demands for limited water
    - Human health consequences of agricultural systems: EPA
    - Changes in agricultural production systems to respond to climate change
- Reducing the risks of climate change for ecosystem goods and services
    - Hydrologic variability and wetland functions and values
    - Shellfish aquacultural challenges related to climate change
    - Human activity on wildlife – land and water
    - Aquatic habitat in lower order watersheds
    - BMPS interactions with ecosystem services and climate change
    - Climate change implications for invasive species
    - Translating research to ecosystem goods and services with application to risk management
- Cross-cutting approaches
    - Leveraging and partnering with other agencies
    - CASTEM: climate change literacy for K-12; summer programs
    - Workforce preparation
    - Need to bring economists to the table at the inception of project development
    - Need to bring extension educators and their perspectives on outcomes and audiences to discussions
    - Bring stakeholders into the planning at the inception of the project
    - Focus on both near term (now) and medium term (10 years) impacts and methodologies
    - Involving counties and cities as advocates – need to help them prioritize
- Watershed management
    - Define the scales of influence – Land Grants are well-positioned to solve problems at local watershed scales
    - Competing demands for scarce water resources with climate change and variability
    - Storm water management in a watershed context – upstream land use and downstream floodplains
    - Drought impact vs. flood impact and economic impacts
- Life cycle analysis needs to be broadened to include human dimensions and economics
    - Includes bio-assessment
    - Modeling to integrate complexities
    - Geospatial techniques need to be melded with process-level models of plant and watershed systems
    - Modeling economic consequences of adaptations and risks for aquatic habitats/organisms
    - Bringing monetary value to adaptation measures
    - Robust decision making in the face of uncertainty and variability
    - Economic values of climate change adaptation

Group C

- Needs of producers (crop animal) in light of adaptation to climate change?
    - What watershed strategies to use to be sustainable in terms of water quantity and quality
- For states in Chesapeake Bay: TMDL-WIP vs. watershed scale in light of climate change may require: "Adaptive Management"

- Model uncertainty and development of plans for adaptation to climate change
- Consideration of using monitoring data from warmer southeast if climate change = increased temperature
- Foodsheds intersection with watersheds "agro-ecosystems" "agro-urban ecosystem" – trends towards tighter foodsheds / local production -- (research/extension/education)
- Climate change impacts on land use, resulting from climate change that can put stress on:
    - Water use
    - Water quality
    - Energy
    - Forestry
- Integrated modeling of systems (all ecosystems) and decision support systems to provide guideline to adapt to climate change: scale considerations (for climate model): large to small – small to large
- Green design / green theme – adaptation / mitigation
    - LID = low impact development
    - Green roof/green wall
- Economics of the strategies for adaptation to climate change – how does that square with the economics of mitigation
- Establish Northeast teaching consortium for climate change (distance education/web-courses) for adaptation/mitigation
- Carbon sequestration (and nutrient fluxes) within the landscape including role of wetlands

Group D

- Chesapeake Bay TMDL (Total Maximum Daily Load)– issue of climate change, how is it integrated into pollutant estimation models
- Regional goals for sub-watersheds of the Chesapeake Bay – goals such as maintaining concentrated urban areas, areas of particular ecosystem value
- At what scale do you need to act to capture and store more water: conservation, water reuse, rain gardens, infiltration (particularly to groundwater); asked in another way, what is cumulative benefit of field scale modifications?
- Reprioritization of BMP's because of climate change due to variability in rainfall, temperature
- Education – role in getting supporters for new policy, understanding why landscape modifications should be justified
- Ag-urban interface: homeowner, cross-disciplinary opportunities, communications
- Who do we target in terms of enacting changes to landscape: department of health, town zoning, master gardeners
- Demonstration projects to provide evidence and verification of effectiveness
- USDA-ARS works at 10,000+ acre scale; makes it hard to see and identify whether changes are effective due to confounding effects
- Lack of monitoring data at appropriate scale, both temporal and spatial (for instance no lag time in accounting for N removal in BMPs)
- Most models are just fitting exercises that can only be sure to work during their calibration period
- Scenario planning – necessary to successful participatory process; use when you have limited control over anticipated changes; main emphasis is on iterative process
- Comparison of surface monitoring data and remotely sensed data
- Where is the money? The support?

- Agro-forestry sequestration; GHG accounting assessment at farm scale – specific type of agricultural system – forested buffer strip in conjunction with field crops
- Systems approach to multiple objectives: water quality, biomass production, carbon credits, economic development
- Policy for change – allowing monitoring and assessment to go together in natural resources management (law for protecting San Fran Bay based on concern over filling in middle 20th century, not for climate change now)
- Irrigation demand, water supply, in-stream flow issues (based on experience in Ct. where number of small reservoirs); how are releases determined and how are competing needs met – main issue, have little expertise to improve management, how do you get expertise when communities have limited resources
- Central themes:
    - Assessing BMPs in a changing climate at temporally and spatially relevant scales; developing better process-based understanding of BMP functions (in contrast to black-box understanding that is norm now)
    - Education for multiple audiences; incorporate a systems approach to evaluate extent of impact
    - Linking science with action; using scenario planning, adaptive management, systems approach (distinguishing feature, thinking about things at a broader scale)

Three Areas of Common Interest

- Optimization of water resource use to balance human/societal needs and the environment
- Regional water conflicts
- Modeling decision support system – integrated approach and BMPS, scaling issues, adaptation

Framing Potential Proposals

Optimization of Water Resource Use to Balance Human/Societal Needs and the Environment

- Framework of local food movement
- Opportunity of abundant water compared to other regions
- Gradient of urban and rural
- Economic Development (jobs) – growing more food, connecting market to producer
- Helping all to make good decisions re water conservation and utilization
- Selection of crops and how they impact the water
- Ethnic based foods
- Environmental planning when landscape starts to change
- Waste stream, composting; minimize the contaminants, LCA economic policy
- Local municipality officials educated through involvement from square one, including research projects.
- USDA, Gates Foundation

Regional Water Conflicts

- Changing climate may lead to new type of agricultural systems and need for supplemental water – potentially leading to new competition for water sources among other users (residential, commercial, thermoelectric, shale gas extraction, ecosystem).

- Aggravating factor – sea level rise and salt water intrusion in coastal aquifers; specific example in Del-Mar peninsula, new additions of center pivot irrigation for corn production drawing from ground water.
- Need to bring in criteria for ecological sustainability.
- Plus component of economic analysis as well as what water regulatory structures are in place to oversee water allocation.
- Other issues: artificial recharge, centralized or local waste water treatment (to maximize in basin recharge), high density development and impacts on existing ground water supplies in Ct. (how can you educate local government to modify zoning to protect domestic water supply wells).
- Particularly in terms of ground water, lack of readily available data on well records (varies from state to state).
- How do we handle hydro-climatology – do we really understand changes in frequency and magnitude of future drought? Can we use scenario-based assessments to identify critical areas where conflict is most likely to occur?
- What does the form of the study look like? Case study approach focusing on 4 to 5 different watersheds characterized by different physical features, regulations, economic concerns, development patterns, shifts in crop systems (particularly in terms of lengthening growing seasons, less risk of frost).
- Issues in terms of cropping systems: what are issues regarding water use, weeds, more use of C4 plants.
- Issues in terms of water quality: more water withdrawals, less stream flow, longer nutrient retention time but flip-side in Chesapeake Bay, water quality improves with dryer conditions.
- Objectives:
    - Quantify potential for competing water demands in different regions of the northeast, with particular emphasis on how will crop irrigation demands change
    - Question: What is the degree of increased competition for water in corn production areas in the northeast? What are the margins of uncertainty and where can more extensive monitoring be used to improve confidence in future projections?
- Requires:
    - Knowledge of changes in irrigation in different states (in regards to economic incentives, climate change influencing water availability)
    - Knowledge of change in cropping systems (as dependent on climate change in regards to growing season
- Needs to cover various regions with distinctly different characteristics. Ideally there would be sufficient overlap that there could be some extrapolation from monitored to unmonitored regions.

<u>Modeling Decision Support System – Integrated Approach and BMPS, Scaling Issues, Adaptation</u>

- Decision Making:
    - Who makes the decision? What is the social consideration?
    - What areas are hot spots?
    - Stakeholder input – their issues, options
    - Existing models – understanding of the different outcomes
    - Use of tools in uncertain future
    - Dynamic model – lag time issues, legacy effect (e.g., accumulation of sediments and sediment bound chemicals), microorganism development
    - In stream flow processes are different – models do not capture details

    - Where is the knowledge gap in these models?
    - Different scale model – field scale, large scale, SWAT, GLEAMS
    - What are true effectiveness of BMPS? Do they change?
    - BMPS – nutrients, urban, enhancing infiltration in turf areas, flushing in small streams/bays, waste treatment, all best management practices in light of climate change
    - Models are 'black boxes'; need to go to mechanistic in order to understand the processes, and understanding the meaning of the number
- Study the Uncertainty of the Models – what are the economic risks?
- Apply lessons learned from Bay models to move into future modeling tasks. Take limitations of models. Understand that there will always be gaps and that policy decisions should be backed by science.
- Objectives:
    - Decision-support modeling system – experts, inputs and common sense
    - Understand the criteria for existing models (i.e. Bay model) and the roles of each user
    - Better monitoring and modeling of specific BMPS in multiple scales, understanding the inputs and how they change
    - Policy impacts – ability to evaluate different policies and their outcomes/effects in view of climate change
    - To effectively communicate to the public what these models are and how they should be interpreted/used
    - Develop and build confidence into the models as we account for variability and risks associated with climate change
- Potential Funding Sources:
    - Dept. of Interior – development of tools
    - USDA
    - USGS
    - NOAA
    - Private foundations

Recommendations

This Forum provided an excellent opportunity for scientists and educators with interests in climate change and water resources to come together and develop working relations. Several key areas of common interest and importance to the region were identified. The participants were encouraged to continue the dialogue beyond the forum. They were further encouraged to consider developing multistate research projects and to consider applying for NERA Planning Grants to provide funding to further develop and refine competitive proposal in these areas. The participants will be sent copies of the announcement for the next round of NERA Planning Grants.

We are aware of at least one significant outcome of the forum. A group of scientists have prepared and submitted a Department of the Interior proposal requesting a Climate Science Center for the Northeast, which included Great Lakes Consortium, New England region, and the Chesapeake Bay region. Faculty from Maryland, Connecticut, Rhode Island, and West Virginia in addition to other states outside the Northeast partnered to develop the proposal.

Agenda Item 4.e

US-Canada Climate Change Think Tank Report

NERA hosted a workshop in Syracuse last August focusing on agricultural adaptation to climate change in the Eastern United States and Canadian Provinces. The purpose of the meeting was to catalyze and facilitate multi-disciplinary and multi-institutional research collaborations among Eastern US and Canadian universities, government agencies and the private sector. The workshop was attended by approximately 35 key decision makers from academia and the public and private sectors and I believe to be a great success. A number of important collaborations were formed at the meeting and we believe they will have critical implications for agriculture in this region.

The leadership of the workshop has maintained monthly conference calls to monitor and facilitate progress among the various partnerships. From this ongoing dialogue, a subgroup proposed the creation of a "think tank" to develop a longer term (2025) scenario for agriculture in this region given expected changes in climate and to identify options for successful agricultural adaption in the region. Approximately 20 deans/directors from the Eastern US (including the Great Lakes region) and Canada and senior level private executives attended a one day meeting on June 28, 2011 in Montreal.

The session started with three very informative presentations:

- "Climate Change and Agriculture – The Road Ahead" – Don Smith, McGill Univ.
- "Plants and CO_2 – Will Rising Temperatures Trump CO_2 Fertilization on Crop Yields" – Bert Drake, Smithsonian Environmental Research Center
- "Preparing Northeast Agriculture for a Changing Climate" – David Wolf, Cornell Univ.

These presentations served as context to develop a consensus around alternative future climate scenarios for the region. General agreement was reached concerning the following potential trends:

- A general warming trend in winter with higher winter lows leading to the potential of greater pest issues.
- Greater frequency of higher summer temperatures resulting in more heat stress on plants and animals.
- Greater precipitation in the spring and fall seasons with higher likelihood of flooding.
- No increase in summer precipitation resulting when couple with higher temperatures in summer water deficits.

The group then identified two short term opportunities for collaboration in the region:

- Use of Farm Level Data – a proposal to utilize farm level data to analyze the impacts of climate change on agriculture. Stan Johnson and Don Smith will prepare a pre-proposal.
- Water Table Management – a proposal to develop alternative strategies to improve drainage and irrigation systems. It would also consider resulting needs and opportunities for new crops and cropping systems. Adel Shirmohammadi, Rob Gordon, Don Smith and Dave Wolfe will prepare a proposal by the end of the calendar year.

Other issues that were discussed include:

- Development of a webpage to provide a collective forum for dialogue on this issue.
- The need for recoupling plant and animal systems relative to nitrogen and water utilization.

- A joint initiative to seek support from the USDA and AAFC which will be initiated on the Canadian side by Rob Gordon and Don Smith.
- Development of a one or two page core message that: frames the problem; identifies resulting opportunities for agriculture in this region; and describes the capacity of the institutions in this initiative to capitalize on these opportunities. A draft will be prepared by Dave McInnes.

Finally, Mike Hoffmann and Don Smith will prepare a summary document of the think tank discussions that can be used in advocating for additional support.

Agenda Item 5

"The Criticality of Formula Funds for Research and Extension" – A White Paper

Sent: Wednesday, June 29, 2011 5:03 PM

Subject: Formula Funds White Paper

To: Gina Eubanks, Chair, AEA
Dyremple Marsh, Chair, ARD
Rick Klemme, Chair, NCCEA
Doug Buhler, Chair, NCRA
Larry Katz, Chair, NEED
Bradley Hillman, Chair, NERA
Jeff Jacobsen, Chair, WAAESD
Jon Boren, Chair, WEDA

FM: Bob Shulstad, Chair, SAAESD
Gaines Smith , Chair, ASRED

CY: Regional Research and Extension Executive Directors

RE: Formula Funds White Paper

At our joint meeting this April, the southern research and extension directors voted unanimously that federal formula funding was still our number one priority and that maintaining or increasing these funding lines was absolutely critical to serving our stakeholders. As a follow up to that discussion, Drs. Ron Brown and Eric Young were asked to draft a white paper that would support this position. The draft document was submitted for review by the Extension and Research directors in the Southern region, with several positive and constructive comments, and the final version, titled "The Criticality of Formula Funds for Research and Extension," is attached. It is our opinion that it is a sound document describing the rationale for our position on this issue.

We invite you to share this document with your respective directors/administrators (Extension or Research) in your region and if your region supports this position, we ask that you consider endorsing this document. Once any such endorsements are received, we will transmit the document to the PBD, BAC, and NIFA leadership, and ask that serious consideration be given to this critical need as decisions are made. We would appreciate a response in this regard by the end of July if possible. You may respond to either of us, or to Ron Brown (brown@ext.msstate.edu) or Eric Young (eric_young@ncsu.edu).

Criticality of Formula Funds for Research and Extension

[Prepared by the Southern Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors and the Association of Southern Region Extension Directors, May 2011. This document relies heavily on previous work by an ECOP/ESCOP Formula Funds Task Force.]

The number one federal funding priority for Agricultural Research and Cooperative Extension organizations in each region of the country is formula funds. There are few other federal programs where limited funds are leveraged five to six times annually over a period of decades, in this case to yield ongoing positive impacts on the nation's food and fiber system. Inadequate funding of the Hatch and Smith-Lever programs, in favor of competitive funding, jeopardizes the world's most productive and successful agricultural research and Cooperative Extension system. While the State Experiment Stations and Cooperative Extension Services within our land-grant universities have consistently emphasized the criticality of formula funds in maintaining strong programmatic capacity for meeting local needs when coupled with state appropriated matches, the federal partner has been unwilling to articulate a similar message, particularly to Congress.

The Administration, through USDA, asserts that, *"The best science results from externally funded competitive programs."* This is based on the assumption that competitive programs can always pick winners and there is little hard evidence to support this statement and much evidence for renouncing it. For example, Huffman and Evenson in their paper, *"New Economic Evidence on Agricultural Total Factor Productivity Determinants: Impact of Funding Compositions,"* October 2004, observed that as increases occur in the share of State Agricultural Experiment Station funding from federal contracts, grants, and cooperative agreements, the impact of public sector agricultural research on state agricultural productivity declines. Huffington and Evenson, 2006, noted that "each unit of HATCH formula funding of SAES research had a larger impact on local agricultural productivity than a similar unit of federal competitive funding" (see Huffman, Norton et al. Investing in a Better Future Through Public Agricultural Research. CAST Commentary QTA 2011-1, March).

A move from formula funds to competitive grant allocations of USDA funds for research and Extension has enormous economic consequences for land-grant universities, their individual faculty and staff, and state and national constituents. Formula funds have been allocated to land-grant university systems over the years with a minimum of transaction costs. Annual plans of work and annual reports ensure accountability without overburdening research and extension faculty, who can focus most of their creativity on basic or translational research and the application and adoption of knowledge discoveries throughout the economy. Formula funds are not assessed fiscal and administrative charges by the receiving university, and the USDA costs to administer formula funds also are low. Consequently, most of the funding appropriated by Congress goes directly into food and fiber system research or Extension programs. Such is not the case when funds are allocated through competitive grants. Faculty must devote a significant percentage of their creativity in developing and orchestrating proposals to submit to the competitive grants process—with no assurance of success. In short, considering the opportunity cost of faculty and staff time in developing major grant proposals, significant overhead costs associated with the grants once obtained, and employee training and administrative costs associated with fluctuating competitive grant revenues; the transaction costs of competitive grants to universities are significantly higher than those of formula funds. In addition, administrative time and costs for USDA personnel to develop RFPs, review proposals, and process awards are much higher than for distributing formula funds.

Formula funding allows land-grant universities to work with national, state, and local clientele to establish priorities and address emerging opportunities related to agricultural systems research and Extension programs. Competitive grant review panels tend to focus on developing 'new' knowledge to address emerging issues and de-emphasize the level of relevancy to state or regional issues. Formula funding, on the other hand, gives land-grant university systems, through state and local cost-sharing, the capacity to support permanent research and Extension faculty at the state, regional, and local levels to address continuing *as well as* emerging needs. In other words, it is critical to maintain human and programmatic capacity to respond rapidly to crises or emerging needs,

to make significant discoveries of new knowledge and technology, and to sustain on-going high priority research and Extension efforts.

Formula funds are especially critical to the research and extension partnership involving federal, state and local governments to enable rapid responses to disease and pest outbreaks and to natural disasters, e.g., floods, hurricanes, and wild fires. Formula funds allow maintenance of a response system to address these types of emergencies. The start and stop nature of competitive funding mechanisms does not provide for this critical infrastructure stability. It is also contrary to the transformational change mission of Extension that leads to economic and social health in agriculture, forestry and natural resources, family and consumer sciences, community resource development and 4-H youth development. This transformational education mission, like the academic education mission of our Land-grant institutions, is different from the research mission, and requires that similar Extension programming be implemented with multiple audiences over time and in different areas. Development of a pest resistant crop variety through research is a single event. However, Extension programming that improves yield through adoption of that new variety must be provided in each community in which there is a needful audience and repeated as additional audiences emerge requiring similar education. Extension is a program of continuing activities, not a stop and start project, and because of this, Extension suffers even greater disruption from a competitive funding model.

In addition to the contrasts described above, there are other key differences between formula and competitive funding mechanisms.

- Competitive funding mechanisms ensure high quality research but do not necessarily ensure relevance to farmers, ranchers, and consumers, particularly at the state or local level. Formula funds, however, promote ongoing engagement of research and Extension with its stakeholders – producers and consumers – and allows for continuous adjustment of program direction and objectives based on that engagement while competitively funded proposals are guided and judged by peers of the proposal developers.
- Formula funding is better able to promote multi-state collaboration that is more efficient, systematic, inclusive, and sustainable, than competitive funding mechanisms, due to its greater flexibility and continuity.
- Formula funding provides a bridge to maintain infrastructure, personnel, and competitiveness between successful grants.
- A loss of formula funds, even with an equal increase in competitive funds, will disproportionately disadvantage smaller institutions and will have a detrimental impact on regional and national networks of research and extension programs. All states and LGUs will be negatively impacted, but competitive-dominated mechanisms create or exacerbate the “have’s and the have-not’s.”
- The State Agricultural Experiment Stations in conjunction with USDA continues to be the primary organization undertaking public sector agricultural research in a number of areas including: crop variety improvement, food safety, water quality assessment, atmospheric deposition, pesticide clearance on minor crops, rural and community development, agricultural policy, etc. These and many other areas of long-term research and development depend on continuous stable funding and will in time be put at significant risk should formula funds be lost in preference to a competitive portfolio.

Formula driven federal funds for research and Extension are expended in a fashion that are relevancy-driven, not curiosity-driven as is the case for major competitive-based portfolios such as NSF and NIH. It is this relevancy-driven research and Extension agenda that will best meet the overall mission and vision of USDA/NIFA, address stakeholder needs, and result in large economic, environmental, and social rates of return on public resources invested relative to other alternatives.

Agenda Item 6

Northeast Regional Invasive Species Forum

- Purpose: To catalyze and facilitate multi-disciplinary and multi-institutional research and outreach groups in the Northeast region to form and develop new regional initiatives in the area of invasives

- Scope: A primary focus on invasive plants within all ecosystems in the Northeast. All relevant disciplines are invited to participate.

- Expected Outcomes:
  - New resources to support research and education on invasive plants in Northeast region identified and secured
  - Increased trans-disciplinary, inter-institutional collaboration in the region
  - A network of experts in the region that will continue to communicate even after the Forum to work on proposal/projects and other cooperative initiatives
  - Specific areas of potential regional collaboration identified
  - Potential teams for regional grant proposals be formed

- Participants:
  - Northeastern Land Grant scientists from a variety of disciplines including the social sciences
  - Northeastern Cooperative Extension educators
  - Federal agency representatives
  - State agency representatives

- Format: The Forum is not intended to be a traditional conference. It will be planned to be an interactive working meeting in an environment for project development for action oriented outcomes.

- Date: End of October or early November 2011

- Location: To be determined

- Registration: The Forum will be sponsored by the Northeast Regional Association of State Agricultural Experiment Station Directors. There will be no registration fee.

- Planning Committee: Donna Ellis
  Cameron Faustman
  Dan Rossi
  Mary Rumpho-Kennedy
  Fred Servello
  Lois Berg Stack
  John Volin
  Donglin Zhang (to be confirmed)
  An economist or social scientist (to be confirmed)

Agenda Item 7

NORTHEAST MULTISTATE ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE MEETING

Agenda

The Mystic Hilton
20 Coogan Boulevard, Mystic, CT 06355

July 10, 2011
2:00pm to 4:00pm

Chair, Jon Wraith (NH)

Members: Kirby Stafford III (CT-NH), Tim Phipps (WV), Stephen Herbert (MA) and Bob Schrader (NEED)

Multistate Research Projects:

1. Request to approve the proposal for a Rapid Response Multistate 500-series project, NE_TEMP1861: Management of the Brown Marmorated Stink Bug [08/2011-2013].
2. Request to approve the proposal, NE_TEMP1741: Ecological Bases for Weed Management in Sustainable Cropping Systems [10/2011-2016], currently NE1026.

Multistate Coordinating Committee (CC) and Education/Extension and Research (ERA) Projects:

3. Request to approve the proposal, NE_TEMP1821: Strategies to Evaluate and Mitigate Ozone Impacts on the Structure and Function of Vegetation [10/2012-2017], currently NE1030. Note that at MAC's meeting in March, the members were concerned that the proposed project lacks a strong research component that demonstrates interdependence among the participating stations, and felt that the Coordinating Committee format may best suit this multistate activity. The technical committee heeded your advice and submitted their full proposal as a Coordinating Committee.
4. Request to approve the proposal, NE_TEMP1781: Northeast Region Technical Committee on Integrated Pest Management [10/2011-2016], currently NEERA1001.
5. Request to approve the proposal, NE_TEMP1761: Sustainable Wood Energy [10/2011-2016], new project.
6. Request to approve the Request to Write a Proposal, entitled Nanotechnology Risk Assessment [10/2011-2016], new project.

Midterm Reviews:

7. Consideration of the following midterm reviews and request to terminate
    - Midterm Review of NE1029 - Rural Change: Markets, Governance and Quality of Life [10/2007 to 9/2012]

- Midterm Review of NE1037 - Wood Utilization Research : Biofuels, Bioproducts, Hybrid Biomaterials Composites Production, and Traditional Forest Products [8/2009 to 9/2014]
- Termination of NECC63 - Research Committee on Commodity Promotion [10/2006-2011].
  A Request to Write was submitted and approved at the March 2011 MAC meeting, but the technical committee came back and expressed that the project had run its course and will terminate instead as scheduled on Sept. 30, 2011.

NRSPs:

8. NRSP Review Committee Recommendations on the FY2012 Off-the-top Funding for NRSPs
   Summary of NRSPRC Recommendations

Other Business:

9. NERA Planning Grant Update
10. MAC Leadership and Membership
11. Advisor Assignments

Agenda Item 8

Agenda Brief: ESCOP National Research Support Project Review Committee

Date: July 20, 2011

Presenter: Ralph Cavalieri/Daniel Rossi

Background Information:

1. Committee Membership:

   - Chair
     - Ralph Cavalieri (WAAESD)
   - Delegates
     - Abel Ponce de Leon (NCRA)
     - Jon Wraith (NERA)
     - Clarence Watson (SAAESD)
     - Kirland Mellad (ARD)
     - Tom Bewick (NIFA)
     - L. Washington Lyons (Cooperative Extension)
   - Executive Director
     - Arlen Leholm (NCRA)
   - Executive Director/Executive Vice-Chair
     - Dan Rossi (NERA)
   - Representative
     - Don Latham (CARET)

2. Meetings

   The NRSP Review Committee met on June 6, 2011 by conference call. It will meet by conference call in August and in person at the ESS/SAES/ARD meeting in Estes Park, CO in September.

3. NRSP Proposals Recommendations

   - NRSP_temp1 - National Information Management and Support System (NIMSS)
     Recommend approval of project proposal for 2011-2016.

4. NRSP 2012 Budget Request Recommendations

Project	Request	Recommendation
NRSP-1	$50,000	$50,000
NRSP-3	$50,000	$50,000
NRSP-4	$481,182	$481,182
NRSP-6	$150,000	Deferred [1]
NRSP-7	$325,000	$325,000 [2]
NRSP-8	$500,000	$500,000 [3]
NRSP-9	$175,000	Deferred

The directors will also be asked to vote on the $15,000 to support the project that receives the 2011 ESS Excellence in Multistate Research Award. The Committee did not discuss this item during the June meeting but will address it during the August conference call.

---

[1] The approval of the proposal and FY2011 budget for NRSP-6 was on condition that the Committee develops a plan for commercial users to pay for the services. No plan has been received so the NRSP-RC deferred a decision on the FY2012 budget request.

On June 27, 2011, the NRSP-6 Technical Committee submitted this response:
A vigorous effort has been made to procure funding to substitute for NRSP6 in FY11. Donations totaling $25,500 (equal to more than 1/6 = 17% of the NRSP6 budget) were solicited and received from private industry in FY11 and deposited in UW accounts created for use by the genebank, and those funds are being used 100% for germplasm research support: Frito-Lay contributed $15K, Kemin Industries contributed $10K, and Controlled Environmental Technology Systems (CETS) contributed $500. Our plan for FY12-15 includes several targets. We will ask Frito Lay, Kemin, and CETS to continue and increase their FY11 contributions, and will similarly approach Simplot, with a goal of increasing annual contributions from private industry to at least 20% of the NRSP6 budget ($30K). In FY12, we will consult the National Potato Council, the leaders of the four US regional genebanks, and our sister potato genebanks in other countries for advice on how private donations can be most efficiently pursued. We will produce and distribute a brochure to all private-sector germplasm recipients which explains the value of the project to the public, and follow up with a personal contact suggesting voluntary donations. We have also had success in getting public sector funds. USDA has assumed the burden of ½ salary for one UW genebank position and converted another former UW genebank position to federal. We got a $50K USAID grant to facilitate cooperative work with our sister genebank in Peru. We sought and received a $3500 federal grant to support germplasm acquisition. We are planning a proposal for the NSF grant program "Improvements to Biological Research Collections" in September. All of these efforts are aimed at maintaining the US Potato Genebank germplasm services which currently benefit SAES faculty.

[2] With the caveat that if funds equal to or less than this amount become available to NRSP-7 through a Congressional special grant or equivalent funding mechanism during FY2011-12, that amount will not be distributed to NRSP-7 from Hatch MRF. In addition, The NRSP-7 Committee requested a floor amount of $100,000 in the event that federal budget approval is delayed. This request cannot be approved as no money is released unless the federal budget is approved.

[3] The Committee deferred a decision on NRSP-9 as it is awaiting confirmation that NRSP-9 has secured matching funds for FY2011 and can provide assurance of matching funds for FY2012.

5. Other Business

- As a result of a concern about the forthcoming federal budget that will result to an estimated $25M cut on Hatch funds, a motion was made to reduce all the NRSPs' off-the-top funding that the NRSP-RC will recommend at the same percentage cut on Hatch for FY2012. While the motion was not passed, a suggestion was made to reconsider this motion at the August conference call of the Committee, as by then, we will have a better picture of where the federal budget is heading.
- The NRSP-RC was asked to provide feedback to a revised ipm-PIPE proposal but decided that it needed more time to review it.
- The issue of placing sunsets and funding caps on NRSP projects was discussed. After considerable discussion it was decided that there is an opportunity to address these concerns when proposals for new projects or renewable of projects are reviewed.

6. Committee Leadership

Abel Ponce de Leon will be recommended as the incoming Chair of the NRSP-RC. He would replace Chair Ralph Cavalieri on October 1, 2011. Arlen Leholm will replace Dan Rossi as the Executive Vice-Chair and will provide administrative support to the chair. Mike Harrington will be the incoming Executive Director-Member, as the next rotation of leadership will be from Western region.

Action Requested: For information only.