

Minutes of the Meeting of The Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors



**Semiahmoo Resort
Blaine, WA
July 19-22, 2009**

Summary of Actions/Assignments

Actions:

1.	Accepted the Agenda as modified	4
2.	Approved adoption of amended agenda and approved minutes of March 23-25, 2009 meeting as posted on the WAAESD web page	4
3.	Approved \$15,000 in off-the-top Hatch MRF for the national Excellence in Research Award	5
4.	Waived the one month notification to allow the Office of the Executive Director to Change the Association By-Laws to reflect the change of NASULGC to APLU and CSREES to NIFA	5
5.	Approved the Treasurer's Report	11
6.	Unanimously approved election of slate of officers	17
7.	Unanimously approved resolution to Washington State University hosts and resolution to H. Paul Rasmussen	25

Assignments:

1.	Harrington to work on plan for funding CARET representative to RCIC meetings	5
2.	Harrington to make changes to Association By-Laws for presentation at Fall Meeting	5

Table of Contents

Participants	1
Agenda	1
1.0 Call to Order, Welcome, Introductions	3
2.0 Approval of Agenda and Minutes of March 2009 Meeting	4
3.0 Chair's Report, Interim Actions, Executive Committee Report	5
4.0 Treasurer's Report	6
5.0 Science and Technology Committee	12
6.0 ARS Report	14
7.0 State Issues Discussion	16
8.0 Appointments and Election of Officers	17
9.0 Future Meetings	
9.1 2009 Fall ESS Meeting	18
9.2 2009 Spring Meeting	20
9.3 2010 Joint Summer Meeting	22
9.4 2009 W. Administrative Officers Meeting	23
10.0 Resolutions	24
11.0 Consent Agenda	
11.1 RCIC Report	26
11.2 System Communications and Marketing Committee	30
11.3 ESCOP Budget and Legislative Committee	33
11.4 ED Report	36
11.5 National Plant Germplasm Coordinating Committee	40
11.6 NRSP Review Committee	41
11.7 Aviation Biofuels Summit	44
11.8 Non-substantive changes to WAAESD By-Laws	48
11.9 Guidelines for National Research Support Projects (NRSPs)	52
11.10 Funding for Excellence in Multistate Research Award	80
11.11 Grantsmanship Workshops for 2009	82
11.12 State Reports	83
11.13 LEAD 21 Information	90
11.14 Land-Grant Knowledge Discovery System	92

WAAESD Meeting

Participants:

Alaska	Carol Lewis	New Mexico	LeRoy Daugherty
Arizona	C. Colin Kaltenbach	Washington	Ralph Cavalieri
Colorado	Lee Sommers	OTHERS:	
Guam	Greg Wiecko	ARS	Andrew C. Hammond
Hawaii	C. Y. Hu		Michael McGuire
Idaho	Greg Bohach	W. Exec. Dir.	H. Michael Harrington
Montana	Jeff Jacobsen	OWDA	Harriet Sykes
Nevada	Rang Narayanan		
	Ron Pardini		

Agenda WAAESD Meeting Wednesday July 22, 2009

9:30	1.0	Call to Order, Welcome, Introductions	Carol Lewis
	2.0	Approval of Agenda and Minutes of March 2009 Meeting (See http://www.colostate.edu/Orgs/WAAESD/WAAESD/SP09Min.pdf)	Carol Lewis
9:35	3.0	Chair's Report, Interim Actions, Executive Committee Report	Carol Lewis
9:40	4.0	Treasurer's Report	Jeff Jacobsen
9:45	5.0	Science and Technology Committee	Greg Bohach
9:55	6.0	ARS Report	Andy Hammond
10:10	7.0	State Issues Discussion	All
11:45	8.0	Appointments and Election of Officers	Carol Lewis
11:50	9.0	Future Meetings	
	9.1	2008 Fall ESS Meeting	Mike Harrington
	9.2	2009 Spring Meeting	Mike Harrington
	9.3	2010 Joint Summer Meeting	Colin Kaltenbach
	9.4	2009 W. Administrative Officers Meeting	Jeff Jacobsen
11:55	10.0	Resolutions	Jan Auyong/Greg Bohach
11.0		Consent Agenda	
	11.1	RCIC Report	Harriet Sykes
	11.2	System Communications and Marketing Committee	Ron Pardini
	11.3	ESCOMP Budget and Legislative Committee	Mike Harrington
	11.4	ED Report	Mike Harrington
	11.5	National Plant Germplasm Coordinating Committee	Lee Sommers
	11.6	NRSP Review Committee	Ralph Cavalieri

11.7	Aviation Biofuels Summit	Mike Harrington
11.8	Non-substantive changes to WAAESD By-Laws	Mike Harrington
11.9	Guidelines for National Research Support Projects (NRSPs)	Mike Harrington
11.10	Funding for Excellence in Multistate Research Award	Mike Harrington
11.11	Grantsmanship Workshops for 2009	Mike Harrington
11.12	State Reports	All
11.13	LEAD 21 Information	Mike Harrington
11.14	Land-Grant Knowledge Discovery System	Colin Kaltenbach

12:00 Adjourn

Agenda Item 1.0: Call to Order, Welcome, Introductions

Presenter: Carol Lewis

Background:

Lewis called the meeting to order. The attendees introduced themselves.

Action Requested: For information

Agenda Item 2.0: Approval of Agenda and Minutes of March 2009 Meeting

Presenter: Carol Lewis

Background:

Lewis asked for comments or corrections on the agenda. A request was made to include: information on the upcoming LEAD 21; information on the 2009 W. Administrative Officers Meeting; and the Land-Grant Knowledge Discovery System Justification and Proposal.

Lewis called for approval of the Agenda as modified.

Lewis called for approval of the Minutes of the March 23-25, 2009 Meeting in Davis, CA.

Action Requested: Approval of Agenda and Minutes of March 2009 Meeting

Action Taken:

- (1) The motion was made, seconded and approved to accept the Agenda as modified.**
- (2) The motion was made, seconded and approved to accept the minutes as posted on the WAAESD web page.**

Agenda Item 3.0: Chair's Report, Interim Actions, Executive Committee Report

Presenter: Carol Lewis

Background:

Lewis reported that the Executive Committee had met on 7/19/09.

She reported on the following interim items:

- As an interim action, the Executive Committee approved an increase in the WAAESD office budget of \$2,000 to cover computer support fees
- The REEO Roadmap suggestions and input were submitted on behalf of the Association

The Executive Committee discussed the following items:

- CSREES has requested each region to suggest representatives to a POW Review Team, which resulted in the following nominations: Frank Johnson (CO) to represent the W. Experiment Station Directors; and Deb Segla (AK) to represent the W. Administrative Officers
- A request for funding support in the amount of \$15,000 for the national Excellence in Research Award has been submitted by ESCOP (information on the request and a table with the impact on each Western state is available in Agenda Item 11.10). These funds would be taken from the off-the-top Hatch MRF. The Executive Committee presented as a seconded motion that \$15,000 in off-the-top Hatch MRF be approved for the national Excellence in Research Award
- Bohach suggested that a similar award for the Western Region Excellence in Research Award be made and that the award be coupled and included with the Extension award. Harrington will check into the possibility of this action.
- The Executive Committee discussed the problem with funding for the CARET representative to RCIC. The Executive Committee presented as a seconded motion that the Association will provide up to \$2500 annually from the Western Directors Special Fund to reimburse the travel costs for CARET members to participate in RCIC. The motion was amended to reimburse travel costs for the CARET member to attend the Spring Meeting. After further discussion, the motion was withdrawn and a new plan will be presented in the fall.
- The Executive Committee recommends a waiver on the one month pre-meeting requirement for amendment of the Association By-Laws to allow the Office of the Executive Director to make non-substantive changes from NASULGC to APLU and CSREES to NIFA.

Action Requested: Approval of Executive Committee recommendations

Action Taken: Approved the following; (1) \$15,000 in off-the-top Hatch MRF be approved for the national Excellence in Research Award; (2) waive the one month notification to allow the Office of the Executive Director to change the Association By-Laws to reflect the change of NASULGC to APLU and CSREES to NIFA

Agenda Item 4.0: Treasurer's Report

Presenter: Jeff Jacobsen

Background:

**WESTERN DIRECTOR EXPERIMENT STATION
FINANCIAL STATEMENT
FY 2009**

14-Jul-09

ASSESSMENTS				
	FY09 Assessments	Outstanding FY08	Payment Received	Balance Due
Am Samoa	600.00		600.00	0.00
Micronesia	600.00		600.00	0.00
Northern Marianas	600.00			600.00
Alaska	10,645.98		10,645.98	0.00
Arizona	18,513.53		18,513.53	0.00
California	29,623.41		29,623.41	0.00
Colorado	21,907.35		14,107.35	7,800.00
CSU Rent	(7,800.00)			-7,800.00
Guam	10,382.18		10,382.18	0.00
Hawaii	13,731.05		13,731.05	0.00
Idaho	16,460.61		16,460.61	0.00
Montana	17,378.09		17,378.09	0.00
Nevada	13,501.69		13,501.69	0.00
New Mexico	13,971.89		13,971.89	0.00
Oregon	20,944.89		20,944.89	0.00
Utah	17,592.61		17,592.61	0.00
Washington	26,407.38		26,407.38	0.00
Wyoming	15,646.34		15,646.34	0.00
Assessment Total	\$240,707.00		\$240,107.00	600.00

INCOME/EXPENSE

Date	Transaction	Income	Expense	Balance
07/01/08	Balance forward			\$56,919.75
	YTD Assessments Received	240,107.00		297,026.75
	July Interest	166.91		297,193.66
	August Interest	366.51		297,560.17
	September Interest	468.69		298,028.86
	October Interest	688.05		298,716.91
	November Interest	424.32		299,141.23
	December Interest	335.50		299,476.73
	January Interest	265.76		299,742.49
	February Interest	199.38		299,941.87
	March Interest	175.33		300,117.20
	April Interest	116.95		300,234.15
	May Interest	81.23		300,315.38
	June Interest	61.02		300,376.40
07/01/08	MT Accounting Fee		3,500.00	296,876.40
10/24/08	CSU 08 Fourth/09 First Qtr		77,544.22	219,332.18
03/11/08	CSU Second Qtr		63,199.37	156,132.81
05/07/09	CSU Third Qtr		57,652.96	98,479.85
07/13/09	CSU Fourth Qtr		59,718.12	38,761.73
	TOTAL	243,456.65	261,614.67	38,761.73

**WESTERN DIRECTOR EXPERIMENT STATION
FINANCIAL STATEMENT
FY 2010**

14-Jul-09

ASSESSMENTS	FY10Assessments	Outstanding FY09	Payment Received	Balance Due
Am Samoa	600.00			600.00
Micronesia	600.00			600.00
Northern Marianas	600.00	600.00		1,200.00
Alaska	11,073.96			11,073.96
Arizona	19,257.57			19,257.57
California	30,310.09			30,310.09
Colorado	22,707.77			22,707.77
CSU Rent	(7,800.00)			-7,800.00
Guam	10,799.57			10,799.57
Hawaii	14,282.96			14,282.96
Idaho	17,122.19			17,122.19
Montana	18,076.54		18,076.54	0.00
Nevada	14,044.40			14,044.40
New Mexico	14,533.48			14,533.48
Oregon	21,786.62			21,786.62
Utah	19,132.16			19,132.16
Washington	27,223.51			27,223.51
Wyoming	16,275.19			16,275.19
Assessment Total	\$250,626.00	\$600.00	\$18,076.54	233,149.46

INCOME/EXPENSE

Date	Transaction	Income	Expense	Balance
07/01/09	Balance forward			\$38,761.73
	YTD Assessments Received	18,076.54		56,838.27
	July Interest			56,838.27
	August Interest			56,838.27
	September Interest			56,838.27
	October Interest			56,838.27
	November Interest			56,838.27
	December Interest			56,838.27
	January Interest			56,838.27
	February Interest			56,838.27
	March Interest			56,838.27
	April Interest			56,838.27
	May Interest			56,838.27
	June Interest			56,838.27
07/01/09	MT Accounting Fee		3,500.00	53,338.27
	CSU First Qtr			53,338.27
	CSU Second Qtr			53,338.27
	CSU Third Qtr			53,338.27
	CSU Fourth Qtr			53,338.27
	TOTAL	18,076.54	3,500.00	53,338.27

**WESTERN DIRECTOR ACADEMIC PROGRAMS
FINANCIAL STATEMENT
FY 2009**

14-Jul-09

ASSESSMENTS	FY09 Assessments	FY08 Outstanding	Payment Received	Balance Due
Alaska	1,267.29		1,267.29	\$0.00
American Samoa	200.00		200.00	\$0.00
Arizona	1,267.29		1,267.29	\$0.00
California	1,267.29		1,267.29	\$0.00
Colorado	1,267.29		1,267.29	\$0.00
Guam	1,267.29		1,267.29	\$0.00
Hawaii	1,267.29		1,267.29	\$0.00
Idaho	1,267.29		1,267.29	\$0.00
Micronesia	200.00		200.00	\$0.00
Montana	1,267.29		1,267.29	\$0.00
Northern Marianas	200.00			\$200.00
Nevada	1,267.29		1,267.29	\$0.00
New Mexico	1,267.29			\$1,267.29
Oregon	1,267.29		1,267.29	\$0.00
Utah	1,267.29		1,267.29	\$0.00
Washington	1,267.29		1,267.29	\$0.00
Wyoming	1,267.29		1,267.29	\$0.00
Assessment Total	\$18,342.00	\$0.00	\$16,874.77	\$1,467.23

INCOME/EXPENSE

Date	Transaction	Income	Expense	Balance
07/01/08	Balance forward			\$5,845.84
	YTD Assessments Received	16,874.77		22,720.61
	July Interest	14.34		22,734.95
	August Interest	29.72		22,764.67
	September Interest	34.30		22,798.97
	October Interest	47.19		22,846.16
	November Interest	41.58		22,887.74
	December Interest	32.87		22,920.61
	January Interest	26.04		22,946.65
	February Interest	19.54		22,966.19
	March Interest	17.20		22,983.39
	April Interest	12.79		22,996.18
	May Interest	10.20		23,006.38
	June Interest	8.35		23,014.73
10/8/2008	CSU 08 Fourth/09First Qtr		8,872.25	14,142.48
3/11/2009	CSU Second Qtr		4,585.50	9,556.98
5/3/2009	CSU Third Qtr		4,585.50	4,971.48
7/14/2009	CSU Fourth Qtr		4,585.50	385.98
TOTAL		\$17,168.89	\$22,628.75	385.98

**WESTERN DIRECTOR ACADEMIC PROGRAMS
FINANCIAL STATEMENT
FY 2010**

14-Jul-09

ASSESSMENTS	FY10 Assessments	FY09 Outstanding	Payment Received	Balance Due
Alaska	1,304.64			\$1,304.64
American Samoa	200.00			\$200.00
Arizona	1,304.64			\$1,304.64
California	1,304.64			\$1,304.64
Colorado	1,304.64			\$1,304.64
Guam	1,304.64			\$1,304.64
Hawaii	1,304.64			\$1,304.64
Idaho	1,304.64			\$1,304.64
Micronesia	200.00			\$200.00
Montana	1,304.64			\$1,304.64
Northern Marianas	200.00	200.00		\$400.00
Nevada	1,304.64			\$1,304.64
New Mexico	1,304.64	1,267.29		\$2,571.93
Oregon	1,304.64			\$1,304.64
Utah	1,304.64			\$1,304.64
Washington	1,304.64			\$1,304.64
Wyoming	1,304.64			\$1,304.64
Assessment Total	\$18,865.00	\$1,467.29	\$0.00	\$20,332.29

INCOME/EXPENSE

Date	Transaction	Income	Expense	Balance
07/01/08	Balance forward			\$385.98
	YTD Assessments Received	0.00		385.98
	July Interest			385.98
	August Interest			385.98
	September Interest			385.98
	October Interest			385.98
	November Interest			385.98
	December Interest			385.98
	January Interest			385.98
	February Interest			385.98
	March Interest			385.98
	April Interest			385.98
	May Interest			385.98
	June Interest			385.98
	CSU First Qtr			385.98
	CSU Second Qtr			385.98
	CSU Third Qtr			385.98
	CSU Fourth Qtr			385.98
TOTAL		\$0.00	\$0.00	385.98

**WESTERN DIRECTOR'S SPECIAL ACCOUNT
FINANCIAL STATEMENT
FY 2009**

14-Jul-09

ASSESSMENTS			
	FY09 Assessment	Payment	Balance Due
Alaska	\$0.00		\$0.00
Arizona	0.00		0.00
California	0.00		0.00
Colorado	0.00		0.00
Guam	0.00		0.00
Hawaii	0.00		0.00
Idaho	0.00		0.00
Montana	0.00		0.00
Nevada	0.00		0.00
New Mexico	0.00		0.00
Oregon	0.00		0.00
Utah	0.00		0.00
Washington	0.00		0.00
Wyoming	0.00		0.00
Assessment Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

INCOME/EXPENSE				
Date	Transaction	Income	Expense	Balance
07/01/08	Balance forward			\$14,614.88
05/22/08	Univ of WY/Grant Workshop	8746.15		\$23,361.03
	FY09 Assessment Received	\$0.00		23,361.03
YTD	July Interest	\$35.24		23,396.27
	August Interest	\$44.11		23,440.38
	September Interest	\$45.57		23,485.95
	October Interest	\$51.38		23,537.33
	November Interest	\$45.27		23,582.60
	December Interest	\$35.79		23,618.39
	January Interest	\$28.35		23,646.74
	February Interest	\$21.27		23,668.01
	March Interest	\$18.79		23,686.80
	April Interest	\$17.42		23,704.22
	May Interest	\$16.20		23,720.42
	June Interest	\$14.30		23,734.72
				23,734.72
				23,734.72
				23,734.72
		\$373.69	\$0.00	23,734.72
Total				

NOTE: Grant Workshop Income from University of Wyoming given for Special Account Use

**WESTERN DIRECTOR'S SPECIAL ACCOUNT
FINANCIAL STATEMENT
FY 2010**

14-Jul-09

ASSESSMENTS			
	FY10 Assessment	Payment	Balance Due
Alaska	\$0.00		\$0.00
Arizona	0.00		0.00
California	0.00		0.00
Colorado	0.00		0.00
Guam	0.00		0.00
Hawaii	0.00		0.00
Idaho	0.00		0.00
Montana	0.00		0.00
Nevada	0.00		0.00
New Mexico	0.00		0.00
Oregon	0.00		0.00
Utah	0.00		0.00
Washington	0.00		0.00
Wyoming	0.00		0.00
Assessment Total	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00

INCOME/EXPENSE

Date	Transaction	Income	Expense	Balance
07/01/09	Balance forward			\$23,734.72
	FY09 Assessment Received	\$0.00		23,734.72
YTD	July Interest			23,734.72
	August Interest			23,734.72
	September Interest			23,734.72
	October Interest			23,734.72
	November Interest			23,734.72
	December Interest			23,734.72
	January Interest			23,734.72
	February Interest			23,734.72
	March Interest			23,734.72
	April Interest			23,734.72
	May Interest			23,734.72
	June Interest			23,734.72
				23,734.72
				23,734.72
				23,734.72
		\$0.00	\$0.00	23,734.72
Total				

Action Requested: For information
Action Taken: Approved Treasurer's Report

Agenda Item 5.0: ESCOP Science and Technology Committee Report

Presenter: Gregory Bohach

Background Information:

1. Committee Membership:

- Chair
 - Greg Bohach (WAAESD)
- Delegates
 - John Liu (SAAESD)
 - Nancy Cox (SAAESD)
 - Mike Hoffmann (NERA)
 - Tom Brady (NERA)
 - Steve Meredith (ARD)
 - Ambrose Anuro (ARD)
 - Larry Curtis (WAAESD)
 - William Ravlin (NCRA)
- Executive Vice-Chair
 - Dan Rossi (NERA, Executive Director)
- CSREES Representative
 - Meryl Broussard
- ERS Representative
 - Terry Nelsen
- Social Science Subcommittee Representative
 - Travis Park
- Pest Management Strategies Subcommittee Representative
 - Frank Zalom
- Liaisons
 - Cliff Gabriel (Office of Science and Technology Policy)
 - Edwin Price (ICOP)

2. Multistate Research Award

The 2009 Multistate Research Award announcement was released on December 19, 2008. The deadline for submission to the regional associations was February 27, 2009. The Committee received nominations from three regional associations – NERA, SAAESD, and WAAESD) and recommended S-1039, “*Biology, Impact and Management of Soybean Insect Pests in Soybean Production Systems*” as the national winner. The ESCOP Executive Committee approved this recommendation and information about the winner was forwarded to APLU. The project will be honored at the APLU Annual Meeting in Washington, DC on November 15, 2009.

3. Science Roadmap

At the March ESCOP meeting, the Science and Technology Committee received approval to proceed with proposal to utilize the Delphi process for identifying and confirming grand challenge areas and respective research objectives for the Science Roadmap. It was proposed that deans, directors of research, Extension and academic programs and key faculty in each institution be asked to participate in the process. A formal proposal to implement this process was prepared by Dr. Travis park of Cornell and the Executive Committee approved the expenditure of up to \$5,000 to support Cornell's efforts to implement the process and analyze the data. A letter was prepared for ESCOP Chair Steve Pueppke to send to Deans and Directors requesting their participation and the nomination of up to five researchers or Extension educators to also participate in the process. The first round was initiated on June 10 and 229 respondents participated.

Once the challenges and objectives are confirmed, the Committee will work on identifying current gaps in knowledge and resources, strategies and metrics to measure progress.

4. Future Meetings

The next face-to-face meeting of the Committee will be in February, 2010 in Washington, DC. The Committee plans to again meet jointly with the Social Sciences Subcommittee.

Actions Requested: For discussion only.

Agenda Item 6.0: ARS REPORT

Presenter: Andrew Hammond

Background:

July 22, 2009

AREA LEADERSHIP

Pacific West Area

- Area Director: Andrew Hammond
- Associate Area Director: Robert Matteri
- Assistant Area Director: Vacant
- *Alaska, Arizona, California, Hawaii, Idaho, Nevada, Oregon, Washington*

Northern Plains Area

- Area Director: Will Blackburn
- Associate Area Director: Vacant
- Assistant Area Director: Mickey McGuire
- *Colorado, Kansas, Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota, Utah, Wyoming*

Southern Plains Area

- Area Director: Dan Upchurch
- Associate Area Director: James Coppedge
- Arkansas, *New Mexico*, Oklahoma, Texas, (Panama)

BUDGET

FY 2009 Appropriation

- ARS Salaries and Expenses: \$1,140,406,000
- ARS Buildings and Facilities: \$46,752,000
- Provided for ARS in PL 111-5 (ARRA): \$176,000,000

FY 2010 President's Budget

- ARS Salaries and Expenses: \$1,153,368,000
- ARS Budget Priorities
 - Prevent Childhood Obesity
 - Sustainable Agricultural Production of Bioenergy
 - Global Climate Change
 - Reduce World Hunger

FY 2010 Appropriation

- House Report 111-181
 - ARS Salaries and Expenses: \$1,155,568,000
 - ARS Buildings and Facilities: \$35,000,000
- Senate Report 111-039
 - ARS Salaries and Expenses: \$1,181,632,000
 - ARS Buildings and Facilities: \$47,027,000

NEW LEADERSHIP AND VACANCIES

ARIZONA

Maricopa

- U.S. Arid Land Agricultural Research Center, Water Management and Conservation Research Unit, VACANT, Research Leader

CALIFORNIA

Albany

- Western Regional Research Center, VACANT, Center Director

Davis

- National Clonal Germplasm Repository for Tree Fruit/Nut Crops and Grapes, VACANT, Research Leader

Parlier

- San Joaquin Valley Agricultural Sciences Center, Commodity Protection & Quality Research Unit, VACANT, Research Leader

WYOMING

Laramie

- Arthropod Borne Animal Disease Research Unit, Dr. Jim Mecham, Acting Research Leader, Recruitment suspended pending outcome of FY 2009/2010 budget process proposing transfer of all personnel to Ames, IA – Senate markup directs ABADRL to Manhattan, KS

COLORADO

Fort Collins

- National Center for Genetic Resources Preservation, New Research Leader: David Dierig

Action Requested: For information

Agenda Item 7.0: State Issues Discussion

Presenter: All

Background:

Each member presented information on activities and issues at their institution. The information is contained in Agenda Item 11.12 State Reports.

Action Requested: For information

Agenda Item 8.0: Appointments and Election of Officers

Presenter: Carol Lewis

Background:

Lewis presented the slate of nominees for officers as recommended by the Executive Committee:

Office	Current	2010
Chair*	David Thawley	Carol Lewis
Past Chair*	Greg Bohach	Continuing
Chair-elect*	Carol Lewis	Jeff Jacobsen
Secretary	Jan Auyong	Continuing
Treasurer	Jeff Jacobsen	Continuing
At large Exec Committee Member	Steve Miller	Barbara Allen-Diaz
At large Exec Committee Member	Greg Wiecko	Continuing
RCIC replacement for Kaltenbach**	Colin Kaltenbach	Brett Hess
RCIC replacement for Miller	Miller	Greg Wiecko
NRSP-RC**	Ralph Cavalieri	Continuing
Resolutions Committee	Jan Auyong/Greg Bohach	Continuing

* These officers are official Association representatives to ESCOP

** four year term

Nominations were sought from the floor.

Action Requested: Approval of Slate of Nominees

Action Taken: Unanimously approved election of slate of officers

Agenda Item 9.1: ESS Annual Meeting**Presenter: H. Michael Harrington****Background:**

The ESS Annual meeting will be held in Oklahoma City September 14-17, 2009 at the [Sheraton Oklahoma City Hotel](#). Registration and other information will be forthcoming. The draft schedule is as follows:

MONDAY, September 14, 2009	
3:00 – 6:00	Regional Meetings
6:00	Opening Reception
TUESDAY, September 15, 2009	
7:00 – 8:00	Breakfast
8:00 – 10:00	Oklahoma State Presentations (Clarence)
10:00 – 10:30	Break
10:30 – 12:00	ESS Business Meeting (Arlen & Steve)
12:00 – 1:30	Lunch
1:30 – 3:00	ESS Business Meeting (Arlen & Steve)
3:00 – 3:30	Break
3:30 – 5:00	Best Management Practices Session (Eric & Carolyn)
5:30 – 7:00	Hospitality Suite
	Dinner on your own
WEDNESDAY, September 16, 2009	
7:00 – 8:00	Breakfast
8:00 – 9:30	REE Under Secretary, NIFA Director, ARS Director (Eric & Arlen)
9:30 – 10:00	Break
10:00 – 11:30	Science Roadmap, general discussion & 5 breakouts (Dan)
11:30 – 1:00	Lunch
1:00 – 3:00	Federal Budget Priorities, general discussion & 5 breakouts (Mike)

3:00 – 3:30	Break
3:30 – 5:00	Research Constraints related to Intellectual Property and Genetic Modification (Arlen)
5:30	Load buses for National Cowboy & Western Heritage Museum
6:00 – 10:00	Museum Visit and Banquet
THURSDAY, September 17, 2009	
7:00 – 8:00	Breakfast
8:00 – 10:00	Meeting room available if needed

Action Requested: For information

Agenda Item 9.2: Joint Spring Meeting with SAAESD

Presenter: H. Michael Harrington

Background:

We will be meeting jointly with the SAAESD in Virginia Beach VA the week of March 22. Tentative plans would have the RCIC meeting on Tuesday followed by individual, joint meetings and a tour of agriculture in the region see attachment. Arrangements are being made at the Holiday Inn Oceanside

Action Requested: For information

SAAESD Meeting 2010 or 2011 Virginia Beach, VA

Possible Tour Stops

Hampton Roads Agricultural Research and Extension Center – Virginia Beach

Provides leadership for the vitality of the environmental horticulture industries -- nursery, landscape, urban tree care, and turf

The Virginia Seafood Agricultural Research and Extension Center

Provide technical assistance to the seafood and aquaculture industries of Virginia thereby helping them to remain competitive economically on a global scale.

Tangier Island – commercial fishing and crabbing

Dublin Farms-Horntown, VA-Potato Farm


Pacific Tomato Co.-Grape Tomatoes Eastern Shore Farmers Market-Melfa, VA

Cherrystone Aqua Farms-Clam Farming, Cheriton, VA

C&E Farms-Snap Bean Operation, Cheriton, VA

Tankard Nurseries-Exmore, VA

Chatham Vineyards & Winery- Machipongo, VA





Western Regional 2010

Save the Date


July 12-15, 2010

Tucson, Arizona

Loews Ventana Canyon Resort

Mid Managers Meeting

July 14-16, 2010



Agenda Item 9.4: 2009 Western Administrative Officers Meeting

Presenter: Jeff Jacobsen

Background:

Jacobsen announced that Montana State University was hosting the 2009 Western Administrative Officers Meeting on September 16-18 in Bozeman, MT. He encouraged all the Directors to support sending their administrative officers to the meeting.

Action Requested: For information

Agenda Item 10.0: Resolutions

Presenter: Greg Bohach

Background:

Resolution #1

WHEREAS Dean Daniel Bernardo and his colleagues including Drs. Ralph Cavalieri, Kim Kidwell, Linda Kirk Fox, and John Winder of the College of Agricultural, Human, and Natural Resources at Washington State University and,

Whereas President Cheryl Crazy Bull and Director Susan Given-Seymour from Northwest Indian College were organizers and hosts for the Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors and the Western Region Joint Summer Meeting at Semiahmoo Resort in Blaine, Washington, July 19-22; and

WHEREAS Drs. Bernardo, Cavalieri, Crazy Bull, Given-Seymour, Kidwell, Kirk Fox, Winder and their associates provided such hospitable surroundings in which to meet; and

WHEREAS Drs. Bernardo, Cavalieri, Crazy Bull, Given-Seymour, Kidwell, Kirk Fox, Winder and their associates were outstanding hosts; and

WHEREAS Drs. Bernardo, Cavalieri, Crazy Bull, Given-Seymour, Kidwell, Kirk Fox, Winder and their associates arranged excellent joint meetings with timely and relevant presentations, tours of stakeholder facilities, and other activities having the thematic focus of 'Foods, Farms, and Fish', be it

RESOLVED that the Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors at its meeting at the Semiahmoo Resort in Blaine, Washington on July 22, expresses its sincere and heartfelt appreciation to Drs. Bernardo, Cavalieri, Crazy Bull, Given-Seymour, Kidwell, Kirk Fox, Winder and their associates for their significant contributions to successful individual and joint meetings; and be it further

RESOLVED that originals of this resolution be provided to Dean Bernardo and President Crazy Bull and that a copy be filed as part of the official minutes of this meeting.

Resolution #2

WHEREAS Dr. H. Paul Rasmussen served as Director of the Utah Agricultural Experiment Station and as a valued administrator at Utah State University (Associate Dean for Research in the College of Agriculture and as a Utah State University Associate Vice President for Research) for the past 20 years;

WHEREAS Dr. H. Paul Rasmussen has been active in the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges and the Experiment Station Committee on Organization and Policy (ESCOP), and has chaired the national organization and has served on numerous ESCOP committees;

WHEREAS Dr. H. Paul Rasmussen was recognized in 2004 by Utah State University with the Leone Leadership Award which honors outstanding administrative activity;

WHEREAS Dr. H. Paul Rasmussen served on numerous state and national boards and was instrumental in negotiating and securing funding for many programs and facilities that will have a lasting impact on Utah State University and agriculture in Utah, including creation of the Utah Botanical Center and the University's Center for Integrated BioSystems and construction of new Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratories in Logan and Nephi;

WHEREAS Dr. H. Paul Rasmussen also served on the faculty of the Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station and Michigan State University conducting extensive research and widely publishing on topics related to horticulture and electron microscopy;

WHEREAS Dr. H. Paul Rasmussen chaired the Department of Horticulture and Landscape at Washington State University for seven years prior to returning to Utah State University as Associate Director of the Utah Agricultural Experiment Station; In 1989, Dr. H. Paul Rasmussen became the 15th experiment station Director in the history of Utah State University, just over 100 years from the experiment station's and university's founding;

WHEREAS Dr. H. Paul Rasmussen retired on May 1, 2009, from the Utah State University; therefore, be it

RESOLVED that the Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors at their meeting at the Semiahmoo Resort in Blaine, Washington, on July22, 2009, expresses its sincere and heartfelt appreciation to Dr. H. Paul Rasmussen, for the significant contributions he has made to our Association; and be it further

RESOLVED, that a copy of this resolution be provided to Dr. H. Paul Rasmussen, and that a copy be filed as part of the official minutes of this meeting.

Action Requested: Approval of Resolutions

Action Taken: Unanimously approved resolution to Washington State University hosts and resolution to H. Paul Rasmussen

Agenda Item 11.1: RCIC Report

Presenter: Harriet Sykes

Background:

REGIONAL COORDINATION IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE (RCIC)

PRELIMINARY DIGEST OF ACTIONS FOR 2009

(summary of Spring & Summer meetings)

July 20, 2009

1.0 The following Western Multistate Research Projects/Coordinating Committees/Development Committees terminated on September 30, 2009.

- 1.1 W1004 "Marketing, Trade, and Management of Fisheries and Aquaculture Resources" (to be replaced by W2004)
- 1.2 W1128 "Microirrigation for sustainable water use" (replaced by W2128)
- 1.3 W1170 "Chemistry, Bioavailability, And Toxicity Of Constituents In Residuals And Residual-Treated Soils" (replaced by W2170)
- 1.4 W1171 "Germ Cell and Embryo Development and Manipulation for the Improvement of Livestock" (to be replaced by W2171)
- 1.5 W1181 "Modifying Milk Fat Composition for Improved Nutritional and Market Value"
- 1.6 W1187 "Interactions among Bark Beetles, Pathogens, and Conifers in North American Forests" (replaced by W2187)
- 1.7 W1188 "Characterizing Mass and Energy Transport at Different Scales " (to be replaced by W2188)
- 1.8 W1190 "Interfacing technological, economic, and institutional principles for managing inter-sector mobilization of water" (to be replaced by W2190)
- 1.9 WDC012 "Integrating Access to Information from Herbaria" (replaced by WERA1015)
- 1.10 WDC013 "Implementation and Assessment of IPM in Urban Environments"
- 1.11 WERA095 "Vertebrate Pests of Agriculture, Forestry and Public Lands"
- 1.12 WERA110 "Improving ruminant use of forages in sustainable production systems for the western U.S." (to be replaced by W1012)

2.0 The following multistate projects are approved from 10/1/2009 - 9/30/2014

- 2.1 W006 "Plant Genetic Resource Management, Preservation, Characterization and Utilization"
- 2.2 W1012 "Improving ruminant use of forages in sustainable production systems for the western U.S." (from WERA110) - pending minor revision

- 2.3 W2004 “Marketing, Trade, and Management of Aquaculture and Fishery Resources” (from W1004) - pending minor revision
- 2.4 W2128 “Microirrigation for Sustainable Water Use” (from W1128)
- 2.5 W2170 “Soil-Based Use of Residuals, Wastewater and Reclaimed Water” (from W1170)
- 2.6 W2171 “Germ Cell and Embryo Development and Manipulation for the Improvement of Livestock” (from W1171) - pending minor revision
- 2.7 W2187 “Interactions of Emerging Threats and Bark Beetle Microbial Dynamics in Forest Ecosystems” (from W1187)
- 2.8 W2188 “Characterizing Mass and Energy Transport at Different Vadose Zone Scales” (from W1188) - pending minor revision
- 2.9 W2190 “Water Policy and Management Challenges in the West” (from W1190) - pending minor revision

3.0 The following WERA projects are approved for five years, from 10/1/2009 to 9/30/2014.

- 3.1 WERA1015 “Developing the U.S. National Virtual Herbarium” (from WDC12)
- 3.2 WERA072 “Agribusiness Scholarship Emphasizing Competitiveness” - pending minor revision
- 3.3 WERA077 “Managing Invasive Weeds in Wheat” - pending minor revision
- 3.4 WERA1004 “Agricultural and Community Development in the American Pacific” - pending minor revision
- 3.5 WCC1003 “Coordination of Western Regional Extension Forestry Activities” - pending minor revision

4.0 The following multistate projects/development committees/coordinating committees received one-year extensions (to 9/30/2010)

- 4.1 W503 “Economic, Environmental, Genetic, and Nutritional Aspects of Grass fed Beef”
- 4.2 WERA11 “Western Regional Turfgrass Research”

5.0 The following development committee was established, from 10/1/2009 to 9/30/2010.

- 5.1 WDC17 “Production, Transition Handling, and Reestablishment of Perennial Nursery Stock”

6.0 The following NRSP project(s) are approved for five years, from 10/1/2009 to 9/30/2014 (these projects require approval of a majority of the four regional associations, as well as approval by the NRSP Review Committee and the ESS)

6.1 NRSP003 “The National Atmospheric Deposition Program (NADP)”

7.0 Mid-term Reviews:

The following projects were reviewed and appear to be progressing satisfactorily with good publication records, adequate resources and/or participation, and the committees are following their stated objectives. The review comments are available to the Administrative Advisor on NIMSS.

W1005	An Integrated Approach to Prevention of Obesity in High Risk Families	Fox (WA)
W1006	Agricultural Literacy	Straquadine (UT)
W1112	Reproductive Performance in Domestic Ruminants	Kaltenbach (AZ)
W1173	Stress Factors of Farm Animals and Their Effects on Performance	Kaltenbach (AZ)
W1192	Economic, Social, and Ecological Issues of Rangeland Fragmentation that Affect Rangeland Sustainability and Rural Communities	Snyder (UT)
WCC1006	Management of the Mexican Wolf	Kaltenbach (AZ)
WERA020	Virus and Virus-Like Diseases of Fruit Trees, Small Fruits, and Grapevines	Cavalieri (WA)
WERA040	Application and Utility of the Ecological Site and Condition Concept for Monitoring Rangeland Ecological Status in the Western U.S.	Miller (WY)
WERA066	Integrated Management of Russian Wheat Aphid and Other Cereal Arthropod Pests	Holtzer & Sommers (CO)
WERA089	Potato Virus Disease Control	Bohach (ID)
WERA099	Broodstock Management, Genetics and Breeding Programs for Molluscan Shellfish	Auyong (OR)
WERA1007	Curly Top virus Biology, Transmission, Ecology, and Management	Loring (NM)
WERA1008	Rangelands West Partnership	Kaltenbach (AZ)

8.0 Administrative Advisor assignments:

- 8.1 W1171 “Germ Cell and Embryo Development and Manipulation for the Improvement of Livestock” - Milan Shipka (AK) replaced C. Y. Hu (HI)
- 8.2 WERA097 “Diseases of Cereals” - John Sherwood and Jeff Jacobsen (MT) replaced Tim Murray and Ralph Cavalieri (WA)
- 8.3 NRSP6 “Inter-Regional Potato Introduction Project: Acquisition, classification, preservation, evaluation and distribution of potato (Solanum) germplasm” - Larry Curtis (OR) replaced C. Y. Hu (HI)

- 8.4 W1005 “An Integrated Approach to Prevention of Obesity in High Risk Families” - Linda Houtkooper (AZ) to replace Linda Fox (WA)
- 8.5 W1006 “Agricultural Literacy” - replacement for G. Straquadine (UT) to be determined
- 8.6 W2001 Population Dynamics and Change: Aging, Ethnicity and Land Use Change in Rural Communities - Jim Christenson (AZ) to replace Linda Fox (WA)
- 8.7 WERA-11 “Western Regional Turfgrass Research” - Greg Wiecko (GU) to replace Steve Wallner and Lee Sommers (CO)

9.0 Other Business

- 9.1 RCIC approved changes to the NIMSS Appendix B (Appendix B: Coordinating Committee or Extension/Education Research Activity (CC or ERA only))
- 9.2 RCIC approved that the WAAESD Executive Director serve as the ex-officio Chair of RCIC
- 9.3 RCIC authorized the Office of the WAAESD Executive Director to make non-substantive changes to the Western Region Supplemental Guidelines for Regional Research

Action Requested: For information

Agenda Item 11.2: System Communications and Marketing Update

Presenters: H M Harrington

Background:

Podesta Group has been contracted to provide assistance in “getting or message out” to a variety of audiences. One major change is that the e-newsletter, each of which is based on a theme, is now a monthly effort. You should be receiving requests for stories that might be included. Additional details are below.

Upcoming e- newsletter Themes:

- July: Energy Conservation and Biofuels, submission deadline July 15
- August: No newsletter – August recess
- September: Nutrition & Wellness/Obesity, submission deadline 15
- October: Sustainability, submission deadline 15

PODESTA REPORT JAN 1 TO MARCH 30, 2009

I. Communications And Media Outreach

1. ***Research, solicit and categorize relevant case studies to be highlighted in the messaging materials***

Researched and drafted pieces for enewsletter which includes the compelling and timely work of several institutions.

2. ***Formulate messages that can be utilized within the industry, on Capitol Hill and in the national and local media***

Developed content for the winter edition of the enewsletter.

3. ***Draft press releases to highlight the research, extension, teaching and international work of land-grant institutions***

Drafted invitation letters for site visits for every target Member office identified in the second year strategic plan.

4. ***Develop op-eds***

Secured publication of an op-ed piece in the Sunday edition of the Washington Times by Allen Levine, the Dean of the College of Food, Agriculture and Natural Resources at the University of Minnesota, titled the Art of Science and Agriculture. This is involved redrafting Dr. Levine submission by linking into to a current event in the news, in this case, President’s Obama’s state of the union speech and the recent passed economic recovery package. PG pitched to several national publications and eventually placed it in the Washington Times. It also ran in the “online” newspaper, Minnpost.com.

5. ***Generate a quarterly e-newsletter which highlights relevant site visits, showcases research, extension, teaching and international stories, and features an editorial submission from a prominent senator or representative.***

Newsletter was sent in mid March and featured a read-through rate of 20 percent. This newsletter featured an op-ed by Rep. Sanford Bishop (D-GA) on the importance research and extension funding that highlighted the work of Fort Valley State. It also highlighted the various ways in which APLU's member university cooperative extension services are helping citizens cope in a struggling economy. Newsletter also included information on the land grant institutions that are currently leading the fight against obesity.

6. ***In addition, PG will also recruit compelling spokespeople within the system who could be made available for interviews with reporters. We will create and maintain - by subject - a list of top-flight spokespeople from a geographically diverse cross-section of institutions who can serve as expert sources for targeted reporters. We will solicit media interviews with reporters and columnists for these spokespeople on hot topics that will serve to highlight and market the research, extension, teaching and international work of relevant institutions.***

PG worked with University of Nebraska Researcher Dr. Ken Cassman to promote the result of a study published in the Journal of Industrial Ecology. This led to the following stories: Corn ethanol produces half emissions of gas: study, Dow Jones News Wire, 1/23/09; Ethanol not so wasteful, report says, Omaha World Herald, 1/27/09; Ethanol study touts emissions, Argus Leader, 1/25/09; New Study Claims Corn Ethanol Helps the Environment, After All, Wall Street Journal, 1/26/09; Research finds ethanol less a threat to environment, Grand Island Independent, 1/25/09:

II. Targeted Activities

1. ***In coordination with Cornerstone, PG will develop a prioritized list of targets. PG will create a calendar of relevant institution events and develop a quarterly site visit program. Where possible, we will tailor specific events at land-grant institutions to match research, extension, teaching or international activities with the political priorities of targets. Working with the targets themselves, PG will aggressively market site visit appearances to the local media.***

Compiled a comprehensive list of next-stage targets as a component of the Second Year plan. The list of targets includes senators: Jack Reed, Sam Brownback, Mark Pryor, Susan Collins, Jon Tester, Arlen Specter, and representatives: Steve Rothman, Sanford Bishop, Lincoln Davis, Maurice Hinchey, Jesse Jackson Jr., Jack Kingston, Jo Ann Emerson, Ben Chandler, and Tom Cole. In addition, drafted and presented to the SCMIC a comprehensive strategic plan for the second year of the marketing campaign.

2. ***Secure sponsorship of an op-ed in e-newsletter or other publication.***

Secured publication of an op-ed piece in the Washington Times by Allen Levine, titled the Art of Science and Agriculture. Published piece by Rep. Sanford Bishop (GA-2) on the importance of providing USDA research funding in the FY10 appropriations process in the quarterly e-newsletter.

3. ***Attend Field, Science or Extension days at AES or other institution facilities.***

Attended the Science on the Hill day on March 3rd and gathered information from exhibiting

institutions to feature in future marketing efforts.

4. ***Placement of media stories in media outlets appropriate for identified target(s)***

Not timely at this juncture

5. ***Identify and assist in arranging visits to projects conducted by institutions overseas when congressional delegations are near the projects.***

Not timely at this juncture.

6. ***Pursue opportunities for institution advocates to testify at relevant forums, summits, panels, or other events, and assist in drafting statements that would be used and pitch the appearances to relevant media institutions.***

Not timely at this juncture

7. ***Pursue profile stories on the work of the institutions with national, regional and trade press***

Drafted summary document highlighting new research by University of Nebraska researcher Dr. Ken Cassman. Utilized document to pitch story to reporters from the Associated Press, Reuters and Des Moines Register. Secured interest from targeted reporters in Dr. Cassman work once it has been published in a peer-reviewed journal.

8. ***Assist Cornerstone, when requested, to place and shape media stories regarding priority funding issues***

Not timely at this juncture

III. Meetings And Conference Calls

PG will work closely with the NASULGC team to assist with meeting planning, implementation, and marketing as needed. Some specifics are highlighted below.

1. ***Plan, organize, and participate in necessary meetings/conference calls***

Participated in several conference calls with members of the marketing committee and deans.

2. ***Provide other assistance as requested by the marketing leadership***

Conducted several meetings with SCMIC officials and Cornerstone Government Affairs

3. ***Joint COPs meeting in July 2009***

Not timely at this juncture.

4. ***APLU Annual Meeting in November 2009***

Not timely at this juncture.

Action Requested: For information

Agenda Item 11.3: Budget and Legislative Committee Report

Presenter: David Boethel/Mike Harrington

Background

Both the House and Senate agriculture appropriations subcommittees have marked up the FY 2010 budget. Overall NIFA funds would increase by nearly 6.5% over FY 2009; with increases proposed for Hatch (3.81 %), McIntire Stennis (8.9%) and Evans- Allen (7.6%). AFRI would increase by a whopping 46% but there was offset by a 40% decrease in Special Grants. The new research programs in the Farm Bill (Organic Agriculture Research and Extension, Specialty Crop Research, Beginning Farmer and Rancher Development; and Biomass R&D) which are not included in the table were maintained at the mandatory amounts totaling \$117 million. The table below shows individual lines and the respective % changes. While there were sizeable increases in certain Extension lines, on a percentage basis research and education activities fared better.

SECTION PRIORITIES FY 2011 RESULTS

Overarching Priorities:

- The Directors indicate that maintaining capacity for research through base funds (Hatch, Evans-Allen, McIntire-Stennis, and Animal Health) is the top priority by 70%:30% margin over moving funds into competitive programs.
- Increasing funding for the AFRI with emphasis on integrated activities continues to be an important priority
- The Directors favor the concept of “continuing services” increases for the formula programs but suggest that the increase should be 5% to 10% rather than the rate of inflation.
- Directors strongly favored seeking increases for new research programs in the 2008 Farm Bill:
 - Biomass Research and Development – 83%
 - Specialty Crops Research Initiative – 83%
 - Organic Agriculture- 52%

WHAT IS THE NEXT \$100 MILLION PROGRAM?

Issue	% Supporting (H+MH)
1. A broad water initiative including supply, quality, use, conservation, etc.	84
2. Focus on the Environment including long term sustainability	83
3. A large scale initiative to provide solutions for bio and renewable energy and the food crisis	83
4. Food, health, obesity and food safety	74
5. Long term sustainable agriculture sites	64
6. Human capacity development including IGERT and young scholars programs	53
7. An integrated National Plant Germplasm System	43

CHANGING BAA-BUDGET AND ADVOCACY COMMITTEE PROCESS AND THE USE OF THEMES

Your committee believes that the use of Themes may be an effective means present our message and to garner additional resources. However, the committee believes that the “Themes” document needs to free of reference to specific programs because this might limit the vision of a particular area. A letter expressing support and the above concern was sent to BAC Chair Scott Smith.

BREAK OUT DISCUSSIONS FOR THE ESS ANNUAL MEETING

Planning is underway for the ESS annual meeting which will develop preliminary priorities for 2012.

National Institute of Food and Agriculture

FY 2010 House and Senate Marks Compared to Prior Years
(All \$Millions)

	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 09-10	FY 09-10
	Enacted	Enacted	President	House	Senate	Mean	Change in	%
Research and Education Activities	Enacted	Enacted	President	House	Senate	Mean	Change in	%
Hatch Act	195.812	207.106	207.106	215.000	215.000	215.000	7.894	3.81
McIntire-Stennis Cooperative Forestry	24.791	27.535	27.535	28.000	30.000	29.000	2.465	8.95
Evans-Allen Program (1890s Research)	41.051	45.504	45.504	48.000	49.000	48.500	3.496	7.68
Agriculture and Food Research Initiative	190.883	201.504	201.504	210.000	295.181	252.591	93.677	46.49
Improved Pest Control	15.313	15.945	15.945	15.945	16.423	16.184	0.478	3.00
Special Research Grants	91.775	84.499	2.021	70.676	50.456	60.566	-34.043	-40.29
Animal Health and Disease (Sec. 1433)	4.971	2.950	2.950	2.950	1.000	1.975	-1.950	-66.10
1994 Institutions Research Program	1.533	1.610	1.610	1.610	2.000	1.805	0.390	24.22
Joe Skeen Institute for Rangeland Restoration	0.983	0.983	0.983	0.983	0.983	0.983	0.000	0.00
Graduate Fellowship Grants	3.675	3.859	3.859	3.859	3.859	3.859	0.000	0.00
Institution Challenge Grants	5.385	5.654	23.154	5.654	5.654	5.654	0.000	0.00
Multicultural Scholars Program	0.981	0.981	0.981	0.981	0.981	0.981	0.000	0.00
Hispanic Education Partnership Grants	6.046	6.237	9.237	10.000	7.737	8.869	1.500	24.05
Secondary/2-year Post Secondary	0.983	0.983	18.483	0.983	0.983	0.983	0.000	0.00
Capacity Building Grants (1890 Institutions)	13.592	15.000	18.000	20.000	16.500	18.250	1.500	10.00
Payments to the 1994 Institutions	3.319	3.342	3.342	3.342	3.342	3.342	0.000	0.00
Native Alaska/Hawaiian-Serving Education Grants	3.196	3.196	3.196	3.196	3.200	3.198	0.004	0.13
Resident Instruction Grants for Insular Areas	0.745	0.800	0.800	1.000	0.800	0.900	0.000	0.00
Distance Education Grants for Insular Areas				1.000		1.000	0.500	100.00
Sun Grant Program		0.000	0.000	3.000		3.000	1.500	100.00
New Era Rural Technology Program		0.750	0.750	1.000	0.750	0.875	0.000	0.00
Veterinary Medical Services Act	0.869	2.950	2.950	4.000	5.000	4.500	2.050	69.49
Federal Administration (Total)	42.154	39.426	12.753	38.498	25.111	31.805	-14.315	-36.31
Alternative Crops	0.819	0.819	0.819	0.000	0.850	0.425	0.031	3.79
Aquaculture Centers (Sec.1475)	3.928	3.928	3.928	3.928	3.928	3.928	0.000	0.00
Critical Agricultural Materials Act	1.083	1.083	1.083	0.000	1.083	0.542	0.000	0.00
Sustainable Agriculture Research & Ed. (SARE)	14.399	14.399	14.399	14.399	14.500	14.450	0.101	0.70
Subtotal	668.286	691.043	622.892	708.004	754.321	731.163	63.278	9.16
	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 09-10	FY 09-10
Extension Activities	Enacted	Enacted	President	House	Senate	Mean	Change in	%
Smith Lever Sections 3(b) and 3(c)	274.660	288.548	288.548	295.000	300.000	297.500	11.452	3.97
Smith Lever Section 3(d):								
Farm Safety	4.726	4.863	0.000	4.863	4.863	4.863	0.000	0.00
Food and Nutrition Education (EFNEP)	65.557	66.155	66.155	68.000	68.139	68.070	1.984	3.00
Indian Reservation Agents	2.979	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.090	3.045	0.090	3.00
New Technologies for Ag Extension (eXtension)	1.475	1.500	1.500	1.500	2.000	1.750	0.500	33.33
Pest Management	9.791	9.791	9.791	9.791	10.085	9.938	0.294	3.00
Sustainable Agriculture	4.568	4.568	4.568	4.568	4.705	4.637	0.137	3.00
Youth at Risk	7.968	8.182	8.182	8.396	8.427	8.412	0.245	2.99
Youth Farm Safety Education and Certification	0.463	0.479	0.479	0.479	0.493	0.486	0.014	2.92
Improved Rural Quality of Life Grants			28.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.00
1890 Institutions and Tuskegee	35.850	40.150	40.150	44.000	41.354	42.677	1.204	3.00
1890 Facilities Grants (Sec. 1447)	17.267	18.000	18.000	21.000	18.540	19.770	0.540	3.00
Renewable Resources Extension Act	4.008	4.008	4.008	4.008	4.128	4.068	0.120	2.99
Rural Health and Safety Education	1.738	1.738	1.738	0.000	1.738	0.869	0.000	0.00
Extension Services at the 1994 Institutions	3.298	3.321	4.321	4.321	4.000	4.161	0.679	20.45
Food Animal Residue Avoidance Database		0.806	0.000	0.806	1.000	0.903	0.194	24.07

Grants to Youth Organizations	1.737	1.767	0.000	1.800	1.767	1.784	0.000	0.00
Women and Minorities in STEM fields					0.500	0.500	0.500	100.00
Federal Administration and Special Grants (total)	17.180	17.374	8.565	13.934	16.463	15.199	-0.911	-5.24
Subtotal	453.265	474.250	487.005	485.466	491.292	488.379	11.216	2.36
	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 09-10	FY 09-10
Integrated Activities	Enacted	Enacted	President	House	Senate	Mean	Change in	%
							\$	Change
Water Quality	12.649	12.649	12.649	12.649	12.649	12.649	0.000	0.00
Food Safety	14.596	14.596	14.596	14.596	14.596	14.596	0.000	0.00
Regional Pest Management Centers	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	4.096	0.000	0.00
Crops at Risk from FQPA Implementation	1.365	1.365	1.365	1.365	1.365	1.365	0.000	0.00
FQPA Risk Mitigation Prog. for Major Food Crops	4.388	4.388	4.388	4.388	4.388	4.388	0.000	0.00
Methyl Bromide Transition Program	3.054	3.054	3.054	3.054	3.054	3.054	0.000	0.00
Organic Transition Program	1.842	1.842	1.842	5.000	1.842	3.421	0.000	0.00
International Science and Education Grants Program	1.986	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000	3.000	0.000	0.00
Critical Issues Program	0.732	0.732	0.732	0.732	0.732	0.732	0.000	0.00
Regional Rural Development Centers	1.312	1.312	1.312	1.312	1.312	1.312	0.000	0.00
Food and Agriculture Defense Initiative	9.830	9.830	9.830	9.830	9.830	9.830	0.000	0.00
Subtotal	55.850	56.864	56.864	60.022	56.864	58.443	0.000	0.00
	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 09-10	FY 09-10
Other NIFA Accounts	Enacted	Enacted	President	House	Senate	Mean	Change in	%
							\$	Change
Tribal Colleges Endowment Fund	11.717	11.880	11.880	11.880	11.880	11.880	0.000	0.00
Interest (Estimated) on Tribal Colleges Endowment	3.209	3.700	3.700	3.700	3.700	3.700	0.000	0.00
	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 2010	FY 09-10	FY 09-10
NIFA (Agency Total)	Enacted	Enacted	President	House	Senate	Mean	Change in	%
							\$	Change
TOTAL	1,192.327	1,237.737	1,182.341	1,269.072	1,318.057	1293.565	80.320	6.49

Action Requested: For information

Agenda Item 11.4: Executive Director Report, April - June, 2009

Presenter: H. Michael Harrington

Background:

I. REGIONAL ACTIVITIES

WAAESD

Meeting Support and Logistics

- **Joint Summer Meeting:** Worked with Chair and Executive Committee to finalize WAAESD agenda. Worked with Lyla Houglum, Linda Fox and others at the WSU to develop agenda for combined session.
- **Western Bioenergy Consortium:** made minor revisions to the draft charter document (CREW) based on feedback/input received from Jan Auyong, Barbara Allen-Diaz and Michael Kahn. Obtained approval of the document and concept. A meeting of the executive committee is being planned for late October in Portland.
- **Western Water Listening Session:** Sought participation for organizing committee, facilitated a number of conference calls, sharpened focus of meeting. See attached summary.

Committee Activities

- **Western SARE Administrative Council:** I serve as the Western Directors' representative on this activity. Completed review of graduate student grant applications.
- **Western Region IMP Center Steering and Advisory Committees:** I participate in policy development discussions, provide background information, review proposals, and participate in funding decisions. Approved priority areas for the FY 2010 RFA.
- **Pacific Basin Advisory Group (T-STAR Program):** The Pacific Basin Advisory Group, in partnership with the Caribbean Advisory Group, administers the Tropical-Subtropical Agriculture Research (T-STAR) special grants program. Participate in policy development decisions, provide background information, review proposals recommended by peer panels and participate in funding decisions. Participated in meeting in Honolulu June 15-18.

Multistate Program

- **Excellence in Multistate Research Awards Program:** Facilitated collection and review of nominations and forwarded to the ESCOP Science and Technology Committee.
- **Impact statements:** Developed agreement with Ms Diane Clarke to develop/edit impact statements for western region multistate projects. To date seven have been finalized and four are pending.
- **CSREES Grantsmanship Workshop, November 10-11, 2009:** The western-most grants workshop will be held in Kansas City in partnership with the University of Missouri, CSREES, and NCRA at the Embassy Suites KC Airport. Working with Arlen Leholm, Marc Linit, Tim Morris, Michael Bowers and others at CSREES to finalize the workshop.

Western Academic Program Directors

- Worked with Nancy Irlbeck to communicate FY 2010 budget and obtain approval from WAPD.

- Revised WAPS By-Laws to reflect the NASULGC to APLU transition

Western Administrative Heads

- Assisted Gene Sander with agenda topics for summer AHS meeting
- Revised WAHS By-Laws to reflect the NASULGC to APLU transition
- Developed draft letter expressing concern over recent appointments of the Policy Board.

II. NATIONAL ACTIVITIES

ESCOP

Committee Activities

- **Chairs Advisory Committee:** Participate in monthly conference calls.
- **ESCOP Budget and Legislative Committee:** Provide support to Chairman David Boethel as the Executive Vice Chair on this important committee. Participated in a number of calls. Organized monthly conference calls to keep committee members informed of latest developments. Provided input to the BAC based on committee input. Obtained regional review of the proposed ‘Themes’ document and developed memo to expressing ESCOP position. Will attend BAC meeting in Minneapolis in July.
- **Farm Bill Implementation Committee:** I am serving on this committee which is providing input on behalf of the BAA to REE on issues related to the 2008 Farm Bill
- **USAF Aviation Biofuels Workshop Steering Committee:** Sought nominations from the region for possible invitees to the important conference. Participated in a number of conference calls and in the identification of some 105 nominees from across the country.
- **LGU Energy Working Group:** Serve as the principle interface between REE and the university system on the REE energy strategic plan. Provide support to this group comprised of representatives from ACOP, ECOP and ESCOP including 1980 participation. The group interfaces with REE on the Energy Science strategic plan and is expected to assist with implementation. The future of this activity is uncertain due leadership changes in REE.
- **BAA Policy Board of Directors:** I provide assistance to the Policy Board’s Energy liaison group to the REE Energy Science to the REE Energy Program.

Summary of Travel April-June 2008

April 8: Western Region Rural Development Center Workshop, Denver

April 20-22: NMCC Meeting, Washington DC

April 26-30: National Extension and Research Administrative Officers Conference, Baltimore, MD

April 29-May 1: Western Region Rural Development Center Board Meeting, Salt Lake City, UT

June 14-18: T-STAR pacific Basin Advisory Group meeting Honolulu, HI

Western Region Water Listening Session

Updated July 14, 2009

Background

The Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors (WAAESD) and the Western Extension Directors Association have agreed that partnering to address pressing needs relating to water in the West is among highest priorities in meeting stakeholder needs. Currently there are seven multistate projects managed by the WAAESD with foci ranging from economics and policy to micro irrigation and watershed management. In addition there are five regional water quality efforts operating with the context of the National Integrated Water Quality Project at USDA-CSREES. However, these efforts should be better integrated among each other and with efforts of the Western Governors Association.

An organizing committee (see below) has held a number of conference calls to discuss agenda, logistics, outcomes, etc for a meeting.

Target Audiences:

- Key stakeholders
- Deans, Directors
- Multistate committees working on various aspect of water
- Water quality project representatives
- Key policy decision makers

Purpose:

- Develop a better understanding of the current water issues from a regional perspective,
- Develop an understanding of the current research, Extension, and education efforts,
- Identify information gaps and research, Extension, and education opportunities,
- What is our competitive niche?
- What can/should the LGUs do?
- What resources are needed?
- Identify new opportunities for multistate collaboration and refocus current multistate efforts.

Potential Outcomes:

A. Internal

- Fostering conversations and effective working relationships on a regional basis and internally (within each LGU) between Experiment Stations, Extension and Water Resources Research Institutes; i.e. Western water projects regularly interact and coordinate activities
- Identification of priorities for water research and Extension programs at LGUs in the western USA.
- University water activities realigned to meet emerging needs
- Recognition and development of new education programs especially those targeted to youth

B. External

- Development of a white paper(s) that prioritize water research and education, and identify gaps to be addressed to effectively deal with western problems.
- WGA, WSWC, CSG-West, and Universities regularly consult to solve current and emerging water problems.

Approach - organizing ourselves:

Who	What	Status
Mike	Each Multistate project would provide a summary of its goals, objectives and outcomes; also include the major gaps and challenges. These would be synthesized into a cogent written report for presentation at the meeting.	
WR- WQ projects	Each state extension water quality project (NIWQP) would provide a summary of its goals, objectives and outcomes; also include the major gaps and challenges. These would be synthesized into a cogent written report for presentation at the meeting.	
Mike and Lyla	Research and Extension in each state would provide a summary of goals, objectives and outcomes; also include the major gaps and challenges. These would be synthesized into a cogent written report for presentation at the meeting.	
Reagan	Each state WRRRI would provide a summary of its goals, objectives and outcomes; also include the major gaps and challenges. These would be synthesized into a cogent written report for presentation at the meeting.	

WAAESD - WEDA Water Listening Session Organizing Committee

Name	Organization	Phone	email
Jonne Hower	WSWC	801 561-5300	jhower@wswc.state.ut.us
Tony Williardson	WSWC	801 561-5300	twillards@wswc.state.ut.us
Tom Iseman	WGA	303 623-9378	tiseman@westgov.org
Kent Briggs	CSG-West	916-553-4423	kbriggs@csg.org
Edgar Ruiz	CSG-West	916-553-4423	eruiz@csg.org
Reagan Waskomb	CO-WRRC	970-491-2974	Reagan.Waskom@Research.ColoState.edu
Bob Mahler	NIWQP (ID)	208-885-7025	bmahler@uidaho.edu
Henry Vaux	CA	510-232-2340 h	vaux0@attglobal.net
Mike O'Neill	CSREES	202-205 -5952	moneill@csrees.usda.gov
Brian Hurd	W1190	575-646-2674	bhurd@nmsu.edu
Lyla Houglum	WEDA	541-737-9920	lyla.houglum@oregonstate.edu
Mike Harrington	WAAESD	970-491-6280	wdal@lamar.colostate.edu

Action Requested: For information

Agenda Item 11.5: National Plant Germplasm Coordinating Committee

Presenters: Lee Sommers/Eric Young

Background:

The National Plant Germplasm Coordinating Committee (NPGCC) met in Beltsville, MD on June 23-24, 2009 at the USDA/ARS George Washington Carver Center. The meeting attendees were Lee Sommers, Tom Burr, Peter Bretting, P.S. Benepal, Ed Kaleikau, Jerry Arkin, Eric Young, Candice Gardner, Ann Marie Thro, and Joe Colletti.

Peter Bretting gave an update from the National Plant Germplasm System (NPGS) and the Plant Germplasm Operations Committee (PGOC) that included the following points:

- New USDA/REE Undersecretary has asked for briefing papers in many areas, including one on the germplasm system. Peter and others have written and submitted this paper which outlines the NPGS strengths and needs.
- The American Type Culture Collection (ATCC) is no longer focused on maintaining plant related microbes, so NPGS has been asked to take this on. The possibility of doing this within the NPGS is being investigated.
- The move to GRIN-Global will be fairly slow within the NPGS because current GRIN database is so large and has numerous users. Other countries will be using the new database system sooner, but the US will eventually transition to it also.
- Even though the Plant Introduction Stations are all facing budget cuts, it has been determined that they can not depend on user fees for significant support because it would shift priorities. Appropriate fees for particular services may be able to supplement budgets in the future, but there are no plans currently to implement this.
- The Plant Introduction Stations continue to receive a large number of requests for seed from private individuals, ~20% of total requests. If the requestor is not involved in research, they are not eligible for seed, but this can become a public relations issue. Usually the Station will send a response explaining the policy and reasons for it. Feedback on this response is generally positive
- PGOC will be working on a system-wide policy for handling requests from the general public. NPGCC will be involved in reviewing and commenting on drafts of this policy as they are developed.

The NPGCC met with Dr. Catherine Parks, Division Chief for Plant Protection and Production in the Research, Education, and Extension Office (REEO). Dr. Parks reported that the REEO Chiefs are working with Undersecretary Shah to identify top priority areas that would help guide activities across all REE agencies. At the time of our meeting, the tentative priority areas were Human Nutrition & Health, International Food Security, Global Climate Change, Bioenergy, and Ecosystem Services. The committee discussed with her the fundamental importance of the NPGS in our ability to address the problems and issues in each of these broad areas. Dr. Parks indicated that it would be useful to have specific examples of how NPGS activities have impacted issues within these areas. Examples are being solicited from the regional Stations and will be compiled and sent to Dr. Parks.

The committee also met with Deborah Sheely, CSREES Deputy Administrator for Competitive Programs, to discuss the new Agriculture and Food Research Initiative (AFRI). Dr. Sheely discussed the new 10-year granting authority given to AFRI in the Farm Bill. This has not yet been implemented, but is being discussed regarding inclusion in future RFA's. The committee indicated that this would be very valuable for long-term research like plant breeding and germplasm collection and characterization.

Actions Requested: For information

Agenda Item 11.6: NRSP-Review Committee Update

Presenter: Ralph Cavalieri

Background:

Current Members: Craig Nessler chair (SAAESD), Michael Vayda (NERA), Alfred Parks (ARD), Tom Bewick (CSREES), Ralph Cavalieri (WAAESD), James Wade (APLU), Don Latham (Stakeholder (CARET), Marshall Martin (NCRA), Dan Rossi (NERA), Eric Young (SAAESD)

The committee has developed draft revisions to the NRPS Guidelines clarifying new project development and review which are under consideration by the regional multistate review committees (see item 11.6b)

Shown below are the committee's recommendations for FY 2011 funding.

1. NRSP-1 Recommendation
 - Approve budget FY10 of \$346,829
 - Renewal proposal next year needs to address future relationship with the new reporting system, REEport
2. NRSP-3 Recommendations
 - Approve renewal proposal for '09 – '14
 - Improve communication of future directors with AES directors
 - Approve FY10 budget of \$50,000
3. NRSP-4 Recommendation
 - Approve FY10 budget of \$481,182
4. NRSP-6 Recommendation
 - Approve FY10 budget of \$150,000
5. NRSP-7 Recommendation
 - Approve proposal for '09 – '14 with the caveat that MRF funding will be reduced each year by whatever special grant is appropriated for this project up to \$325,000 and contingent on an edited proposal with additional information on the following three questions sent to NRSP Review Committee by August 1.
 - What is the process for selecting which drugs are tested through NRSP-7?
 - How many drugs are on the waiting list and what is the projected progress over the next 5 years?
 - Is the industry support for this activity only \$16,800 as indicated in the budget tables? If not, please provide more information on industry support.
 - Approve FY'10 budget of \$325,000, with caveat that MRF funding will be reduced whatever special grant amount is appropriated for this project in FY'10 up to \$325,000. This recommendation is also contingent on the edited proposal.
6. NRSP-8 Recommendation
 - Approve FY'10 budget of \$500,000

- Next year’s budget request must include justification for each species’ budget, including the purpose (ie salary, travel, supplies, etc) and why the funding is divided equally among species rather than based on priority and need.

7. New NRSP Review Process

- Guidelines section VI A. “New NRSP Development”
 - First sentence change “encouraged” to “required” and add “no later than September 1” to end of that sentence.
- Develop peer review form that must be used in peer reviews and add to Guidelines.
- Change Appendices A1 and A2 under “January 15” section by replacing “Executive Directors” with “NRSP Review Committee Chair”.

8. NRSP_temp 201

- Discussion
 - Public breeders and other specialty crops improvement programs need help navigating the regulatory process
 - Project is huge, difficult to determine what decision process will be used to target specific crops
 - Proposal seems to have strong advocacy slant toward government and industry trying to convince public what’s best
 - Public consumers of specialty crops should be primary the stakeholder to help create a market demand for transgenic varieties which would motivate industry to fund regulatory compliance
 - Project needs more involvement of consumers and consumer advocates and refocus on public good
 - The loss of anticipated benefits from transgenic varieties may be more due to lack of public acceptance rather than regulatory requirements
 - One main problem with proposal is the very elaborate structure and organization involved
 - If there is a true need for this type of assistance, private sector would likely provide this service.
 - Need more preliminary work on public need and acceptance of crops being proposed for release
 - NRSP-4 exists because minor crop production industry demanded it, but there does not seem to be a similar demand for this from specialty crop producers
 - In principle this idea has merit but the proposal needs to be refined
 - Activity is appropriate as a NRSP
 - Proposed structure to facilitate regulation process is too elaborate and inefficient
 - Should work with regulatory community to make the process less cumbersome
 - The proposal seems to have made the case that there is a need for this project. The stakeholder comments indicate that the missing element in commercializing transgenic crops is the regulatory hurdle. After a public investment of \$200,000,000, it would be a waste to not leap that hurdle so that consumers could have the choice to use or not use them. However, the structure proposed in this project seems pretty cumbersome and more elaborate than necessary.

- Recommendation
 - Defer the ESS decision on this proposal so that it may be revised and resubmitted to address the following concerns. The four regional Administrative Advisors should be appointed and involved in the revision.
 - Provide documentation of substantive interest by the specialty crop industry for this type of program focused on obtaining data needed for regulatory submissions.
 - Provide a description of the process by which proposals for data collection will be reviewed and selected. This process should include input from the spectrum of stakeholders; including consumer groups, specialty crop industry, environmental, and other organizations.
 - Include a requirement for matching funds (not just in-kind) from the appropriate specialty crops industry to support collection of regulatory data for specific crops.
 - Simplify the proposed organization and structure to reduce costs associated with administration.

9. NRSP_temp161 Recommendation

- Approve proposal for '09 – '14 contingent on a revised proposal answering the following questions being received by NRSP Review Committee no later than August 1, otherwise it will be deferred to next year.
 - Why did NRC stop providing this service? Did they determine if was not needed or used by the industry, or did it become a low budget priority for NRC, or some other reason?
 - What role does ARS have in the proposed activity?
 - Why is the budget split equally between the different activity areas. What is the justification for this? What is basic budget for each coordinator and technical group, ie. salaries/wages, travel, supplies, etc?
 - Why is aquaculture and other minor species (small ruminants, horses, etc.) not included?

Action Requested: For information

Agenda Item 11.7: Biofuels for Aviation Summit, September 1-2, 2009

Presenter: H M Harrington

Background:

The regional Executive Directors were asked to identify potential invitees of the conference sponsored by the US Air Force. A total of 209 nominations were received with 48 from the Western Region. One hundred four (104) names (22 from the West) were identified and potential invitees. These along with nominees from ARS, SunGrant, government industry, etc. will be considered for invitation to the summit. Invitations should be out by the time of this meeting.

Purpose:

The Air Force is planning to have its entire fleet of planes certified for 50 percent biofuel use by the end of 2012. The commercial aviation industry in the US and world-wide is on a similar timeline compared to the Air Force to certify their aircraft for 50 percent biofuel consumption. The purpose of the Biofuels for Aviation Summit is to provide the Air Force and the commercial aviation industry with a realistic assessment of the availability of biofuels by 2012 in different parts of the United States, and then to look ahead 5 years (2017) to determine if technology or other factors may change the availability of biofuels for aviation consumption at that time. Estimated US fuel consumption for both the Air Force and the commercial industry is approximately 1.7 million barrels (or 71.4 million gallons) per day. On a world wide basis the consumption is about 5.0 million (or 210 gallons) per day (see <http://www.eia.doe.gov/pub/international/iea2006/table35.xls>).

The Summit will produce a report estimating the current availability of biofuels and provide 5 year projections on availability. The report will include as well an assessment of how biofuel production could be organized for continuous delivery of quantities demanded to the major airports in the US (specific to particular locations) currently and five years into the future. The Air Force will use the report from this Summit to guide their approach to the introduction of a 50 percent biofuels requirement for their fleet.

Anticipated Results:

The result of the Summit will be the report prepared by the National Center for Food and Agricultural Policy (NCFAP) that details the conclusions of the Summit on the availability of biofuels currently (2012) and five years in the future (2017). In addition, the report will address Summit recommendations that are important to the Air Force and the commercial industry on feedstocks availability, feedstocks logistics, processing deployment, and the economics of the production and consumption prescriptions (five **tracks**). In each of these five **tracks**, a set of three general **issues** will be considered. These issues in general include the carbon footprint, sustainability, and food fuel considerations. In addition, a specific set of **questions** addressing these issues will be put before the participants in the five tracks. After these more general scientific deliberations, the participants in the Summit will be asked to consider five major airports in the US, and to tailor their recommendations to special conditions that the five different localities

present. Thus the report will present general information and specialized information (if necessary) to the localities of the five airports.

Organization:

The Summit will be uniquely designed to generate concrete recommendations on biofuels for aviation. The plenary sessions and luncheons will have individuals as speakers that can set the parameters for the discussions and provide information to address the topics of the five breakout and the airport supply sessions. Approximately 100 of the best agricultural and biofuels scientists from academia and industry will attend and make recommendations, along with about 25-40 representatives from government and industry involved in decisions about biofuels for aviation.

Tentative agenda:

September 1st

8:30 am - 10:00 am	Plenary Session (3 speakers)
10:30 am - 12:00 noon	First session for tracks
12:00 noon - 1:30 pm	Lunch and Speaker
1:30 pm - 3:00 pm	Second session for tracks
3:00 pm - 3:30 pm	Break
3:30 pm - 5:00 pm	Third session for tracks
6:30 pm - 8:00 pm	Reception and Buffet Dinner

(Moderators and recorders meet during the evening to prepare remarks for the opening session in the morning of the 2nd)

September 2nd

8:00 am - 10:00 am	Reports from the five tracks
10:00 am - 10:30 am	Break
10:30 am - 12:30 noon	Sessions on the five airports (i.e., Atlanta, Washington DC, Minneapolis, Dallas, Los Angeles)
12:30 noon- 1:30 pm	Lunch and Speaker
1:30 pm - 3:00 pm	Reports from the airport sessions
3:00 pm – 3:30 pm	Short closing comments, Summit ends

Plenary and Luncheon Session Speakers

Plenary Session I:

- Biofuel research and development as well as the timing of the certification process and expected results
- Possible actions of the commercial airlines for biofuels adoption and a possible time table
- Current state of the art for production and processing, 2012 and 2017

Luncheon Speakers:

- EPA Secretary - describing the situation for carbon footprints and climate change, 2012 and 2017

- USDA or World Bank representative - describing the food/fuel issues for increasing aviation and other biofuels consumption.

Breakout Sessions

- Feedstocks availability
- Feedstocks logistics
- Processing or conversion of biofuels
- Economics including policy issues
- Deployment of the biofuels industry

Roadmap for the Breakout Track Sessions

Track/Session Issues	Feedstocks availability	Feedstocks logistics	Proceession or conversion	Deployment	Economics and policy
Carbon and greenhouse gases	Moderator: Three Panelists:	Moderator: Three Panelists:	Moderator: Robert Brown Three Panelists:	Moderator: Three Panelists	Moderator: Three Panelists:
Sustainability, input requirements, etc.	Moderator: Three Panelists:	Moderator: Three Panelists:	Moderator: Three Panelists:	Moderator: Three Panelists:	Moderator: Three Panelists:
Food/fuels issues	Moderator: Three Panelists:	Moderator: Three Panelists:	Moderator: Three Panelists:	Moderator: Three Panelists:	Moderator: Three Panelists:
Summary	Presented by Moderator	Presented by Moderator	Presented by Moderator	Presented by Moderator	Presented by Moderator

The objectives of the breakout or track sessions will be to develop “game changing” information on the five topics. The idea is to report information that can change the context of the discussion on each of these five main topics.

Supply at different airports will be investigated in the five sessions on the final day of the Summit. Two general questions will be asked of each of the special sessions:

1)What is your recommendation for the feedstock(s), logistics, processing, economics and deployment for supply of the respective airport with current technology (2012)? 2) What is your recommendation for the supply of aviation fuel for the respective airport five years out technology (2017)? The idea is to get specific on recommendations that are special to locations in the US. They will review the topics and issues addressed in each of the breakout session meetings and integrate them for recommendations at specific airport locations. A different set of participants will be in these sessions than in the breakout tracks—specifically, some participants from each of the breakout track will be assigned to each of the five sessions on specific airports. The results of the airport discussions will be reported to all participants during the last session.

Action Requested: For information

Agenda Item 11.8: Non-substantive Changes to WAAESD By-Laws

Presenter: H. M. Harrington

Background:

Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors By-Laws

WESTERN ASSOCIATION OF AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION DIRECTORS

Experiment Station Section

Board on Agriculture Assembly

~~National Association of State Universities~~

~~and Land Grant Colleges~~

Association of Public and Land Grant Universities

Adopted August 8, 1975

Amended August 9, 1982

Amended June 26, 1990

Amended March 24, 1992

Amended September 30, 1999

Amended March 26, 2003

Amended February 15, 2007

Amended July xx, 2009

Article I - Name

The name of this organization shall be the Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors, hereinafter called the Western Directors Association (WDA), as is stated above and established in conformity with the constitution of the ~~National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges~~ **Association of Public and Land Grant Universities** (hereinafter called the National Association).

Article II - Purpose

The Western Directors Association, one of five such Regional Associations, shall represent the administrators of the State Agricultural Experiment Stations (SAES) in the Western Region in their collective dealings. On matters to be ratified by, reported to, or recommended to the National Association the consensus of WDA shall be conveyed to the Chair, Experiment Station Section of the Board on Agriculture Assembly of the National Association by the Chair of the WDA. WDA shall conduct its affairs in conformance with the stated objectives and procedures of the By-laws of the Section and the Board on Agriculture Assembly of the National Association.

The WDA, with the other such Regional Associations, is an integral part of the Experiment Station Section. It provides through its business meetings a means by which the views of the WDA may be determined formally and transmitted to the Experiment Station Committee on Organization and Policy (ESCOP) and the Experiment Station Section on matters either of its

own origin or on matters referred to it by ESCOP or the Section. The WDA also provides a forum for the exchange of information and for discussion and debate among members and guests on matters of common concern that may not require formal action. And, it provides the means by which the WDA may take action that is limited to the Western Region. These and other functions of the WDA are spelled out more completely, as follows:

1. Arranges for and conducts its own affairs, elects members to ESCOP, makes recommendations to ESCOP and to the Section, reacts to proposals of ESCOP and the Section and participates in the handling of interim business of the Section;
2. Participates with ~~CSREES~~ NIFA and other Regional Associations in the programming and conducting of cooperative multistate research supported by the Multistate Research Fund (MRF) authorized by section 3(c)3 of the Hatch Act, Public Law 84-352 and the Agricultural Research, Extension and Education Reform Act of 1998;
3. Facilitates cooperation among its member State Agricultural Experiment Stations (SAES), with federal and other state agencies, with industry and others in the planning, programming, financing, implementing and performing of agricultural and related research;
4. Employs, and pays the salaries and/or benefits of, the Executive Director and other staff as well as other expenses related to the functions of the Executive Director;
5. Facilitates cooperative joint efforts with the Western Extension Directors and Western Academic Program Directors to meet AREERA legislation requirements and the pressing needs of the region;
6. Collects and disburses dues, enters into contracts with cooperators and/or granting agencies to cover the costs of the programs agreed upon within the WDA.

Article III - Membership

The voting members of the Western Directors Association shall be eighteen (18) in number consisting of the Directors (or duly authorized representatives) of its member institutions (Alaska, American Samoa, Arizona, California, Colorado, Guam, Hawaii, Idaho, Micronesia, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Northern Mariana Islands, Oregon, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming) and the Western Executive Director. Associate and Assistant Directors of the member SAES of the WDA and the Administrative Heads of Agriculture of the member institutions also shall be members; however, the voting privilege shall be limited to one vote for each institution. The Administrator of the **National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA)** ~~Cooperative State Research, Education, and Extension Service (CSREES)~~, USDA, and the ~~Director~~ **Vice President for Food and Agriculture** ~~Office of Governmental Relations~~ of the National Association shall be ex officio, non-voting members of the WDA.

Article IV - Meetings

There will be an annual meeting and other meetings as determined by the WDA and/or its Executive Committee.

Article V - Officers

A. The Officers of the WDA shall be a Chair, Chair-Elect, Past Chair, Secretary and a Treasurer, each for a one (1) year term that begins at the close of the Association meeting held in conjunction with the annual meeting of the ~~National Association~~ **Experiment Station Section**. Officers may succeed themselves (be re-elected) for one additional term, except for the Treasurer who may serve successive terms.

B. Elections. The Officers, members of the Executive Committee and other designees of the WDA shall be elected by the membership at the WDA meeting immediately preceding the annual meeting of the **Experiment Station Section**. Nominations shall be submitted by a nominating committee named by the Chair. A simple majority vote is required for election. In the event the Chair-Elect, Secretary or Treasurer resign or are otherwise unable to serve, the remaining members of the Executive Committee shall appoint a member of WDA to complete the term.

C. Executive Director. There shall be an Executive Director chosen and employed by the WDA under the terms of the Memorandum of Agreement among the states, 1967, with duties as specified therein and as up-dated from time to time as recorded in the Minutes. The Office of the Executive Director shall provide staff support to the WDA.

A position of Recording Secretary is established within the Office of and responsible to the Executive Director. The Recording Secretary shall assist the Secretary and the Executive Director in the keeping of the official records of the WDA including Minutes of meetings. The Recording Secretary also shall assist the Regional Coordination and Implementation Committee in the performance of its responsibilities and perform other duties as assigned.

Other staff may be appointed at the discretion of the WDA.

D. Duties. The Chair shall preside at business meetings of the WDA, at meetings of its Executive Committee and on all other occasions where the head of the organization is to be recognized. He/She is the chief executive officer of the WDA.

The Chair-Elect shall serve as Vice-Chair and undertake such duties as the Chair prescribes. He/She shall become Chair for the remainder of the term should the Chair resign or otherwise be unable to serve. He/She shall preside in the absence of the Chair.

The Secretary shall see to it that the secretarial duties of the WDA are fulfilled; he/she also serves as the official Secretary of the Executive Committee. He/She presides in the absence of the Chair and Chair-Elect. The Secretary of the WDA shall bear the official responsibility on behalf of the WDA for approving all actions and communications emanating from the Recording Secretary.

The Treasurer shall bill each member institution for its share of the budget for the Office of the Executive Director, and transmits the funds to the institution at which the Office of the Executive Director is located. He/She administers the Western Directors Special Fund and performs such other duties involving finances and the transfer of funds as may be required.

Officers and other designees of WDA are expected to exercise their own judgments in the execution of their roles and duties subject to prior policy guidance and/or policy review by the WDA.

All officers and other designees of the WDA are responsible for maintaining and then passing on to their successors complete sets of official documents of a continuing directive nature.

Article VI Executive Committee

The Executive Committee shall be composed of the Chair, Chair-Elect, Past Chair, Secretary, Treasurer, Senior Member of ESCOP, and two members at-large. The terms of the two at-large members shall be one (1) year. They may succeed themselves for one additional one-year term. The Executive Director shall be an ex officio, non-voting member of the Executive Committee.

The Executive Committee through the Chair executes the program of the WDA and supervises the Executive Director and any other staff. The Executive Committee also is empowered to handle the interim affairs of the WDA between business meetings.

Article VII - Committees and Designees

Committees may be established and Administrative Advisors and other designees named at the will of the WDA. Administrative Advisors shall be named from among the membership of the WDA and such other administrators as the WDA may designate from time to time. A list of committees and designees for the coming year is to be prepared by the Recording Secretary, as approved by the Secretary, and circulated to the membership annually.

Regional Coordination and Implementation Committee (RCIC). The RCIC is comprised of members of the WDA, the Western Extension Directors, and the Western Academic Program Directors and other partner agencies and groups. The RCIC is responsible for the review and on-going evaluation of the region's portfolio of multistate activities that are funded in part by the multistate research fund. The RCIC approves multistate activities on behalf of the WDA, the Western Extension Directors, and the Western Academic Program Directors and designates Administrative Advisors for projects from among the WDA, and other such administrators within the region consistent with the policies of USDA-NIFA ~~CSREES~~ governing the multistate research program. The RCIC provides regular reports of its actions to the WDA, the Western Extension Directors, and the Western Academic Program Directors.

Article VIII -Quorum

For purposes of doing business of the WDA, a quorum shall consist of a minimum of ten (10) members or their officially designated representatives present and voting at any duly called meeting where written notice and agenda are sent out a month in advance of the meeting. A simple majority resolves all issues except amendment of the By-Laws.

Article IX - Parliamentary Authority

The emphasis in all meetings shall be on orderly process to achieve an objective decision by those present and voting. Should there be a parliamentary challenge, however, it shall be answered by reference to Robert's Rules of Order.

Article X - Amendment of By-Laws

These By-Laws may be amended at any business meeting of the WDA, provided the proposed amendment has been submitted to all members one month in advance of the meeting and is passed by a two-thirds majority of the voting members present at the meeting.

Action Requested: Approval to proceed with the amendment of By-Laws to be approved at the Fall Meeting

Action Taken: Waived the one month notification to allow the Office of the Executive Director to change the Association By-Laws to reflect the change of NASULGC to APLU and CSREES to NIFA

Agenda Item 11.9: Guidelines for National Research Support Projects (NRSPs)
 Presenter: H. M. Harrington
 Background:

THE EXPERIMENT STATION SECTION

GUIDELINES FOR NATIONAL RESEARCH SUPPORT PROJECTS (NRSPs)

ADOPTED December 13, 2002
 REVISED September 27, 2004
 REVISED September 17, 2007
REVISED September 15, 2009

Table of Contents

I. MISSION OF NATIONAL RESEARCH SUPPORT PROJECTS	2
II. GENERAL	2
III. ORGANIZATION: NRSP REVIEW COMMITTEE.....	2
A. General	3
B. The NRSP Review Committee shall consist of:	3
C. NRSP Review Committee Operations	4
IV. ESTABLISHING NEW NRSPs.....	4
A. Relevance	4
B. Management and Business Plan	5
C. Objectives and Projected Outcomes	5
D. Integration	5
E. Outreach, communications and assessment	5
F. Budget: The NRSP team must present an annual budget for each of the five years (See	6
V. RENEWAL OF AN NRSP	6
A. General	6
B. Relevance	6
C. Assessment of Outcomes	6
D. Objectives	6
E. Management and Business Plan	6
F. Integration and Documentation of Research Support	7
G. Outreach and Communications	7
H. Budget:	7
VI. REVIEW AND APPROVAL TIMELINES FOR NEW NRSPs OR RENEWAL	7
OF AN EXISTING NRSP (Also, refer to Appendix A1 – A3)	7
A. New NRSP Development	7
B. During Project Term (years 2-4)	9
C. Renewal of an Existing NRSP	9
VII. ANNUAL REPORT OF AN NRSP.....	10
VIII. Revision of Guidelines	11
APPENDIX A1 - NRSP Calendar For New NRSP Projects.....	11
APPENDIX A2 - NRSP Calendar For Renewal of NRSP Projects	13
APPENDIX A3 - NRSP Calendar For Continuing NRSP Projects.....	14
APPENDIX B - CRITERIA FOR ESTABLISHING OR RENEWING A NATIONAL RESEARCH SUPPORT PROJECT	15
A. Prerequisite criteria for NRSPs	15
B. These are the criteria addressing the rationale for the NRSP	15

Style Definition: TOC 1: Font: Bold, Do not check spelling or grammar, Tab stops: 6.49", Right,Leader: ...

Formatted: Tab stops: Not at 6.49"

Formatted: Tab stops: Not at 6.49"

Formatted: Tab stops: Not at 6.49"

Formatted: Tab stops: Not at 6.49"

Formatted: Tab stops: Not at 6.49"

C. Criteria for implementing the NRSP proposal	16
APPENDIX C - NRSP Proposal Outline	18
STATEMENT OF ISSUES AND JUSTIFICATION:	18
IMPLEMENTATION:	19
PROJECT PARTICIPATION: Appendix EF	20
LITERATURE CITED:	20
BUDGET:	20
APPENDIX D - NRSP Proposal Peer Review Form	20
APPENDIX DE - NRSP Proposals Regional Review Form	21
APPENDIX EF - Format for Reporting Projected Participation	27
APPENDIX FG - NRSP BUDGET REQUESTS SUMMARY	28

Formatted: Tab stops: Not at 6.49"

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Tab stops: Not at 6.49"

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

I. MISSION OF NATIONAL RESEARCH SUPPORT PROJECTS

The activity of an NRSP focuses on the development of enabling technologies, support activities (such as to collect, assemble, store, and distribute materials, resources and information), or the sharing of facilities needed to accomplish high priority research, but which is not of itself primarily research.

II. GENERAL

National Research Support Projects are created to conduct activities that enable other important research efforts. Ideally, an NRSP would facilitate a broad array of research activities. The primary purpose of NRSPs shall not be solely to conduct research as there are other available mechanisms for creating these types of projects including the multistate research projects and the National Research Project (NRP) options. Examples of NRSP activities might include collection of data that are widely used by other research groups and efforts; development of databases; or development of critical technologies.

All NRSPs must involve a national issue, relevant to and of use by most, if not all regions. These projects draw on the best minds and resources within and outside the State Agricultural Experiment Station (SAES) system to address the issues. All projects must pass scientific scrutiny as well as be an issue that has national significance. Where appropriate, linkages to similar international activities are encouraged.

Priority for funding will be given to NRSPs that address and meet one or more of the national priority areas identified by ESCOP. General consideration will be given to assuring that the portfolio of NRSP projects has sufficient diversity so as to make best use of limited funds.

NRSP are initiated by use of Hatch funds drawn from the total federal allocation prior to the formula distribution to state agricultural experiment stations (SAESs). This funding process is called "off-the-top" and in total represents about 1% of the federal formula funds to SAES.

The National Information Management and Support System (NIMSS) is the official repository for NRSP project information. NIMSS is a web application for management of the Multistate Research Activities in a paperless environment. It is an information technology tool that facilitates the submission of proposals, reports and reviews online. NIMSS also serves as the central repository of records pertaining to multistate research projects and activities since September 2003. Information can be accessed anywhere, anytime at www.nimss.umd.edu.

Refer to Appendix B for more information on "Criteria for Establishing or Renewing an NRSP."

III. ORGANIZATION: NRSP REVIEW COMMITTEE

A. General

Since the dissolution of the Committee of Nine, there has been no single SAES entity with the general oversight responsibility for National Research Support Projects. An NRSP Review Committee (hereafter referred to as the committee) with broad oversight responsibility for the NRSP portfolio has been established and charged with providing general oversight, consistency in review and approval processes, and a national perspective relative to research support needs. The committee does not have the responsibility to micromanage individual projects.

While playing a gatekeeper function for the SAES system, it is also important that the committee's role is clearly advisory to the system. It makes recommendations to the Experiment Station Section (ESS) concerning existing and new projects. A key component of their role is to oversee implementation of sunset clauses whereby an NRSP reduces or eliminates its dependence on off-the-top funding. The committee brings its recommendations to the annual ESS meeting, currently held in September. It reports on the final project proposals and projected budgets, as well as their final recommendation. The SAES Directors vote (one vote per institution contributing off-the-top funding) on approval of the project and five-year budget. A simple majority vote is required to overturn the NRSP Review Committee recommendation.

One of the specific charges to the committee is to use the national priorities and needs as a basis for the review and evaluation of existing and new NRSP projects. It is responsible for assuring that the NRSP portfolio is monitored and is responsive to needs. The committee will identify specific areas of research support needs or at least utilize input from an established ESCOP mechanism such as the Planning Committee because of their focus on emerging issues and needs. The committee has the authority to proactively identify research support needs. The committee has access to resources available to seed the creation of new NRSPs responsive to emerging needs.

The committee is directly responsible for the annual review of progress and budget for existing NRSPs. It has the authority to ensure that the criteria contained in these guidelines are satisfactorily met by NRSPs.

Relative to the evaluation of revised and new projects, the committee oversees review by peer and merit panels. It develops criteria for the reviews, selects reviewers, assists in establishing protocols for review, and prepares the specific charge to the panels. Utilizing the results of the reviews and the committee's understanding of national research support needs, the committee makes recommendations concerning revised and proposed projects to the ESS.

A final role for the committee is one of broad advocacy for the NRSP system. It insures the documentation of system and individual project impacts. It serves as the point entity for marketing the system and bringing it to national level prominence.

B. The NRSP Review Committee shall consist of:

1. One representative from each of the four SAES regions (1862 experiment stations) who is a current or past member of an MRC, and one from the ARD region (1890 research directors), appointed by the regional association chair. Each unit represented on the NRSP Review Committee will also designate an alternate to insure representation. For the geographical regional associations, a logical alternate would be the regional MRC chair.
2. One representative from Extension appointed by the ESCOP Chair following the recommendation of the ECOP Chair.
3. One representative from CSREES, preferably a National Program leader, recommended by

the CSREES Administrator and appointed by the ESCOP Chair.

4. One stakeholder representative, possibly a CARET representative, appointed by the ESCOP Chair.

5. Two regional executive directors appointed by the ESCOP Chair. One of the executive directors should be from the same region as the chair of the committee and will serve as the Executive Vice Chair, administratively supporting the committee. These two appointed executive directors will be voting members of the Committee. The other three regional executive directors (both SAES and/or ARD) not assigned to the Committee may attend meetings as ex officio, non-voting members.

6. Officers will include a chair and chair-elect chosen by the committee from the representatives' four SAES regions. The position of chair will rotate among the four geographical regions NC, W, S, and NE.

C. NRSP Review Committee Operations

1. Term of appointment to the committee will be four years. Terms of the four SAES regions' representatives will be staggered so as to provide continuity to deliberations.

2. The committee will meet face-to-face once per year prior to the September ESS meeting. Other business of the committee will be conducted electronically through conference calls and e-mails. All expenses will be borne by member's respective institutions except for the stakeholder representative. Travel funds for the stakeholder representative will be provided by ESS/ESCOP.

3. The committee will coordinate peer reviews of new and revised NRSP proposals and associated five-year and annual budgets.

4. The committee and CSREES jointly arrange for external peer review of NRSPs at the beginning of year 5.

5. The committee reports at the ESS Fall meeting on new or revised NRSP project proposals and five-year and annual budgets and makes a recommendation for approval or rejection.

6. The committee reviews annual reports and annual budgets of active NRSPs and reviews annual budget requests. The committee reports and makes a recommendation for approval or disapproval or projects and annual budgets at the annual ESS meeting.

IV. ESTABLISHING NEW NRSPs

(Also refer to Appendix B for the NRSP criteria; Appendix C for the NRSP proposal format; **and Appendix D for the NRSP Peer Review Forms and Appendix E for Regional Association Review Form.**)

In addition to addressing the criteria described in the General section above, a proposal for a new NRSP must contain the following elements:

A. Relevance

The proposal must identify stakeholders and indicate their involvement in project development, review and/or management plan. The proposal must indicate how the project meets stakeholder needs and indicate the relationship with the research to be supported. (The real stakeholders are the researchers and the funding agencies that will use the information or services generated.) The proposal must also include a mechanism for assessing stakeholder use of

project outputs.

B. Management and Business Plan

Each NRSP should have a well-developed business plan that describes how the project will be managed and funded for a five-year period. This plan includes a management structure to adequately integrate the efforts of multiple participants. The plan should include provisions for linking multiple sources of funding and leveraging those sources with the limited off-the-top research funds. This plan should include efforts to bring in new agencies, organizations, industry, foundations, etc. to help address the issues and provide funding for the project.

All project proposals must provide evidence of contributions from experiment stations across the nation beyond what is available through off-the-top funds.

In general, NRSPs should expect a finite period of off-the-top funding. This is not a reflection of the quality of work being conducted or the research being supported by the project. Rather, this allows the SAES system to continually assess needs and develop new projects as necessary. For this reason, the business plan of project renewals must include a transition plan and provisions for developing alternative funding or reducing off-the-top funding to a minimal level.

C. Objectives and Projected Outcomes

Objectives, milestones and deliverables should be described in sufficient detail such that progress can be measured. Indicate the prospects for meaningful impacts within the proposed duration of the project. The proposal must indicate what approaches will be used to assess outcomes and how these assessments will be used in program planning.

D. Integration

Where applicable, projects should indicate how efforts are integrated with extension or academic programs and how results might be of use by other potential stakeholders.

E. Outreach, communications and assessment

All projects must have a sound outreach, communications and assessment plan that seeks to communicate the programs goals, accomplishments and outcomes/impacts. The communication plan must detail how results will be transferred to researchers and other end users and contain the following elements:

1. Clear identification of the intended audience(s) of the NRSP. Since this is a Research Support Project, in most instances the primary beneficiary of the results will be other scientists. However, careful consideration should be given to other possible users of the information (such as consumers, producers, governmental agencies (local, state and federal), general public, etc.)
2. Clear description of the engagement of stakeholders in the definition and/or conduct of the research support project.
3. Thorough description of the methodology to measure the accomplishments and impacts of the National Research Support Project. Methods such as surveys, town meetings, conferences, analyses of reference data (e.g. citation index, etc.), and use of professional evaluators should be considered.
4. Specific description for development of communication pieces describing the activities, accomplishments, and impacts of the NRSP. The communication pieces will be used with SAES/ARD directors, stakeholders and their organizations, funding sources and agencies, and congressional delegations.

5. Suggested mechanisms for distribution of the results of the research support project. Examples include sharing the results at annual meetings of stakeholders, providing material to the Budget and Advocacy Committee of the NASULGC Board on Agriculture Assembly and other appropriate committees within the SAES/ARD organization, and assisting CSREES in preparation of appropriate documents highlighting the impacts of the project.

F. Budget: The NRSP team must present an annual budget for each of the five years (See Appendix F-G). The budget must take into account all sources of funds (Multistate Research Funds, industry, federal agencies, grants and contracts, and SAESs). There are two tables in Appendix F, one for MRF and one for Other Sources. For the SAESs, the project should estimate the in-cash and in-kind contributions. The budget narrative should provide an estimate of the per cent contribution from each funding source.

V. RENEWAL OF AN NRSP
(Also refer to Appendix B for the NRSP criteria; Appendix C for the NRSP proposal format; and Appendix D for the NRSP Review Forms.)

Prior to renewal, each NRSP must undergo an external peer review according to the schedule presented in the timelines section. Each NRSP seeking renewal must meet/address all of the criteria for a new NRSP described in the previous section. In addition, renewal requests must address the following:

A. General

NRSPs should expect a finite period of significant levels of off the top funding. This allows “the system” to undertake new initiatives and address new priorities. For this reason the business plans of applications for renewals will be carefully scrutinized. For renewals, proposals must demonstrate direct relationship in support of continuing national priority need(s). The proposal should discuss its support activities relative to other NRSPs. The renewal application builds on the previous project and provides a logical progression.

B. Relevance

Proposals must demonstrate continued need as evidenced by stakeholder use of outputs and impacts of research efforts that are supported by the activity,

C. Assessment of Outcomes

The proposal must address productivity, completion of original objectives and the relationship between projected goals and actual accomplishments.

The proposal must include an assessment of the outcomes and/or impact of the previous project period. This assessment must include an evaluation of stakeholders’ use of project outputs

D. Objectives

The proposed objectives must reflect appropriate revision, e.g. evolution or building to greater depth, and/or capacity. All project revisions must incorporate stakeholder needs. Renewals will be judged as to the degree to which project has been on task, on time and within budget for the previous funding period.

E. Management and Business Plan

In general, NRSPs should expect a finite period of off-the-top funding. This is not a reflection of the quality of work being conducted or the research being supported by the project. Rather, this allows the SAES system to continually assess needs and develop new projects as necessary. For this reason, the business plan of project renewals must include a transition plan and

provisions for developing alternative funding or reducing off-the-top funding to a minimal level. Included would be an assessment of transition options, and alternative funding sources.

However, not all projects may be shifted to other funding sources. Projects seeking to continue with significant amount of off the top funding should fully justify the request.

The renewal application should include a critical assessment of the original plan and address any shortcomings to ensure that the project will function more smoothly or effectively in the future. The proposal must indicate what additional resources have been generated or leveraged and indicate how those and any additional resources will be continued or sought.

Note. Not all projects can be transitioned to other funding sources and, if the project meets an ESCOP priority, the project may continue with off-the-top funding.

F. Integration and Documentation of Research Support

The business plan must indicate the diversity of partners involved in the project as well as the multiple sources of funding. The proposal should indicate any new partnerships built during the project period. The proposal should address the degree to which full team is engaged in project planning and implementation and discuss plans to complement any weaknesses that may have been identified.

The proposal should contain a description of how research activities nationwide will be supported by the project.

G. Outreach and Communications

The proposal should assess the success of the project's outreach and communications plan and indicate any steps to be taken to improve effectiveness. A clear description of impacts resulting from the project is required.

H. Budget:

The NRSP team must present an annual budget for each of the five years (See Appendix [FG](#)). The budget must take into account all sources of funds (Multistate Research Funds, industry, federal agencies, grants and contracts, and SAESs). There are two tables in Appendix [FG](#), one for MRF and one for Other Sources. For the SAESs, the project should estimate the in-cash and in-kind contributions. The budget narrative should provide an estimate of the per cent contribution from each funding source.

VI. REVIEW AND APPROVAL TIMELINES FOR NEW NRSPs OR RENEWAL OF AN EXISTING NRSP (Also, refer to Appendix A1 – A3)

A. New NRSP Development

Anytime

Individuals interested in creating a new NRSP are ~~required~~ **encouraged** to submit an outline of the proposed NRSP's objectives, justification, and tentative budget to the NRSP Review Committee for a preliminary review no later than September 1 of the year prior to the proposed start date (ie Sep 1, 2010 for a start date of Oct 1, 2011). If this review is positive then the following steps should be followed to formally submit a proposal for consideration by the ESS.

(Note: transmission of materials to the Executive Directors throughout this process implies subsequent transmission to members of corresponding regional associations for consideration by their multi-state review committee)

Sponsoring Director(s) submits request to establish a regional development committee to one of the Executive Directors following that region's standard process for initiating new multistate activities.

Sponsoring regional association assigns lead Administrative Advisor and solicits names of Co-advisors from other Executive Directors. Sponsoring regional association follows the normal process for approving the establishment of a development committee and soliciting additional participants.

NRSP development committee membership, in consultation with Administrative Advisors, prepares initial project proposal, including projected five-year budget.

Administrative Advisors submit the project proposal and projected five-year budget, and ~~conducts~~ arranges for at least three external peer reviewers of the proposal. Peer reviewers should be instructed to use the peer review form shown in Appendix D. The Administrative Advisors work with the NRSP development committee to revise the proposal and budget based on the peer review comments.

Not later than January 15

Administrative Advisors submit revised proposal and five-year budget, along with peer review comments and the committee's responses, to the ~~Executive Directors~~ NRSP Review Committee Chair via NIMSS. NRSP Review Committee Chair reviews package for completeness and then forwards it to the Executive Directors.

Formatted: Default

February - April

Appropriate regional committees review the project proposal and projected five-year budget using the review form shown in Appendix E and report to AES Directors at their Spring regional association meeting. Executive Director transmits comments and/or concerns along with a summary of the review form results to the Administrative Advisors and NRSP Review Committee.

April - June

NRSP Development Committee addresses any comments and/or concerns received from the regional association spring meetings and finalize the proposal in NIMSS for submission to the NRSP Review Committee.

June

NRSP Review Committee meets and prepares preliminary recommendation relative to project proposal. The preliminary recommendation is transmitted to the Executive Directors

Formatted: Default

July 1

The NRSP Review Committee recommendations are shared with and reviewed by the regional associations. Final project proposal, projected five-year budget, and preliminary recommendation from the NRSP Review Committee are transmitted to the Executive Directors so all information can be shared with regional associations.

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

August 1

NRSP Review Committee finalizes recommendations that will be presented at the annual ESS meeting.

September

The NRSP Review Committee reports at the ESS annual meeting on the final project proposal and projected budget, and its recommendation. SAES Directors vote (one vote per institution

contributing off-the-top funding) on approval of the project and five-year budget. A simple - majority vote is required to overturn the NRSP Review Committee recommendation.

October 1

Approved NRSP starts five-year cycle with five-year budget approved.

B. During Project Term (years 2-4)

January

NRSP Committee submits annual report (see below) and detailed budget for subsequent fiscal year to the NRSP Review Committee and Executive Directors by January 15.

If there is no change in total annual budget from approved five-year budget, the Executive Directors transmit report and budget to regional associations for their consideration at spring meetings. If a change in the annual budget from the approved five-year budget is requested, a detailed justification must be submitted to the Executive Directors for consideration by the regional associations and the NRSP Review Committee.

February - April

Regional associations review budget requests during spring meetings and transmit comments to the NRSP Review Committee.

April - September

The NRSP Review Committee interacts with CSREES and NRSP Administrative Advisors to determine and recommend any budget changes for the next year to the ESS.

The NRSP Review Committee meets in person or via teleconference in June to discuss proposed budgets and feedback from regional associations. The budget recommendations are forwarded to the Executive Directors and each NRSP Administrative Adviser

September

The NRSP Review Committee reports at the ESS Fall meeting on the final project proposal and projected budget, and its recommendation. SAES Directors vote (one vote per institution contributing off-the-top funding) on approval of the project and five-year budget. A simple majority vote is required to overturn the NRSP Review Committee recommendation.

October 1

New NRSP approved starts five-year cycle with year 1 budget approved.

C. Renewal of an Existing NRSP

Year 4

CSREES and the NRSP Review Committee jointly arrange for peer review of NRSP that is due to terminate at the end of year 5. Review organizer consults with the NRSP Review Committee and NRSP Administrative Advisors regarding review protocol, charge, etc.

Year 5

September - December

External peer review team conducts review of past four years progress and provides feedback to the NRSP project on a ~~possible draft~~ renewal proposal. ~~The peer review team should use the peer review form shown in Appendix D to guide review of the draft renewal proposal. The NRSP develops a renewal proposal and forwards to the Executive Directors a final proposal, 5-year budget, and the external review report.~~

December

NRSP Committee ~~revises-completes~~ proposal based on external review comments.

No Later Than January 15

~~Renewal proposal, budget, and external peer review responses are received by regional association Executive Directors sent to the NRSP Review Committee Chair. NRSP Review Committee Chair reviews package for completeness and then forwards it to the Executive Directors.~~

Formatted: Font: 11 pt

Formatted: Font: 11 pt

Formatted: Font: 11 pt

February - April

~~Appropriate regional committees review the renewal proposal using the review form shown in Appendix E. Regional associations discuss renewal proposal and budget at their Spring meetings and Executive Director transmits comments and/or concerns along with a summary of the review form results to the Administrative Advisors and the NRSP Review Committee.~~

April - May

NRSP Committee addresses any comments and/or concerns identified through renewal proposal reviews and/or budget revisions and/or separate responses.

June

The NRSP Review Committee meets in person or via teleconference to discuss the project proposal and proposed budgets and feedback from regional associations. The project proposal and budget recommendations are forwarded to the Executive Directors and each NRSP Administrative Adviser. If desired, the final recommendations can be discussed at the summer regional association meetings.

September

The NRSP Review Committee reports at the ESS Fall meeting on the final project proposal and ~~projected~~ budget, and its recommendation. SAES Directors vote (one vote per contributing institution) on approval of the project and five-year budget. A simple majority vote is required to overturn the NRSP Review Committee recommendation.

October 1

NRSP approved for renewal starts five-year cycle with year 1 budget approved. NRSP not approved for renewal receives one-year extension (with budget equal to 5th-year budget) to transition off NRSP funding to other sources or downsize project.

VII. ANNUAL REPORT OF AN NRSP

Annually each NRSP will prepare a State Agricultural Experiment Station 422 Report (SAES-422) and include the following information:

1. Stakeholders: A description of the interaction and engagement with the stakeholders during the past year and brief description of plans for next year.
2. Activities, Accomplishments, and Impacts: A description of the activities (ie. meetings, etc.), accomplishments (ie. publications, information sharing, etc.), and impacts

(ie. demonstration of adoption of new techniques, advancement in sharing information, change in stakeholders' techniques, knowledge, or action, etc.) for the past year and a brief description of plans for next year.

3. Communication Plan: A description of the implementation of the Communication Plan as stated in the proposal and a brief description of plans for next year.

4. Research Support activities: Describe how project contributes to and supports related research programs nationwide.

VIII. Revision of Guidelines


These guidelines will be modified using the following process:

1. Periodically, the guidelines will be reviewed by the NRSP Review Committee. Proposed changes will be drafted by the Committee and incorporated into this document.
2. The proposed changes will be submitted to ESCOP for review, editing, and approval.
3. Changes will be presented to the ESS for approval by a simple majority vote at the annual meeting.

APPENDIX A1 - NRSP Calendar For New NRSP Projects

Anytime
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regional association or NRSPRC recommends development of new project as NRSP and notifies CSREES (as well as NRSPRC if they are not already aware). • Potential NRSP committee is created through a regional association development committee.
Jan 15
Administrative Advisors submit NRSP proposal and five-year budget, along with peer review comments from review form in Appendix D and the committee's responses , to the Executive Directors NRSP Review Committee Chair via NIMSS.
Feb-April
Appropriate regional committees review the project proposal and projected five-year budget using review form in Appendix E and report to AES Directors at their Spring regional association meeting.
Apr-June
NRSP Development Committee addresses any comments and/or concerns received from the regional association spring meetings and finalize the proposal in NIMSS for submission to the NRSP Review Committee.
June
The NRSP Review Committee meets in person or via teleconference to discuss proposal and budgets and feedback from regional associations.
July 1
Final project proposal, projected five-year budget, and preliminary recommendation from the NRSP Review Committee are transmitted to the Executive Directors so all information can be shared with regional associations.

August 1
NRSP Review Committee finalizes recommendations that will be presented at the annual ESS meeting.
September
The NRSP Review Committee reports at the ESS annual meeting on the final project proposal and projected budget, and its recommendation. Directors vote on recommendations.
October 1
Approved NRSP starts five-year cycle with annual budget approved.



APPENDIX A2 - NRSP Calendar For Renewal of NRSP Projects

September - December
External review of NRSP occurs.
December
NRSP Committee develops renewal proposal based on external review comments.
Jan 15
Administrative Advisors submit NRSP proposal and five-year budget, along with peer review comments from review form in Appendix D and the committee's responses , to the Executive Directors NRSP Review Committee Chair via NIMSS.
Feb-April
Appropriate regional committees review the project proposal and projected five-year budget using review form in Appendix E and report to AES Directors at their Spring regional association meeting.
Apr-June
NRSP Development Committee addresses any comments and/or concerns received from the regional association spring meetings and finalize the proposal in NIMSS for submission to the NRSP Review Committee.
June
The NRSP Review Committee meets in person or via teleconference to discuss proposal and budgets and feedback from regional associations.
July 1
Budget recommendations from the NRSP Review Committee are transmitted to the Executive Directors so all information can be shared with regional associations.
August 1
NRSP Review Committee finalizes recommendations that will be presented at the annual ESS meeting.
September
The NRSP Review Committee reports at the ESS annual meeting on the final project proposal and projected budget, and its recommendation. Directors vote on recommendations.
October 1
Approved NRSP starts five-year cycle with annual budget approved. NRSP not approved for renewal receives one-year extension (with budget equal to 5th-year budget) to transition off NRSP funding to other sources or downsize project.

APPENDIX A3 - NRSP Calendar For Continuing NRSP Projects

Jan 15
Administrative Advisors submits annual budget for NRSP to the Executive Directors.
Feb-April
Appropriate regional committees review the annual project budget and report to AES Directors at their Spring regional association meeting.
Apr-June
NRSP Development Committee addresses any comments and/or concerns received from the regional association spring meetings and finalize the budget for submission to the NRSP Review Committee.
June
The NRSP Review Committee meets in person or via teleconference to discuss proposal and budgets and feedback from regional associations.
July 1
Budget recommendations from the NRSP Review Committee are transmitted to the Executive Directors so all information can be shared with regional associations.
August 1
NRSP Review Committee finalizes budget recommendations that will be presented at the annual ESS meeting.
September
The NRSP Review Committee reports at the ESS annual meeting on the annual budget and its recommendation. Directors vote on recommendations.
October 1
Annual off-the-top budget for NRSP approved.

APPENDIX B - CRITERIA FOR ESTABLISHING OR RENEWING A NATIONAL RESEARCH SUPPORT PROJECT

Established September 22, 2003

These criteria are based on the NRSP Guidelines adopted by the Experiment Station Section in January 2003. The Experiment Station Section adopted these specific criteria on September 22, 2003.

The following statement defines the mission of the NRSP program:

“MISSION OF NATIONAL RESEARCH SUPPORT PROJECTS

The activity of an NRSP focuses on the development of enabling technologies, support activities (such as to collect, assemble, store, and distribute materials, resources and information), or the sharing of facilities needed to accomplish high priority research, but which is not of itself primarily research. Ideally, an NRSP would facilitate a broad array of research activities. The primary purpose of NRSPs shall not be solely to conduct research as there are other available mechanisms for creating these types of projects including the multistate research projects and the National Research Project (NRP) options. Examples of NRSP activities might include collection of data that are widely used by other research groups and efforts; development of databases; or development of critical technologies.”

Based on the mission of NRSPs, all proposals (new and renewals) will be evaluated using the following criteria (renewal of an NRSP must meet all of the criteria for a new NRSP in addition to the specific criteria identified for a renewal):

A. Prerequisite criteria for NRSPs

- 1. Mission:** All NRSPs must be consistent with the mission of an NRSP.
- 2. National Issue:**
 - a. All NRSPs must involve a national issue, relevant to and of use by most, if not all regions. These projects draw on the best minds and resources within and outside the State Agricultural Experiment Station (SAES) system to address the issues. The proposal should discuss its support activities relative to other NRSPs.
 - b. For renewals, proposals must demonstrate direct relationship in support of continuing national priority need(s). The renewal application builds on the previous project and provides a logical progression.

B. These are the criteria addressing the rationale for the NRSP.

- 1. (20 points) Priority Established by ESCOP/ESS:** Priority for funding will be given to NRSPs that address and support one or more of the national priority areas identified by ESCOP (see ESCOP Science and Technology Committee and Science Roadmap)
- 2. (20 points) Relevance to Stakeholders:**
 - a. The proposal must identify stakeholders and indicate their involvement in project development, project activities, review and/or management plans. The proposal must indicate how the project meets primary and secondary stakeholder needs and indicate the relationship of the stakeholders with the research to be supported. The proposal must also include a mechanism for assessing stakeholder use of project outputs. Identify project outcomes that aide in development of or contribute to the discussion of public policy.
 - b. For renewals, proposals must demonstrate continued need as evidenced by stakeholder use of outputs and impacts of research efforts that are supported by the activity.

C. Criteria for implementing the NRSP proposal

1. (15 points) Management and Business Plan:

- a. Each NRSP should have a well-developed business plan that describes how the project will be managed and funded for a five-year period. This plan includes a management structure to adequately integrate the efforts of multiple participants. The plan should include provisions for linking multiple sources of funding and leveraging those sources with the limited off-the-top research funds. The plan should demonstrate that alternative funding sources have been explored. This plan should include efforts to bring in new agencies, organizations, industry, foundations, etc. to help address the issues and provide funding for the project. All project proposals must provide evidence of contributions from experiment stations across the nation beyond what is available through off-the-top funds.
- b. The business plan for project renewals must include a funding plan including development of alternative funding for reducing off-the-top funding to a minimal level. Renewals will be judged as to the degree to which the project has been on task, had an impact, on time and within budget for the previous funding period. The renewal application should include a critical assessment of the original plan and address any shortcomings to ensure that the project will function more smoothly or effectively in the future. The proposal must indicate what additional resources have been generated or leveraged and indicate how those and any additional resources will be continued or sought.

2. (15 points) Objectives and Projected Outcomes:

- a. Objectives, milestones and deliverables should be described in sufficient detail such that progress can be measured. Indicate the prospects for meaningful impacts within the proposed duration of the project. The proposal must indicate what approaches will be used to assess outcomes including stakeholder use and how these assessments will be used in program planning.
- b. For renewals, the proposal must address productivity, completion of original objectives and the relationship between projected goals and actual accomplishments. The proposal must include an assessment of the outcomes and/or impact of the previous project period. This assessment must include an evaluation of stakeholders' use of project outputs. The proposed objectives must reflect appropriate revision, e.g. evolution or building to greater depth, and/or capacity. All project revisions must incorporate stakeholder needs.

3. (15 points) Integration and Documentation of Research Support:

- a. Projects should indicate how efforts are integrated with extension or academic programs and how results might be of use by other potential stakeholders.
- b. For renewals, the proposal should indicate any new partnerships built during the project period. The proposal should address the degree to which the full team is engaged in project planning and implementation. Discuss plans to correct any weaknesses that may have been identified.
- c. Proposals should indicate specifically how the project will support research activities nationwide.

4. (15 points) Outreach, Communications and Assessment:

- a. All projects must have a sound outreach, communications and assessment plan that seeks to communicate the programs goals, accomplishments and outcomes/impacts. The communication plan must detail how results will be transferred to researchers and other end users and contain the following elements:
 - i. Clear identification of the intended audience(s) of the NRSP. Since this is a Research Support Project, in most instances the primary beneficiary

of the results will be other scientists. However, careful consideration should be given to other possible users of the information (such as consumers, producers, governmental agencies (local, state and federal), general public, etc.)

ii. Clear description of the engagement of stakeholders in the definition and/or conduct of the research support project.

iii. Thorough description of the methodology to measure the accomplishments and impacts of the National Research Support Project and effectiveness of the communication plan. Methods such as surveys, town meetings, conferences, analyses of reference data (e.g. citation index, etc.), and use of professional evaluators should be considered.

iv. Specific description for development of communication pieces describing the activities, accomplishments, and impacts of the NRSP. The communication pieces will be used with SAES/ARD directors, stakeholders and their organizations, funding sources and agencies, and congressional delegations.

v. Suggested mechanisms for distribution of the results of the research support project. Examples include sharing the results at annual meetings of stakeholders, providing material to the Budget and Advocacy Committee of the NASULGC Board on Agriculture Assembly and other appropriate committees within the SAES/ARD organization, and assisting CSREES in preparation of appropriate documents highlighting the impacts of the project.

b. For renewals, the proposal should assess the success of the project's outreach and communications plan and indicate any steps to be taken to improve effectiveness. A clear description of impacts resulting from the project is required.

APPENDIX C - NRSP Proposal Outline

15 Page limit

Project Title: (140 characters)

Requested Duration:

Administrative Advisor:

CSREES Representative:

STATEMENT OF ISSUES AND JUSTIFICATION:

Prerequisite Criteria:

1. How is the NRSP consistent with the mission? (8,000 characters)
 - a. Mission: The activity of an NRSP focuses on the development of enabling technologies, support activities (such as to collect, assemble, store, and distribute materials, resources and information), or the sharing of facilities needed to accomplish high priority research, but which is not of itself primarily research. Ideally, an NRSP would facilitate a broad array of research activities. The primary purpose of NRSPs shall not be solely to conduct research, as there are other available mechanisms for creating these types of projects including the multistate research projects and the National Research Project (NRP) options. Examples of NRSP activities might include collection of data that are widely used by other research groups and efforts; development of databases; or development of critical technologies.”
2. How does this NRSP pertain as a national issue? (10,000 characters)
 - a. All NRSPs must involve a national issue, relevant to and of use by most, if not all regions. These projects draw on the best minds and resources within and outside the State Agricultural Experiment Station (SAES) system to address the issues. The proposal should discuss its support activities relative to other NRSPs.
 - b. For renewals, proposals must demonstrate direct relationship in support of continuing national priority need(s). The renewal application builds on the previous project and provides a logical progression.

Rationale:

1. Priority Established by ESCOP/ESS: Priority for funding will be given to NRSPs that address and support one or more of the national priority areas identified by ESCOP (see ESCOP Science and Technology Committee and Science Roadmap) (8,000 characters)
2. Relevance to stakeholders: (8,000 characters)
 - a. The proposal must identify stakeholders and indicate their involvement in project development, project activities, review and/or management plans. The proposal must indicate how the project meets primary and secondary stakeholder needs and indicate the relationship of the stakeholders with the research to be supported. The proposal must also include a mechanism for assessing stakeholder use of project outputs. Identify project outcomes that aide in development of or contribute to the discussion of public policy.
 - b. For renewals, proposals must demonstrate continued need as evidenced by stakeholder use of outputs and impacts of research efforts that are supported by

the activity.

IMPLEMENTATION:

1. Objectives and Projected Outcomes: **(4,000 characters)**
 - a. Objectives, milestones and deliverables should be described in sufficient detail such that progress can be measured. Indicate the prospects for meaningful impacts within the proposed duration of the project. The proposal must indicate what approaches will be used to assess outcomes including stakeholder use and how these assessments will be used in program planning.
 - b. For renewals, the proposal must address productivity, completion of original objectives and the relationship between projected goals and actual accomplishments. The proposal must include an assessment of the outcomes and/or impact of the previous project period. This assessment must include an evaluation of stakeholders' use of project outputs. The proposed objectives must reflect appropriate revision, e.g. evolution or building to greater depth, and/or capacity. All project revisions must incorporate stakeholder needs.
2. Management, Budget, and Business Plan: **(16,000 characters)**
 - a. Each NRSP should have a well-developed business plan that describes how the project will be managed and funded for a five-year period. This plan includes a management structure to adequately integrate the efforts of multiple participants. The plan should include provisions for linking multiple sources of funding and leveraging those sources with the limited off-the-top research funds. The plan should demonstrate that alternative funding sources have been explored. This plan should include efforts to bring in new agencies, organizations, industry, foundations, etc. to help address the issues and provide funding for the project. All project proposals must provide evidence of contributions from experiment stations across the nation beyond what is available through off-the-top funds.
 - b. The business plan for project renewals must include a funding plan including development of alternative funding for reducing off-the-top funding to a minimal level. Renewals will be judged as to the degree to which the project has been on task, had an impact, on time and within budget for the previous funding period. The renewal application should include a critical assessment of the original plan and address any shortcomings to ensure that the project will function more smoothly or effectively in the future. The proposal must indicate what additional resources have been generated or leveraged and indicate how those and any additional resources will be continued or sought.
3. Integration and Documentation of Research Support: **(5,000 characters)**
 - a. Projects should indicate how efforts are integrated with extension or academic programs and how results might be of use by other potential stakeholders.
 - b. For renewals, the proposal should indicate any new partnerships built during the project period. The proposal should address the degree to which the full team is engaged in project planning and implementation. Discuss plans to correct any weaknesses that may have been identified.
 - c. Proposals should indicate specifically how the project will support research activities nationwide.
4. Outreach, Communications and Assessment: **(15,000 characters)**
 - a. All projects must have a sound outreach, communications and assessment

plan that seeks to communicate the programs goals, accomplishments and outcomes/impacts. The communication plan must detail how results will be transferred to researchers and other end users and contain the following elements:

- i. Clear identification of the intended audience(s) of the NRSP. Since this is a Research Support Project, in most instances the primary beneficiary of the results will be other scientists. However, careful consideration should be given to other possible users of the information (such as consumers, producers, governmental agencies (local, state and federal), general public, etc.)
- ii. Clear description of the engagement of stakeholders in the definition and/or conduct of the research support project.
- iii. Thorough description of the methodology to measure the accomplishments and impacts of the National Research Support Project and effectiveness of the communication plan. Methods such as surveys, town meetings, conferences, analyses of reference data (e.g. citation index, etc.), and use of professional evaluators should be considered.
- iv. Specific description for development of communication pieces describing the activities, accomplishments, and impacts of the NRSP. The communication pieces will be used with SAES/ARD directors, stakeholders and their organizations, funding sources and agencies, and congressional delegations.
- v. Suggested mechanisms for distribution of the results of the research support project. Examples include sharing the results at annual meetings of stakeholders, providing material to the Budget and Advocacy Committee of the NASULGC Board on Agriculture Assembly and other appropriate committees within the SAES/ARD organization, and assisting CSREES in preparation of appropriate documents highlighting the impacts of the project.

| **PROJECT PARTICIPATION:** [NIMSS Appendix E](#)

LITERATURE CITED:

BUDGET:

- | The NRSP must present an annual budget for each of five years (See Appendix [FG](#)). Information should be provided on funding from MRF and funding from other sources (i.e. industry, federal agencies, grants and contracts, and SAESs). (**Refer to Appendix [FG](#)**)

APPENDIX D - NRSP Proposal Peer Review Form

(NOTE: THIS APPENDIX IS ALL NEW)

The following statement defines the mission of the National Research Support Projects (NRSP's):

“The activity of an NRSP focuses on the development of enabling technologies, support activities (such as to collect, assemble, store, and distribute materials, resources and information), or the sharing of facilities needed to accomplish high priority research, but which is not of itself primarily research.”

Based on this mission statement, please rate the proposed NRSP using the following criteria.

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Unacceptable
Mission:				
Consistency with the mission of an NRSP	_____	_____	_____	_____
Relevance:				
Addresses and supports a high priority national issue	_____	_____	_____	_____
Demonstrates clear/tangible benefit to the scientific community as a whole	_____	_____	_____	_____
Clearly identified sponsoring “stakeholders”/ beneficiaries	_____	_____	_____	_____
“Stakeholder” involvement in project development, project activities, review and/or management plans	_____	_____	_____	_____
Technical Merit:				
Overall technical merit (sound scientific approach, achievable objectives, appropriate scope of activity)	_____	_____	_____	_____
Potential for significant outputs (products) and outcomes and/or impacts	_____	_____	_____	_____
Implementation Plan:				
Benchmarks for success clearly identified	_____	_____	_____	_____

Management structure that adequately coordinates efforts of multiple participants	_____	_____	_____	_____
Well developed business plan that links multiple sources of funding and leverages limited off-the-top research funds	_____	_____	_____	_____
Funding plan that develops of alternative funding sources to reduce off-the-top funding in future years	_____	_____	_____	_____
Efforts integrated with extension and/or academic programs	_____	_____	_____	_____
Outreach, communications and assessment plan that communicates the programs goals, accomplishments and outcomes/impacts	_____	_____	_____	_____

Comments (Please add general and specific comments on strengths and weaknesses of the proposal, including specific revisions that would improve the proposal. Use as much space as needed for your comments.):

Recommendation: ___ Approve ___ Approve with revision ___ Disapprove

APPENDIX DE - NRSP Proposals Regional Association Review Form

The following statement defines the mission of the NRSP program:

MISSION OF NATIONAL RESEARCH SUPPORT PROJECTS

The activity of an NRSP focuses on the development of enabling technologies, support activities (such as to collect, assemble, store, and distribute materials, resources and information), or the sharing of facilities needed to accomplish high priority research, but which is not of itself primarily research. Ideally, an NRSP would facilitate a broad array of research activities. The primary purpose of NRSPs shall not be solely to conduct research as there are other available mechanisms for creating these types of projects including the multistate research projects and the National Research Project (NRP) options. Examples of NRSP activities might include collection of data that are widely used by other research groups and efforts; development of databases; or development of critical technologies.”

Based on the mission of NRSPs, all proposals will be evaluated using the following criteria:

A. Prerequisite criteria for NRSPs:		Circle One:
1. Mission: Is the NRSP consistent with the mission of an NRSP?		Yes / No
2. National Issue:		
	1. All NRSPs must involve a national issue, relevant to and of use by most, if not all regions. These projects draw on the best minds and resources within and outside the State Agricultural Experiment Station (SAES) system to address the issues. The proposal should discuss its support activities relative to other NRSPs.	Yes / No
	2. For renewals, proposals must demonstrate direct relationship in support of continuing national priority need(s). The renewal application builds on the previous project and provides a logical progression.	Yes / No
Comments:		

B. These are the criteria addressing the rationale for the NRSP:		Total Points:
a. (20 points) Priority Established by ESCOP/ESS: Priority for funding will be given to NRSPs that address and support one or more of the national priority areas identified by ESCOP (see ESCOP Science and Technology Committee and Science Roadmap)		__ / 20
2. (20 points) Relevance to Stakeholders:		__ / 20
	a. The proposal must identify stakeholders and indicate their involvement in project development, project activities, review and/or management plans. The proposal must indicate how the project meets primary and secondary stakeholder needs and indicate the relationship of the stakeholders with the research to be supported. The proposal must also include a mechanism for assessing stakeholder use of project outputs. Identify project outcomes that aide in development of or contribute to the discussion of public policy.	

	b. For renewals, proposals must demonstrate continued need as evidenced by stakeholder use of outputs and impacts of research efforts that are supported by the activity.	
Comments:		


C. Criteria for implementing the NRSP proposal		Total Points:
1. (15 points) Management, Budget and Business Plan:		__ / 15
	<p>a. Each NRSP should have a well-developed business plan that describes how the project will be managed and funded for a five-year period. This plan includes a management structure to adequately integrate the efforts of multiple participants. The plan should include provisions for linking multiple sources of funding and leveraging those sources with the limited off-the-top research funds. The plan should demonstrate that alternative funding sources have been explored. This plan should include efforts to bring in new agencies, organizations, industry, foundations, etc. to help address the issues and provide funding for the project. All project proposals must provide evidence of contributions from experiment stations across the nation beyond what is available through off-the-top funds.</p> <p>b. The business plan for project renewals must include a funding plan including development of alternative funding for reducing off-the-top funding to a minimal level. Renewals will be judged as to the degree to which the project has been on task, had an impact, on time and within budget for the previous funding period. The renewal application should include a critical assessment of the original plan and address any shortcomings to ensure that the project will function more smoothly or effectively in the future. The proposal must indicate what additional resources have been generated or leveraged and indicate how those and any additional resources will be continued or sought.</p>	
2. (15 points) Objectives and Projected Outcomes:		__ / 15
	<p>a. Objectives, milestones and deliverables should be described in sufficient detail such that progress can be measured. Indicate the prospects for meaningful impacts within the proposed duration of the project. The proposal must indicate what approaches will be used to assess outcomes including stakeholder use and how these assessments will be used in program planning.</p> <p>b. For renewals, the proposal must address productivity, completion of original objectives and the relationship between projected goals and actual accomplishments. The proposal must include an assessment of the outcomes and/or impact of the previous project period. This assessment must include an evaluation of stakeholders' use of project outputs. The proposed objectives must reflect appropriate revision, e.g. evolution or building to greater depth, and/or capacity. All project revisions must incorporate stakeholder needs.</p>	

3. (15 points) Integration and Documentation of Research Support:	__ / 15
<p>a. Projects should indicate how efforts are integrated with extension or academic programs and how results might be of use by other potential stakeholders.</p> <p>b. For renewals, the proposal should indicate any new partnerships built during the project period. The proposal should address the degree to which the full team is engaged in project planning and implementation. Discuss plans to correct any weaknesses that may have been identified.</p> <p>c. Proposals should indicate specifically how the project will support research activities nationwide.</p>	

4. (15 points) Outreach, Communications and Assessment:	__ / 15
<p>a. All projects must have a sound outreach, communications and assessment plan that seeks to communicate the programs goals, accomplishments and outcomes/impacts. The communication plan must detail how results will be transferred to researchers and other end users and contain the following elements:</p>	
<p>i) Clear identification of the intended audience(s) of the NRSP. Since this is a Research Support Project, in most instances the primary beneficiary of the results will be other scientists. However, careful consideration should be given to other possible users of the information (such as consumers, producers, governmental agencies (local, state and federal), general public, etc.)</p>	Yes / No
<p>ii) Clear description of the engagement of stakeholders in the definition and/or conduct of the research support project.</p>	Yes / No
<p>iii) Thorough description of the methodology to measure the accomplishments and impacts of the National Research Support Project and effectiveness of the communication plan. Methods such as surveys, town meetings, conferences, analyses of reference data (e.g. citation index, etc.), and use of professional evaluators should be considered.</p>	Yes / No
<p>iv) Specific description for development of communication pieces describing the activities, accomplishments, and impacts of the NRSP. The communication pieces will be used with SAES/ARD directors, stakeholders and their organizations, funding sources and agencies, and congressional delegations.</p>	Yes / No
<p>v) Suggested mechanisms for distribution of the results of the research support project. Examples include sharing the results at annual meetings of stakeholders, providing material to the Budget and Advocacy Committee of the NASULGC Board on Agriculture Assembly and other appropriate committees within the SAES/ARD organization, and assisting CSREES is preparation of appropriate documents highlighting the impacts of the project.</p>	Yes / No

	<p>b. For renewals, the proposal should assess the success of the project's outreach and communications plan and indicate any steps to be taken to improve effectiveness. A clear description of impacts resulting from the project is required.</p>	
Comments:		

Total Points:	<hr style="width: 100%;"/>
	100



APPENDIX EF - Format for Reporting Projected Participation (NIMSS Appendix E)

For each participant in this activity, include his/her name and e-mail address, employing institution/agency, and department; plus, as applicable:

- For research commitment, indicate the CRIS classifications [Research Problem Area(s) (RPA), Subject(s) of Investigation (SOI), and Field(s) of Science (FOS)], and estimates of time commitment by Scientists Years (SY) (not less than 0.1 SY), Professional Years (PY), and Technical Years (TY);
- For extension commitment, indicate FTE and one or more of the seven extension programs (See <http://www.reeusda.gov/1700/programs/baseprog.htm>); and,
- Objective(s) under which the each participant will conduct their studies.

Project or Activity Designation and Number (if applicable):

Project or Activity Title: _____

Administrative Advisor: _____

Participant Name and E-Mail Address	Institution and Department	Research						Extension		Project Objectives				
		CRIS Codes			Personnel					FTE	National Program	1	2	3
		RPA	SOI	FOS	SY	PY	TY							

APPENDIX FG - NRSP BUDGET REQUESTS SUMMARY

Project Number and Title

MRF FUNDING										
DESCRIPTION	Proposed FY (year 1)		Proposed FY (year 2)		Proposed FY (year 3)		Proposed FY (year 4)		Proposed FY (year 5)	
	Dollars	FTE	Dollars	FTE	Dollars	FTE	Dollars	FTE	Dollars	FTE
SALARIES										
FRINGE BENEFITS										
WAGES										
TRAVEL										
SUPPLIES										
MAINTENANCE										
EQUIPMENT/ CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT										
TOTAL										

OTHER SOURCES OF FUNDING										
Please check one of the following:			Industry	Federal Agencies	Grants/Contracts	SAESs				
Other (please list): _____										
DESCRIPTION	Proposed FY (year 1)		Proposed FY (year 2)		Proposed FY (year 3)		Proposed FY (year 4)		Proposed FY (year 5)	
	Dollars	FTE	Dollars	FTE	Dollars	FTE	Dollars	FTE	Dollars	FTE
SALARIES										
FRINGE BENEFITS										
WAGES										
TRAVEL										
SUPPLIES										
MAINTENANCE										
EQUIPMENT/ CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT										
TOTAL										

Action Requested: For information

Agenda Item 11.10 Funds for Excellence in Multistate Research Award

Presenter: H M Harrington

Background:

Efforts have been made to find a way for CSREES to provide funds each year to the multistate project that is selected for the Excellence in Multistate Research Award. These funds could be used to pay travel expenses for two project members to attend the awards ceremony at the APLU Annual Meeting in November and to provide support for other project activities; such as meeting expenses, outside speaker, research supplies, technical assistance, etc.

In early May, Dennis Kopp, who coordinates the teaching and extension awards, provided the following details on how CSREES proposes that this funding be managed.

- CSREES would annually set aside \$15,000 in Hatch Multistate Research Funds that would be used for the Excellence in Multistate Research Award.
- Up to \$5,000 would be used to cover travel for the Administrative Advisor and the Chair of the recipient committee (or their appointed designees) to attend the awards ceremony at the APLU annual conference.
- The remaining \$10,000 award funds will be used to support activities which would enhance and contribute to the research and/or outreach goals of that multistate project, consistent with the appropriate use of Hatch Funds. Use of these funds would be a committee decision made in conjunction with its Administrative Advisor.
- Award funds distribution process would be as follows:
 - In late June CSREES would be notified of the award winner for that year and provided the name and contact information of the project's Administrative Advisor.
 - CSREES will then contact that Administrative Advisor and arrange to have the Multistate award funds transferred to his/her institution as part of their annual MRF allocation.
 - The Administrative Advisor would be responsible for the proper distribution and appropriate use of the award funds.
- The 2009 Excellence in Multistate Research Award will be the first year for which there will be a financial award.

These details were discussed by the ESCOP Chairs Advisory Committee, who had one significant concern regarding CSREES's proposal. Because the ability and ease of expending these funds in the manner intended would vary greatly between different SAES offices, the ESCOP CAC proposed that the funds should be allocated to North Carolina State University and managed by the SAAESD Executive Director's office in residence there. This would ensure a consistent process for disbursing the funds each year and relieve the Administrative Advisor of this task. The SAAESD ED's office would be directed by the winning project's Administrative Advisor on the specific use of the funds. CSREES has agreed with this recommendation and the NCSU AES Director has agreed to receive these funds and allow the ED's office to manage them for the intended purpose.

Because the \$15,000 award funds would come off the top from MRF Hatch, the ESS needs to approve this use, which will normally be done at the September ESS meeting. However, CSREES must allocate

these funds this year no later than August 1, therefore approval for FY'09 needs to be obtained during the regional summer meetings. Approval for FY'10 will be considered at the ESS meeting this September.

To put the award funds in perspective, \$15,000 is approximately 0.035% of the FY'09 MRF Hatch that is allocated to individual an AES. This would be an average of \$290 per AES, but would vary according to the amount each one actually receives. Below is a table indicating the actual FY 2009 contributions that would be made by each state.

Action Requested:

Approve use of \$15,000 MRF Hatch for the Excellence in Multistate Research Award recipient project in FY 2009 and management of these funds as described above.

Multistate Award Contributions by State

State/Territory	State MRF	Total MRF	State/total	Award	Amount
Alaska	\$161,266	\$46,633,571	0.003	\$15,000	\$51.87
American Samoa	\$24,482	\$46,633,571	0.001	\$15,000	\$7.87
Arizona	\$852,684	\$46,633,571	0.018	\$15,000	\$274.27
California	\$1,786,491	\$46,633,571	0.038	\$15,000	\$574.64
Colorado	\$1,144,185	\$46,633,571	0.025	\$15,000	\$368.03
Guam	\$138,084	\$46,633,571	0.003	\$15,000	\$44.42
Hawaii	\$432,389	\$46,633,571	0.009	\$15,000	\$139.08
Idaho	\$672,270	\$46,633,571	0.014	\$15,000	\$216.24
Montana	\$752,901	\$46,633,571	0.016	\$15,000	\$242.18
Nevada	\$412,233	\$46,633,571	0.009	\$15,000	\$132.60
New Mexico	\$453,555	\$46,633,571	0.010	\$15,000	\$145.89
Oregon	\$1,066,359	\$46,633,571	0.023	\$15,000	\$343.00
Utah	\$842,089	\$46,633,571	0.018	\$15,000	\$270.86
Washington	\$1,525,712	\$46,633,571	0.033	\$15,000	\$490.76
Wyoming	\$600,709	\$46,633,571	0.013	\$15,000	\$193.22

Action Requested: Approval of off-the-top funding of \$15,000 for the National Excellence in Research project

Action Taken: Approved

Agenda Item 11.11: 2009 CSREES Grantsmanship Workshops and Writing Winning Grants Workshops

Presenter: H. M. Harrington

Background:

Grantsmanship workshops will be held again this fall to highlight the competitive programs in USDA-CSREES and to help grant writers improve their overall success. Both the CSREES Grantsmanship Workshop and the Writing Winning Grants Workshop have received outstanding reviews from across the country in past years. These workshops will be offered together in Kansas City, MO on Nov 10 – 11 and in Washington, DC on Nov 16 – 17.

During the CSREES Grantsmanship Workshop an excellent group of program directors from CSREES will be providing an overview of funding programs within the Agriculture and Food Research Initiative (AFRI) and other competitive programs and the 2010 AFRI Request for Applications. In addition, there will breakout discussion on specific program areas as well as a mock review panel to provide insights on successful grants and the review process.

The Writing Winning Grants Workshop, presented by Drs Thomas Fretz and Michael Harrington, will feature topics that include: Where to look for funds, Principles of grant writing, writing effective objective statements, organizing integrated proposals, developing the grant budget, ethics in grant writing, and common short-comings in the grant application.

Travel grants will be available for participants from minority serving institutions, including 1890s, 1994s and other tribal colleges as well as Pacific Islander, Native Hawaii and Hispanic serving institutions. The travel grant application forms for each workshop are available on the web sites below. Applications from eligible faculty are due August 15.

Washington DC Workshop: November 16 - 17,
Crystal Gateway Marriott - Arlington, VA

Cosponsored by the Southern Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors, the Northeast Regional Research Association, and USDA-CSREES

Please visit the workshop website for information on registration, hotels and program agenda:
<http://www.cpe.vt.edu/usdagrant/index.html>

Kansas City, MO Workshop: November 10 - 11
Embassy Suites Kansas City Airport, Kansas City, MO

Cosponsored by University of Missouri, the North Central Research Association, Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors, and USDA-CSREES

Please visit the workshop website for information on registration, hotels and the program agenda:
<http://muconf.missouri.edu/usda-csrees/index.html>

Action Requested: For information

Agenda Item 11.12: Alaska State Report

Presenter: Carol Lewis

Background:

School of Natural Resources and Agricultural Sciences

Agricultural and Forestry Experiment Station

University of Alaska Fairbanks

State Report for FY 09

July 14, 2009

Three events highlighted the year for the School of Natural Resources and Agricultural Sciences (SNRAS) and the Agricultural and Forestry Experiment Station (AFES). We are launching the strategic plan for the Palmer Center for Sustainable Living, formerly the Palmer Research and Extension Center in south central Alaska. SNAP, the Scenarios Network for Alaska Planning, rose to prominence as an outreach center for climate information in Alaska, and our livestock program received a boost (non-monetary at this point) from the University of Alaska Board of Regents. With new management in our business office that incorporates CES as well as SNRAS and AFES, we were able to end the budget year with a small surplus giving us a reasonable outlook to enable us to not go into a deficit position in FY 10.

Palmer Center for Sustainable Living: The Palmer Research and Extension Center (PREC) in south central Alaska has been under a great deal of pressure from urban expansion of the Anchorage core into the Matanuska Valley. The PREC comprises our SNRAS/AFES south central Alaska administrative offices located on 23 acres in downtown Palmer, 40 miles from Anchorage, and the Matanuska Experiment Farm (MEF) on 1000 acres approximately 7 miles west of Palmer. In 2006, the AFES allowed sales of two pieces of property on the MEF totaling 40 acres for construction of a regional hospital. Rather than succumb to further sales of our lands, we created an innovative plan for the PREC renaming it the Palmer Center for Sustainable Living (PCSL). The PCSL includes: the Matanuska Experiment Farm dedicated to agricultural research, education, and public service; Kerttula Hall, the former Palmer Research Laboratory, dedicated to a prominent agriculturalist and Alaska State Senator who obtained the original funding that will house our administrative support staff as well as faculty offices, classrooms, and laboratories; the Matanuska Colony History Center providing a future conference center, distance delivery facilities (ready for class in fall 2009), a future historical and natural resources library and guest offices that includes all of our historical buildings that date to 1917; and the Alaska Environmental Studies and Learning Park our headquarters for our K-12 natural resource and geography programs in south central Alaska, the Biomass Energy Research and Development Laboratory, and the future UAF Mountain Science Center honoring Brad Washburn, mountaineer and distinguished geographer. The unveiling of the PCSL will be held August 6, 2009, at an invitation only gathering for distinguished Alaskans that will feature an Alaskan Grown luncheon and will include tours of the 1000 acre property.

Scenarios for Alaska Planning (SNAP): SNAP is a collaborative network of the University of Alaska, state, federal, and local agencies, and NGOs. It is a part of the University of Alaska Geography Program housed in SNRAS and is the creation of Associate Professor Scott Rupp of the Forest Sciences and Geography departments. The primary products of the network are (1) datasets and maps projecting future conditions for selected variables, and (2) rules and models that develop these projections, based on historical conditions and trends. SNAP is assisting the Governor's Sub-Cabinet with the task of preparing and implementing an Alaska Climate Change Strategy. This will be a transparent document which deals with state policies for anticipated climate change. The Sub-Cabinet's goals include building the state's knowledge of the actual and foreseeable effects of climate warming in Alaska, developing appropriate measures and policies to prepare communities in Alaska for the anticipated impacts from climate change, and providing guidance regarding Alaska's participation in regional and national efforts addressing causes and effects of climate change. SNAP has come into prominence because of its outreach capabilities to agencies providing them with a user-friendly interface to access predictive climate models that are regionalized within Alaska. Learn more about SNAP at <http://www.snap.uaf.edu>.

Livestock Program: The species of choice for the predominant component of AFES livestock research is the reindeer. However, we are also working with a pastured herd of Angus that are only grass fed. Recently, we hosted a luncheon for the University of Alaska Board of Regents that featured our Angus cattle. The Board was impressed with the quality of the meat as were we with the chef's preparation. A boost to our reindeer program in Nome is the purchase of a mobile slaughterer plant in partnership with the Northwest Community Campus. The slaughter plant will not only serve the reindeer industry on the Seward Peninsula but will be a feature in our High Latitude Range Management certificate program offered through the Northwest Community Campus that includes instruction and training in reindeer slaughter and processing.

Carol E. Lewis
Dean and Director

Agenda Item 11.12: Arizona State Report

Presenter: Colin Kaltenbach

Background:

As of this writing we are still waiting for the Arizona Legislature to figure out how they are going to deal with a \$3+ billion deficit in the coming year. We have already taken a 10% cut and there is more to come. The Legislature passed a budget at the last hour on June 30 but the Governor line item vetoed a significant portion of their work including cuts to the University system. Given the state of the budget they will have to reinstate some of the cuts but only time will tell the magnitude of the recisions.

We are now operational at our new Agricultural Center facility at Red Rock, AZ which is located off of I-10 approximately 40 miles NW of Tucson. We are focusing on energy related work at this new Center which will hopefully include a lot of solar installations and a significant algae growing effort.

We dedicated our new 20,000 sq. ft. office/laboratory building in Yuma in November . This was a 20 year dream and long standing effort that finally came to fruition thanks to a lot of help from our constituents in the Yuma area

Otherwise things are pretty much normal in Arizona–hot, dry and broke!!!.

For information only, no action requested

Agenda Item 11.12: California State Report

Presenter: Barbara Allen-Diaz

Background:

California State Report

Three things to take away from my brief remarks

1. ANR professionals have a unique, proven, and respected ability to bring together the resources needed to solve tough problems: science-based, new knowledge, targeted research and extend education
2. Unprecedented times
Had budget cuts before, but not like this with the state budget situation as it is
3. Everything, every program, every admin structure, every way that we do business is being discussed, ideas are being generated, and it is clear that we will not look the same when this is all over
4. We are fortunate because we have a Strategic Vision to guide us.

I will try and briefly explain the budget situation. As you know:

1. UC is facing a \$800M plus budget deficit
2. All UC employees are facing an 8% pay reduction (furlough and/or pay cut)
3. Many positions are frozen throughout the system, and there will be little or no hiring in '09-10
4. Many layoffs have occurred and many more are on the horizon
5. Campus units are experiencing unprecedented budget shortfalls on the order of 20% now and rising

In addition, ANR

1. as a principle, decided not to weaken every program and unit with across the board cuts
2. has frozen staff hiring
3. is attempting to minimize layoffs and hopefully prevent layoffs of academics
4. has frozen **all** state-funded competitive grants programs for the 2nd year
5. will transition some endowment competitive grants programs toward funding strategic initiatives, and other endowment grants programs to funding academic salaries in order to prevent layoffs of academics, all within the terms of the endowments
6. placed every program and every administrative unit on the table for possible elimination
7. declined to appoint statewide program directors up for renewal for the 'normal' 5 year term
8. has empowered Program Council to recommend solutions to the budget crisis
9. all budget discussions are using the Strategic Vision as a guide to the future.

Agenda Item 11.12: Colorado State Report

Presenter: Lee Sommers

Background:

Following Marc Johnson's resignation in the June 2008, I served as Interim Dean of the College of Agricultural Sciences while a national search was conducted for a Dean. Dr. Craig Beyrouthy joined CSU as Dean of Agricultural Sciences on July 10, 2009. Craig was a faculty member at the University of Arkansas and for the past 8+ years has been Head of the Department of Agronomy at Purdue University. Other administrative changes at CSU include the appointment of Dr. Tony Frank as Interim President following the resignation of Dr. Larry Penley last fall; his appointment as President was finalized in June 2009. Dr. Rick Miranda, Dean of Natural Sciences, has served as Interim Provost since January 2009.

As in many other states, the state budget suffered significant reductions in FY09. The state mandated a rescission in February 2009 which resulted in a 3% funding cut for the College, AES, and Extension. The administrative units at CSU were impacted with significantly higher budget cuts. The state has devoted a significant amount of federal stimulus funding to higher education which appears to buffer CSU from further significant funding cuts for the next 2 years. However, CSU will likely see a \$30M cut in future state funding, about a 23% decrease. As a result we are implementing a 5% budget cut for FY10 and starting to plan for a series of budget cuts for the 3 years of about 3% per year. This is all based on a stabilization of the state economy which remains in question especially since the June 2009 state revenue was less than needed to balance the state budget. It is projected that there will be about 40 staff layoffs across the campus. The College, AES, and Extension are using retirements and resignations to address most of the needed reductions in staff. A priority of the central administration is to maintain the academic core of the institution so there is not a current impact on tenure-track or tenured faculty positions.

In spite of the budget situation, the College has hired replacement faculty in several departments. The following is a summary of recent faculty hires:

Brett Kirch, Department of Animal Sciences, Youth Livestock and Equine Program

Jason Ahola, Department of Animal Sciences, Beef Production Systems

Dale Woerner, Department of Animal Sciences, Meat Science

Frank Stonaker, Department of Horticulture and Landscape Architecture, Specialty and Alternative Crops

Paul Ode, Department of Bioagricultural Sciences and Pest Management, Insect Ecology

Jay Ham, Department of Soil and Crop Sciences, Soil Physics and Micrometeorology

Stephan Kroll, Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics, Resource Economics

We also participated in a university-wide bonding program to obtain funds for renovation of campus greenhouse facilities. Two separate greenhouse complexes are being upgraded with the funds.

Agenda Item 11.12: Hawaii State Report

Presenter: CY Hu

Background:

College of Tropical Agriculture and Human Resources, University of Hawaii at Mānoa Station Report for Western Directors Joint Summer Meeting, July 2009

Budget Cuts: Like other state government agencies, the University of Hawaii has been hard hit by the current economic situation and the downturn in state revenues. The 2009 Legislature reduced the university's general fund budget by \$46 million per year for the next two fiscal years in order to balance the state budget. To partially offset these reductions, the University anticipates an infusion of federal stimulus funds of \$22 million per year for the next two years.

However, the Governor has notified the University that she is restricting UH's budget by \$52.1 million in Fiscal Year 2010, and \$54.7 million in Fiscal Year 2011, resulting in overall general funds reductions of \$76 million in FY10 and \$78 million in FY11.

At UH Mānoa, our cuts amount to at least \$66 million, or 26% of our general fund budget of \$260 million over the next two years. This campus anticipates federal stimulus funds to offset \$14.7 million for each year of the biennium. With ongoing labor negotiations including a contested court case which determined that the Governor's plan to furlough workers for three days per month must be negotiated with labor unions, progressively gloomy economic forecasts, and other factors that determine the required "budgetary bottom line," the Mānoa Chancellor has provided plans to meet net reductions amounting to \$36 million this fiscal year by re-directing tuition, fees and other available funds received from increased tuition costs and an increase in enrollment; reducing operating costs for utilities and mandating other efficiency savings; imposing 4% reductions on all programs, and directing staffing and course reductions.

Other sources of funding, such as funds received for research and return of overhead funds from research grants and contracts may are also available to reduce and redirect existing resources to meet budget cuts. To date, the unfunded shortfall on this campus is \$30 million. Other universities are using furloughs, retirement incentives, pay reductions, and elimination of programs and entire schools --- options that are possibilities for us. One thing is certain: these are tough times and trimming is necessary. We are looking to be meaner and leaner, and are committed to educating our students and fulfilling our core mission.

Enrollment: After five consecutive years of increasing enrollment, which saw a 40% increase in CTAHR's student majors from 2002 to 2007, the college's total enrollment dropped dramatically in Fall 2008. CTAHR's enrollment in Fall 2008 was 754, 10% lower than in Fall 2007 (839 student majors). The decrease came primarily at the undergraduate level, in CTAHR's three largest academic programs. The number of student semester credit hours taught by CTAHR's programs, however, remained approximately the same. We anticipate an increase in enrollment in the 2009-2010 academic year.

Grants and contracts: During FY2008, the college experienced steep declines in both the number and value of its grants and contracts, 116 extramural awards worth just over \$11 million. For FY 2009, the college's faculty and staff members have received 169 awards worth almost \$19 million.

Changes in Leadership: Dr. M.R.C. Greenwood, chancellor emerita of the University of California, Santa Cruz, has been named president of the University of Hawaii System. A nationally and internationally known expert on obesity and diabetes, Greenwood is also considered a national leader on science and technology policy and an expert on higher education policy issues. University of Hawaii at Manoa also has a new Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs: Dr. Reed Dasenbrock who served as the cabinet secretary in charge of New Mexico's Higher Education Department before joining UHM. He formerly served as provost, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, and professor of English at the University of New Mexico. Dr. Doug Vincent has replaced retiring Dr. James Carpenter as chair of the college's Department of Human Nutrition, Food and Animal Sciences. Dr. Cathy Chan-Halbrendt will replace Dr. Carl Evensen as the chair of the Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Management on August 1. Dr. Russell Nagata has arrived from University of Florida to assume the county administrator for Hawai'i County.

Agenda Item 11.12: State Report- University Wyoming College of Agriculture

Presenter: Steve Miller

Background:

The university was required to cut its budget by 10% (= \$18.3 M) by executive order from the Governor's office. The major impact to the college was elimination of our development officer position, CPM of both faculty and staff vacancies, and a reduction in operating budgets. Because of our revolving accounts in the Agricultural Experiment Station, we were able to spare the R&E Centers from any budget reductions.

Position hires slated for 2010-11

- Range scientist
- Bioinformatics
- Agroecology AP
- Animal Science AP
- Horticulturalist – SREC

Position hires 2009-2010

- RNEW department head, John Tanaka
- Reclamation ecologist, Christine Hufford
- Agroecologist, Ursula Norton
- Invasive weeds specialist, Brian Mealor
- Turf specialist and director, SREC, Steve Keeley
- Equine specialist, Amy McLean
- Vet Sciences virologist, Jonathan Fox
- Water economist – Kristiana Hansen
- Spicer Chair – Steven Smutko – joint Ag & Environment & Natural Resources

Searches in progress:

- Irrigation specialist (PREC)
- Energy specialist – joint Ag & School of Energy

Grant Dollars

- Ag ranked second at UW for external funding
- \$14.5 million

Academic & Student Programs

- ≈ 890 undergraduates
- ≈ 145 graduate students (41 hard money, 104 soft money)

Experiment Station Additions

- Laramie (LREC)
 - Pellet mill
 - GrowSafe system – sheep
 - Automated control – greenhouse
- James C. Hageman Sustainable Agriculture Research & Extension Center (SAREC), Lingle
 - New wet lab
 - Congregate residence – grad students, visiting faculty
 - Commodity shed
- Powell (PREC)
 - Lateral move sprinkler
 - Seed cleaning facility
- Sheridan (SREC)
 - Automated weather station
 - Horticultural emphasis
 - Third year agroecology program with Sheridan College

LEAD21
LEADERSHIP FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

LEAD21
LEADERSHIP FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

Class of 2010-2011:
 June 20-25, 2010
 October 4-7, 2010
 February 9-12, 2011

Class of 2011-2012:
 June 19-24, 2011
 October 3-6, 2011
 February 8-11, 2012

Registration Deadline:
November 30th

For More Information, call (706) 542-1108 or visit us on the web at:
www.fanning.uga.edu/prog/lead21



Strategic Partnerships



Research, Academics, & Extension



LEAD21 is intended to meet the needs for leadership development of faculty, specialists, program and team leaders, research station and center directors, district and regional directors, department heads and chairs, and others in land grant universities' colleges of agricultural, environmental, and human sciences and USDA/CSREES.

Program goals are for participants to:

- » Enhance application of skills and knowledge learned in nine core leadership competencies.
- » Develop a peer leadership network in order to enhance personal leadership practice, collaboration, and diversity of perspective.
- » Develop and implement an individual leadership development process.

Program components include:

- » Three on-site sessions
- » Independent learning

Program cost:

- » \$9000
- » Includes all participant materials, meals and lodging
- » Scholarships available
- » Institutions are encouraged to send a team of individuals



FIVE CORE COMPETENCIES

- ❖ Developing Self and Others
- ❖ Leading with Integrity and Values
- ❖ Resolving Conflict
- ❖ Fostering Collaboration
- ❖ Managing Change

SECONDARY COMPETENCIES

- ❖ Communicating Effectively
- ❖ Valuing Diversity
- ❖ Developing a Deeper Knowledge and Appreciation of Higher Ed
- ❖ Developing and Managing Resources

Developing leaders in land grant institutions and their strategic partners who link research, academics, and extension in order to lead more effectively.

Land-Grant Knowledge Discovery System Justification and Proposal¹

The Panel's analysis makes a case for ... a dynamic national agricultural information system. As has occurred with the National Library of Medicine, this system would draw on innovative technologies to directly link users to quality content (abstracts, full-text, data, and information packages) in all areas ... in the support of the total U.S. food and fiber enterprise. Included would be a complementary mix of services ... 24/7 document delivery, and all interconnected through a powerful search interface providing users with the closest approximation possible to a "one-stop-shopping" reality.²

National Knowledge Needs and Role of Land-Grant Institutions

Today's critical issues require an understanding of many disciplinary areas and the ability to bring these different knowledge bases together in new ways. Our collective interests, and even more the future we leave for the next generation, require immediate and novel approaches for securing our food and water resources, addressing the consequences of climate change, implementing alternative fuels and energy sources, and conserving natural resources. To find solutions to these complex issues will require the harnessing of all knowledge sources using the full power of information dissemination and discovery technologies. *U.S. Land-Grant institutions house extensive resources that could be brought to bear on the challenges of our day, but current access to these resources is extremely limited.*

Critical Issues of Accessibility

- Important scientific resources (print & data sets) are being lost as a generation retires from the nation's Land-Grant universities and colleges (LGUs).
- Most LGUs lack the resources to maintain institutional repositories and do not have procedures in place for preserving and providing access to institutional intellectual property, in particular agricultural experiment station and Extension reports, bulletins, scientific papers, and data sets.
- Historic literature is in increasing demand, but is difficult to find. For example, there is new interest in the organic farming literature of the 1930s and 1940s.
- "Born Digital" materials (those resources created only in digital format) are often ephemeral, subject to "link rot" and loss of persistent, stable, and long-term access.

The Promise of Deep Web Technologies

A 24/7 distributed, multi-institutional knowledge management system employing deep web search capabilities will offer scientists, policy makers, and members of the public and private sectors with the ability to mine content for new relationships with the potential for discovering solutions to multifaceted interdisciplinary problems. Specifically, deep web tools will provide unique search algorithms to identify previously undiscovered linkages between multiple and disparate datasets and scientific materials, and to do so quickly, efficiently, and across disciplines and publication formats. In addition, Web services and 2.0 technologies will allow for personalized customization combined with self-management capabilities to directly involve all stakeholders in the development and maintenance of the system.

¹ Prepared by Barbara Hutchinson (University of Arizona – barbarah@ag.arizona.edu) and Linda Eells (University of Minnesota - lle@umn.edu)

² Vanderhoef, L. N. (Panel Chair) and others. 2001. *Report on the National Agricultural Library*. National Agricultural Library: Beltsville, MD. <http://www.nal.usda.gov/assessment/contents.html>

Examples of Current LGU Silo Approach

Currently, the agriculture-related repository environment is extremely fragmented and is made up of silos of resources. While there are examples of components for a knowledge discovery system, to date most action has been in the form of discussions rather than tangible progress.³ Examples of silo repositories:

- Texas A&M CALS Repository - <http://txspace.tamu.edu/handle/1969.1/3370>
- Michigan State University Extension Repository - <http://www.msue.msu.edu/portal/>
- UC Davis Ag & Natural Resources Repository - <http://ucanr.org/repository/>
- University of Minnesota Ag Experiment Station Repository - http://www.extension.umn.edu/ext_image_lib/ and Digital Conservancy - <http://conservancy.umn.edu/handle/48246>

Complementarity to Other USDA Information Systems

The USDA has supported a number of coordinated information management programs among its agencies and partners:

- Current Research Information System (CRIS) documentation and reporting system for ongoing agricultural, food and nutrition, and forestry research projects.
- Research, Education, and Economics Information System (REEIS) for accessing information from research, education and extension programs, projects and activities.
- Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (AREERA) system for approved Plans of Work and Annual Reports of Accomplishments.
- Science.gov for providing access to government documents in a wide variety of scientific fields, including agriculture.
- eXtension initiative for making available synthesized extension materials. (Note: it is not in the eXtension mission to act as a persistent, long term, comprehensive repository of primary, full-text, or data set resources)

These services are successful because USDA has provided leadership in their development, and has recognized these needs as critical to the broad agriculture sector. Many of these services were the direct result of USDA-sponsored expert meetings and consultations. However, none of these services incorporates comprehensive access to digital resources housed in the LGU network.

Immediate Actions Needed

The technical and human capacity is in place to achieve what has not been possible in the past – a dynamic new means for discovery and advancement that will serve vital food, agricultural and environmental issues facing Americans today, and that has the potential to provide a key component toward leaving our world a better place for future generations. Thus, it is of paramount importance that we bring together the best minds to consider how to efficiently and effectively gain access to the wealth of un-tapped knowledge and intellectual property in the nation's Land-Grant institutions.

Requested Signatories: Deans of Colleges of Agriculture and Natural Resources; Directors, Agricultural Experiment Stations; Directors of Extension; and Deans/Directors of Libraries

³ Discussions have taken place in the Agriculture Network Information Center (AgNIC's) Born Digital Committee and ADEC's Digital Infrastructure Group, as well as among members of the U.S. Agriculture Information Center (USAIN).

We the undersigned propose the immediate convening of a USDA/CSREES-sponsored strategy meeting to bring together key stakeholders for the purpose of initiating a pilot project that will form the basis for a Land-Grant Knowledge Discovery System.

<u>Name/Title</u>	<u>Institution</u>	<u>Date</u>
1)		
2)		
3)		
4)		
5)		
6)		
7)		
8)		
9)		
10)		
11)		
12)		
13)		
14)		
15)		
16)		
17)		
18)		
19)		
20)		
21)		
22)		
23)		
24)		