Southern Administrative Heads Summer Meeting

Embassy Suites, Cary, NC

Saturday, August 5, 2017, 10:15 – 12:00

Minutes

1. Attending –
   Nancy Cox, Steve Lommel, Shirley Hymon-Parker, Paul Patterson, Vernie Hubert, Tim Cross, Moses Kairo, Vallerie Giddings, Mark Hussey, Tom Coon, Rich Linton, Mark Cochran, Alan Grant, Alton Thompson, Eric Young, Edmund Buckner, Ray McKinney, Jeanna Mastrodicasa

2. Additional questions/comments on BAC and/or CLP Updates – Alan Grant & Greg Bohach
   - Most recent advocacy campaign with video
     - Some deans were told not to send letter by their government affairs directors because delegation was already supportive of capacity funds
     - Stakeholder response was low partly due to the request not being clear that it be forwarded to them
     - Seems like kglobal should be asking stakeholders directly to do this.
     - Learned a lot on this first try and will make changes to improve process

3. Other advocacy efforts; Riley Foundation, SoAR, AGree, etc – Greg Bohach
   - Riley continues to bring groups together to discuss getting a broad base of support to increase ag research funding

   a. Submissions for SoAR's Retaking the Field (food safety, nutrition, and zoonotic diseases)
      - ESCOP is submitting 2 or 3 stories in each of the three subject areas for their next publication
      - SoAR is now supporting of capacity funds and is also behind the infrastructure needs
   b. N-CFAR Lunch 'n Learn and other efforts (brief below)
   c. BAA's LGU Public Value Statement draft (brief below)
   d. Communication and Marketing Committee status
      - Need a closer connection of the CMC to the BAC
        - PBD is looking into how best to do this
        - Starting immediately, the CMC chair will be invited to sit in on BAC calls and meetings and PBD meetings

4. Southern Mini Land-grant Meeting, Spring 2019 – Eric Young
   a. Tentative schedule (brief below)
   b. CARET/AHS tour Thursday
   c. Joint session topics (issues, programmatic, administrative – BMP's, speakers, breakouts)?
      - One suggested topic: alternative models for engaging with private partners

5. Deferred maintenance and potential infrastructure bill – Tom Coon
   - Met with Sinclair Cooper, President of Public Infrastructure Development for Hunt Companies, and a representative from Cobank

    - Military model that Hunt Companies used probably won't work for most university construction because a steady stream of income is needed to pay back the costs
    - Cobank has restrictions on only lending in rural counties and you still have to pay it back
- House Ag Committee is thinking in terms of competitive grants and there is clearly interest among the members to do something
- Connected with White House Office of Economic Advisors member and he wondered why we hadn't come to them with this issue yet
    - Referred him to Peter McPherson as the best point to start that conversation
- Need to refer to this issue as "Infrastructure Investment", not deferred maintenance, because the later implies we didn't do what should have been done

6. Other legislation of interest – Eric Young, et al.
    a. HEARD Act (brief below)
    b. Nevada Land-grant legislation (brief below)
        - Senate is sympathetic to states' right to designate the LGU(s) in their state, so probably not interested in doing any legislation that would limit that
        - Need to try to weave some policy language into the Farm Bill that would at least make it more difficult for the Nevada situation to happen again.
    c. Healthy Food Systems, Healthy People Farm Bill language (brief below)

7. Healthy Forest initiative – Eric Young
    a. Purpose, charge, and Steering Committee membership (brief below)

8. 2018 Southern CARET/AHS Summer Meeting, Auburn – Paul Patterson
    - Auburn, Alabama A&M, and Tuskegee Institute will co-host the summer meeting in Auburn on July 27-29, 2018
    - Next Southern AHS meeting is during the SAAS conference on February 5, 2018, in Jacksonville, FL, from 11:00 to 3:00

9. Other agenda items
    - Combination of SNAP-Ed and EFNEP
        - Concerned about the House Ag staff wanting to combine these based on legitimate policy concerns and efficiency
        - This is a contentious issue among various stakeholders, if LGU's take a stand it could alienate some supporters
        - Also, there will be winners and losers among the LGU's
    - Meeting in DC Sep 19-20 on virtual antimicrobial resistance institute
        - This issue is controversial with some of our stakeholder

NCFAR Meeting Highlights, 072117-727 Draft

ROC Vice Chair Caron Gala called the ROC meeting to order, with the following participants: Spady (ASPB); Ohlhorst (ASN); LaVigne (ASTA); Stein (FS-Liaison); Schescke (CAST); Cain (AAVMC); Van Wychen (WSSA); Jonker (NMPF); Van Arsdall. Gala turned chair over to Spady on arrival.

Highlights

- Hill Seminar Series
  - 6 completed to date, 478 attendees.
  - Also collaborated on Ag Research Exhibition & Reception, 175 attendees.
  - 3 more already approved (forest farming, stormwater, gene editing), fall dates TBD, for total of 9 approved to date.
  - Staff advised of another event [not NCFAR] scheduled for September 14, will work to avoid.
  - Listing of existing nominations discussed.
  - **ACTION: After discussion, nomination on seminar featuring IR-4 research was approved.**
- FY18 Appropriations
  - Discussion about NCFAR testimony (3X, including Wilkins live testimony), plus group letter effort for food and ag REE mission.
  - Action by Senate Ag Approps and full Committee markup of FYD18 Ag Approps just completed. Level funding ($375 million) for AFRI, outcome on other lines due to come out shortly.
    - https://www.appropriations.senate.gov/news/majority/senate-subcommittee-approves-fy2018-agriculture-appropriations-bill.
  - **ACTION: ROC members encouraged to participate in collaborative effort underway by AFRI Coalition and others on hill visits in anticipation of floor action in Senate.**
    - *Spady to circulate* **google site** *where meetings being posted.*
- Farm Bill
  - Spady led discussion on SoAR-facilitated effort on farm bill reauthorization, goal of unified effort on research title.
  - Spady represented ASPB and NCFAR, latter on behalf of LaVigne.
  - Referenced summary circulated earlier by Spady, Gala. Other NCFAR representatives who participated encouraged to add observations.
  - Report of first session to be produced, plus possible legislative language, and circulated in coming weeks.
  - Discussion about NCFAR role in process.
  - LaVigne provided input.
  - NCFAR role still evolving.
  - SoAR requesting modest financial contributions from participants, reportedly $500.
  - Hopefully will inform and jump-start efforts of NCFAR farm bill subcommittee to develop timely NCFAR position.
  - **ACTION: Spady to represent NCFAR.**
    - *Staff to provide update to Board about developments to date.*

- Summit
  - Gala and LaVigne briefed the ROC on Summit being planned to create a vision for food and ag REE for the future.
  - While may inform farm bill reauthorization, longer term, strategic planning for agency and stakeholders.
  - Co-convened by NCFAR and Riley Memorial Foundation (RMF).
  - Targeting early December.
  - Gala discussed funding support for the initiative (REE agencies, RMF, other).
  - Discussion about efforts to focus summit on complementing other ongoing initiatives, including SoAR-NAS initiative and RMF unified message effort, and generating value-added outcomes, with NCFAR emphasis on mission of funding for REE mission.
  - **ACTION: Gala to circulate summary to ROC.**
    - *Staff to provide update to Board about developments to date.*
- Other
  - General discussion, no actions taken.
- Meeting adjourned, next meeting subject to call of the chair.

SoAR-Facilitated Farm Bill Consensus Meeting *Spady-Gala Notes*

Many participants were surveyed in advance to prepare for the meeting. Broad themes emerged:

1-the importance of ag research
2-the decline in federal investments in ag research
3-the decline in US leadership in ag research

Within the context of those preliminary interviews, several policy issues/topics were brought up:

1-the need for improve infrastructure (human/physical)
2- the need for enhanced coordination across programs
3- the importance of providing for the full breadth of ag research
4-authorization levels
5-research portfolio balance with regard to programs, types of grants, funding approaches, and types of research
6-NIFA matching requirement
7-workforce needs (wide variety of skills and expertise)
8-effectiveness of programs shared with states (land grant universities, experiment stations, cooperative extension, etc.)
9-REE structure
10-funding for ag related science outside of USDA

Several impediments were also mentioned:

1-research is not a top priority for many organizations
2-ag research search plays out as a local/parochial issue
3-complexity of how public sector ag research is financed in the US

The following themes for community advocacy were mentioned:

1-do no harm
2-broaden coalition
3-unity around a single message
4-must include broader targeting than just working on the hill
5-new approaches

Ideas that were floated as examples for what the community might seek included the following:

1-short term surge in funding
2-consolidation of ARS and NIFA (and ERS) – This point requires the most discussion.
3-expansion of public and private partnerships beyond FFAR
4-the need for a consolidated data infrastructure that makes USDA data management for research private and efficient
5-promotion of workforce opportunities (funding for postdocs, graduate students, and early career individuals; loan forgiveness; etc.)
5-ARPA-type approach

As a result of the day's discussion, several tentative priorities emerged and were agreed upon:

1-single top line ask for REE USDA (potential "numbers" include a doubling of the USDA research budget over five years)
2-structural improvements to USDA that would include the creation of a distinct chief scientist position to elevate research and increase coordination. The idea of an NIH-style common fund was also discussed and received support.
3-infrastructure (research facilities, workforce development and training, and data management)… This would include a yet to be defined mechanism of assessment and prioritization.

Crafting a Strategic Vision for the Future

A Summit to Plan for Agriculture, Food, Health, and Natural Resource Research, Education, Extension Coalition Building Summit

PURPOSE OF EVENT

A. *Diverse agricultural leaders — from national commodity organizations, allied industries, USDA and other federal and state agencies, and universities — will envision a long-term plan of federally and state funded agricultural research that clearly connects with and meets challenges facing the agriculture sector and, in turn, society.*
B. *Research priorities will be identified that are essential to short and long-term productivity and prosperity of U.S. food, agriculture, bioeconomy and rural resources sector.*
C. *Approaches will be discussed that most effectively optimize a nationwide partnership of science to realize opportunities and address challenges.*
D. *Opportunities will be outlined for public-private partnerships that leverage existing or emerging efforts aimed at raising the prominence of food, agricultural and natural resources in federal research investments — and that clearly communicate the widespread impact and value of agricultural research programs.*

Research, extension, and education has the potential to contribute valuable insights and to identify public policy and private sector strategies to address current and emerging issues. To capitalize on the robust potential of the agricultural, food, and resource sectors to fuel further growth in the United States economy, the National Coalition for Food and Agriculture Research and Riley Memorial Foundation are planning a summit which will focus on critical areas that may include:

- fueling growth in the agricultural economy through rapid adoption of innovations and new technologies;
- harnessing the power of big Ag. data in research and extension;
- advancing the health of U.S. consumers and environmental quality; and
- assuring the security of U.S. agriculture and food systems.

An important benefit of this Summit event is the building of a cohesive coalition that USDA can engage to seek input and to implement a robust research, education, and engagement strategy that supports the vitality of the agricultural, food, natural resource, and human health sectors.

OBJECTIVE AND OUTCOME/PRODUCT

The output from the conference will provide a vision for the next generation of research and education investments in agricultural and related fields. An integrated set of priorities, clearly communicated to policy leaders, industry stakeholders, and consumers is a crucial resulting outcome.

The executive committee will develop a summary report that will document the improved roles of the four major components (commodity organizations, allied industries, USDA and other federal agencies and universities) and establish priorities that all four components can actively support. The resulting succinct report will highlight critical issues for research and development of future technologies, production practices, and food-processing strategies throughout the supply chain. It will provide evidence documenting the importance of adequately supporting research, education, and dissemination of results, and formulating policy to support the priorities identified. This will also set the stage for the individual disciplines to pursue research within their areas of expertise and across disciplinary boundaries to assure that the United States continues to be the global economic leader in agriculture, food quality and distribution, natural resource management, and biosecurity.

Comments on coordinating with other community events: The effort would complement and support the related activities of the Riley Memorial Foundation, the Board on Agriculture and Natural Resources Science Breakthroughs 2030, and the Association of Public and Land-grant Universities. The Summit is not a standalone event, but part of a longer-term effort to engage a diverse broad community of stakeholders with interests in agriculture, health, and natural resources.

Draft Conference Agenda
Capitol Hilton, 70 attendees

Day 1

1:00 PM **Opening speaker** – Defining the need, and describing the charge.

1:30 PM **Inspiring expert and stakeholder talks** about a vision for public research and partnerships, that may include (input needed):

- fueling growth in the agricultural economy through rapid adoption of innovations and new technologies;
- harnessing the power of big Ag. data in research and extension;
- advancing the health of U.S. consumers and environmental quality; and
- assuring the security of U.S. agriculture and food systems.

6:00 PM **Pre-workshop dinner**

Day 2

8:00 AM **Opening speaker**

9:00 AM **Facilitated breakout sessions** - Groups identify research questions, infrastructure needs, research concepts/collaborations, and milestones to evaluate progress.

12:00 PM **Working lunch** - Group leaders report out.

1:00 PM **Breakouts reconvene** to revise suggestions.

4:00 PM **Group reconvenes** to discuss outcomes and key themes.

4:30 PM END

Governance groups: Summit Executive Planning Committee, Summit Organizing Committee, Summit Special Advisors, and Summit Attendees.

kglobal
public affairs + public relations

The Board on Agriculture Assembly: Public Values Statement Matrix

October 24, 2016

Main Message "First Sentence"

The Board on Agriculture Assembly is a national organization that represents more than 200 public universities providing solutions to the food, natural resource, health, economic and environmental challenges facing our communities in a diverse and rapidly changing world.

Target Audience Supporting Message "Second Sentence

General Public (taxpayers)
By supporting publicly funded university research, education and Extension and outreach programs, you are helping to ensure a safe and affordable food supply, good jobs and a strong economy, and the preservation of our natural resources for the next generation.

Media
Our programs focus on the public good: we look to advance the boundaries of science, and empower the next generation to answer our society's most challenging questions.

Alumni, Current Students, Parents
We educate and equip the next generation of innovators and leaders to address broad challenges facing our communities.

Local Government (town/county/state)
Your local college of agriculture, *XXX*, provides this *town/county/state* with trusted, unbiased research, education and Extension and outreach programs that contribute to stronger local economies, safe food and water supplies, improved health and a cleaner, sustainable environment. Your support ensures a continued "public goods" knowledge base that private industry does not, and cannot, fund.

2001 L Street NW | 6th Floor | Washington, DC 20036
hello@kglobal.com | 202.349.7075 | kglobal.com

Ag and Commodity Groups
Our universities educate the next generation of professionals to keep your industry viable, discover the next generation of technology to keep your industry competitive, and support the current and next generation of community citizens through programs and resources.

Think Tanks and Professional Societies (competitive)
By engaging with organizations such as *XX*, we can share talent, knowledge and collaborative approaches to solve problems in the interest of the greater public good.

Foundations
Like you, we are a nonprofit organization dedicated to improving the quality of life for every individual. We provide access to verifiable, scientific information that allows for rapid response and long-term practical solutions for emerging issues.

Corporate Sector (private)
With access to a diversity of expertise, we leverage public investment to develop future leaders and innovative solutions to efficiently address complex issues facing our nation's food, health, environmental and economic systems.

Partner Disciplines
Our programs provide trusted local education to improve outcomes for farmers and the agricultural industry. Working with partners like you, we can advance rural and urban livelihoods and improve the safety and abundance of food to consumers.

2019 Southern Mini Land Grant Tentative Agenda-at-a-Glance

7/24/2017

Day	Time	Group	Contact	Setup	# people	Notes
Monday	All day					Attendee arrival day
Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday	6:30-8:00am			Rounds	170	Room for breakfast/lunch
Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday	6:30-8:00am				30	Hospitality suite for daily guest breakfast
Tuesday	8:00-10:00am	SAAESD/ASRED	Eric Young & Ron Brown	Crescent rounds	57	Joint meeting
Tuesday	9:00-noon	AEA	L Washington Lyons	U-shape	24	
Tuesday	9:00-noon	ARD	Alton Thompson	U-shape	24	
Tuesday	10:00-10:30am					AM Break
Tuesday	10:30-5:00pm	ASRED	Ron Brown	Hollow Square	25	
Tuesday	10:30-5:00pm	SAAESD	Eric Young	U-shape	32	
Tuesday	12:00-1:30pm					Group lunch
Tuesday	1:30-3:00pm	S-AHS/S-CARET	Eric Young	Crescent rounds	45	Joint meeting
Tuesday	1:30-5:00pm	ARD/AEA	Alton Thompson & L. Washington Lyons	Hollow Square	48	Joint meeting
Tuesday	1:30-4:00pm	S-APS	Wendy Fink	U-shape	15	
Tuesday	3:00-3:30pm					PM Break
Tuesday	3:30-5:00pm	S-CARET	Eric Young & Eddie Gouge	Crescent rounds	30	
Tuesday	3:30-5:00pm	S-AHS	Eric Young	U-shape	15	
Tuesday	6:00-9:00pm				200	Reception for 200 ppl, ideally outside space
Wednesday	6:30-8:00am					Room for breakfast/lunch
Wednesday	8:00-4:30pm	All Groups		Half rounds of 6	167	Breakfast and lunch in separate room
Wednesday	10:00-10:30am					AM Break
Wednesday	12:00-1:30pm					Group lunch
Wednesday	3:00-3:30pm					PM Break
Wednesday	6:00-9:00pm				200	Dinner will most likely be offsite
Thursday	6:30-8:00am					Room for breakfast/lunch
Thursday	8:30-10:00am	S-CARET	Eric Young & Eddie Gouge	Hollow Square	30	Tour on Thursday 10-3 with lunch
Thursday	8:30-10:00am	S-AHS	Eric Young	U-shape	15	Tour on Thursday 10-3 with lunch
Thursday	8:30-noon	ASRED	Ron Brown	Hollow Square	25	
Thursday	8:30-noon	SAAESD	Eric Young	U-shape	32	
Thursday	8:30-noon	S-APS	Wendy Fink	U shape	15	

Testimony of

Thomas G. Coon, Ph.D.

Vice President, Division of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources
Oklahoma State University

Chair, Task Force on Deferred Maintenance
Board on Agriculture Assembly
Association of Public and Land-grant Universities

on

The State of Infrastructure in Rural America

Before the
Committee on Agriculture
United States House of Representatives
July 19, 2017

Introduction

Thank you, Chairman Conaway, Ranking Member Peterson, Congressman Lucas and other Honorable Members. I am honored to represent Oklahoma State University and the Association of Public and Land Grant Universities (APLU) today.

I also want to express my appreciation for the inclusion of agricultural research infrastructure needs in the Rebuild Rural Coalition – The Farm Credit Council, American Farm Bureau Federation and other members of the coalition clearly see the connection between the innovation that derives from agricultural research at the nation's public agriculture colleges and the positive influence that has on economic development in rural America.

The Rural Prosperity Task Force that is being led by Agriculture Secretary Sonny Perdue also calls attention to the challenges that our rural communities face today. Because so much agricultural production takes place in America's rural landscape, research that strengthens agriculture's future helps to support strong school systems, health care delivery systems, and thriving businesses.

Perhaps I can summarize my message in this way: prosperity in food, agriculture and rural communities has depended on public investment in research that supports food and agriculture industries, and we stand at a crossroads of commitment for the future of the infrastructure that has supported publicly funded research.

Investments in research fuel innovation in rural America

I have been fortunate to work with farmers, ranchers and natural resource managers in my native Iowa, and in California, Minnesota, Michigan, Missouri and Oklahoma. In every case, I have worked with university colleagues who see their role as being in support of those front line producers and managers. Our scientists push the envelope of discovery to develop new insights and new technologies that enhance the yield of our rich natural heritage for food, fiber and environmental benefits for all Americans.

Just as roads, electricity, water and other infrastructures support and sustain people in our rural communities, the innovations from research have helped rural residents build individual and community wealth, whether through improved plant and animal genetics, in healthy soils and clean water, the latest irrigation scheduling application software or improved food safety practices on the farm or in the market.

Those of you on the Biotechnology, Horticulture and Research Subcommittee heard testimony from Dr. Jay Akridge of Purdue University in March about the importance of federal funding in support of agricultural research. In the 20th Century, that support transformed American agriculture and made our industry a leader of innovation. Dr. Akridge pointed out that other nations have followed our lead, and as public support for agricultural research has stagnated in the U.S., other nations have surpassed us. As of 2011, the nations of Brazil, India and China together spend $2.15 for every $1.00 that the U.S. invests in public agriculture research and development.

In June, a number of my colleagues from public and land grant agriculture colleges in Florida, California, Alabama and Texas expanded on how they have leveraged the federal investment in agricultural research with state, local and private funds to continue growth and innovation in their state's agricultural economy. One of the great strengths of the American food and agriculture system is the tremendous diversity of environments we use, the yields our farmers and ranchers produce and the processed food and fiber products consumers can purchase. The federal partnership with state and local governments and with industry and non-government organizations has created a unique engine of innovation across the breadth of that diversity.

We have a similar heritage of resourcefulness and productivity in Oklahoma, where in spite of diminished purchasing power of federal funds and recent declines in state funding, we continue to develop and release new varieties of hard red winter wheat and forage crops developed for the unique soil and farm management practices of the southern plains, our scientists develop and release new software applications to help manage beef cattle herd health and our scientists are creating faster and more definitive technologies for detecting and eliminating pathogens in food supply chains.

Research depends on modern facilities

One of the hallmarks of our agricultural colleges at public universities has been the infrastructure dedicated to research, teaching and Extension in agricultural and natural resource sciences. That includes laboratories on university campuses as well as field stations for research and Extension demonstrations. The Hatch Act of 1887 recognized the need for specialized facilities dedicated to research on agricultural topics, and

many states have used the federal capacity funds they receive through the Farm Bill to build and maintain those facilities.

However, those facilities are aging, and with stagnant or reduced federal and state funding, many of the facilities that helped to drive innovation in agriculture have deteriorated to the point of limiting their usefulness and safety for conducting 21st Century research.

In 2015, the APLU commissioned a study to document the state of research facilities at public colleges of food, agriculture and natural resources. The study was conducted by an independent organization, Sightlines, and they queried 101 institutions and received responses from 91 of them. The study included data from 15,596 buildings, which contain 87 million gross square feet of space. They estimate the replacement value of this space, based on a larger database that Sightlines maintains, at $29 billion.

Our study followed one completed by the USDA Agricultural Research Service in 2012. In that study, they classified the status of 122 major research facilities owned by the ARS, which totaled $3.7 in capitalization value. That study applied an industry standard of annual capital expenditures equal to 4% of the capitalization value to conclude that $148 million would be needed annually for maintaining the ARS facilities and another $100 million per year for replacement of outdated facilities. As much as 30% of the ARS research is conducted in facilities of cooperators, most of which are public universities, and not in ARS facilities. The Capital Investment Strategy of the ARS is complementary to the proposal we have developed based on the APLU study. Indeed, implementation of the recommendations from the APLU study will benefit ARS research as well.

One of the more noteworthy findings to emerge from the APLU study is that the total value of deferred maintenance across the 91 institutions is $8.4 billion. Annual capital spending in agriculture research infrastructure is estimated to be $1.82/GSF, which is 41% of the public university average ($4.40/GSF). Of this, $6.7 billion (80%) is in facilities that are more than 25 years old. Because buildings require more maintenance as they age, the combination of older infrastructure and underfunded maintenance is undermining the ability of our research enterprise to provide the information needs of today and the future.

The APLU study estimated the Net Asset Value of the infrastructure – in other words the replacement cost minus the cost of deferred maintenance to be at 71%. Moreover, the current deferred maintenance figure of $95/GSF puts us very close to the threshold of $100/GSF that is associated with a greater likelihood of building systems failures – such as HVAC or electrical systems – that can result in catastrophic losses of research findings.

Our study at Oklahoma State was reflective of the national study: Of our facilities on campus, 49% of the square footage was assessed as being in need of major repair or past useful life. Of our facilities at our research farms in Stillwater, 38% was in that state of disrepair.

In some respects, our faculty are being penalized for being too resourceful. One of our hallmark programs at Oklahoma State is our Wheat Improvement Team, which includes a wheat breeder, a molecular geneticist, two entomologists, a plant pathologist, a soil nutrient agronomist, a commodity market economist, and a cereal biochemist. Together, they have developed a number of varieties of hard red winter wheat well suited to the agronomic practices and environmental conditions of the southern Great Plains. For the crop that was harvested this summer, we had 15 OSU varieties of wheat available for growers to plant, and those comprised about half of the acreage planted in Oklahoma. Our wheat team continues to perform in a way that is meeting the agronomic demands of our growers and the wheat quality demands of millers. They are doing this in a greenhouse complex that was constructed before World War II and in field laboratory buildings that were constructed before I was born. We are extremely proud of their accomplishments, but we also wonder how much more successful they might be with modern facilities.

Addressing the challenge

A group of administrators and scientists from APLU developed a set of recommendations for following up on the findings of the facility survey. Those include two primary directions: one is that we need to be better stewards of our facilities. Clearly, the greatest assets of our Agricultural Experiment Station resources are the faculty, technicians and students who carry out the research. As universities have faced stagnant and declining budgets, the tendency has been to protect faculty positions as the top priorities. I think there has been a tendency to interpret a decrease in funding as a temporary phenomenon and so facility maintenance and upgrades are put off until the funding picture improves. In the meantime, faculty are expected to bring in funding through competitive grants and industry contracts to help finance the additional personnel and operating costs of their research. In many cases, the optimism that funding will return hasn't been fulfilled, and so the facility maintenance delays become permanent deferrals and we end up asking our scientists to "get by" with diminished capacity and increased unreliability of our facilities.

University administrators need to be more disciplined in adopting best management practices for facility maintenance and replacement. We need to direct more of the funding for Facilities and Administration – or Indirect Costs – into implementing those best management practices. In addition, we need to clearly communicate with our funding partners the real costs of research. Most federal agencies pay a negotiated F&A rate for university-conducted research. Those rates are carefully scrutinized by the funding agencies and each university. However, the US Department of Agriculture is authorized to fund less than the full indirect costs rate, yet we need those funds in order to carry out the necessary stewardship of our research facilities.

Even improved stewardship will not fix the problems that the APLU study has demonstrated. Some of the facilities we are using are simply outdated and cannot be brought up to 21st Century standards. The other key recommendation from the APLU task force is to invest aggressively in new facilities or major renovations to upgrade and modernize our research infrastructure. There is still a great public good that comes from research in food, agriculture and natural resource management. The

nation's interest depends on research findings that are made available to all participants in the food, agriculture and natural resource economy. The same is true for each state and local governmental entity. At the same time, many private interests, from producers to processors to wholesalers and retailers derive benefits from publicly funded and publicly available research findings. They have a part to play in financing investments in America's public agricultural research infrastructure.

We propose a funding mechanism whereby federal funds are used to leverage state, local, private industry, and private philanthropic investments into our research infrastructure needs. Our very successful public agricultural research enterprise has been built on this multi-partner model of collaborative funding.

Federal funding is especially important for addressing research needs in the national interest. It would seem important to provide federal funds with some contingencies, such as a required match with some combination of state, local, industry and/or non-governmental organization support. In addition, federal funds should be contingent on demonstrating that the research will address national or regional needs and that it will build on a record of accomplishment in research among the faculty and programs that will use the facilities. Collaboration across universities should be favored over duplicative programs in neighboring states.

Based on the findings in the APLU study, we determined that we would need to replace 68% of the research infrastructure over the next 10 years in order to position our scientists to be successful in addressing food security, food safety, agricultural productivity and environmental stewardship needs for the 21st Century. The estimated replacement cost of all research facilities included in the APLU study is $29 billion, and 68% of that is $20 billion. A federal program of investing $1 billion per year over 10 years would help to stimulate the other investments needed to complete this initiative and would position the U.S. agriculture research system to be on par with other nations who are competing in the world food and agriculture markets.

This proposed level of funding is large. Whether our federal and other partners are up to this challenge, it is important to recognize that the need is real and it is of strategic importance. The competitiveness of our agriculture sector, the security and safety of our citizens' food supply – and in large part their health – as well as the health of our environment depends on the research our scientists produce. The challenging investments that federal and state funding made in our research infrastructure in the 20th Century have created a dynamic, innovative and job-creating food and agriculture industry and a safe and secure food supply today. We owe it to future generations to make the investments that will ensure they benefit from the bounty of our tremendous natural resources and uniquely American collaboration between scientists and the farmers, ranchers and workers in our nation's food and agriculture systems.

The Hunting, Education and Recreational Development Act (HEARD ACT)

Support revenue for local education and increased access to public lands

Deadline to be an Original Cosponsor COB Wednesday, July 19.

Dear Colleague:

I invite you to become a cosponsor of the Hunting, Education and Recreational Development Act, or HEARD Act; legislation that will benefit education and increase access for hunters, fisherman, and other recreational enthusiasts.

The bill also establishes an orderly process for the sale, conveyance and exchange of federal lands not being utilized by public land management agencies that have been identified for disposal.

The legislation will yield significant benefits for education, counties and states by establishing a revenue sharing mechanism that ensures a fair return for all. The HEARD Act distributes certain revenues derived through this Act by returning 15% to the state where the disposal takes place for K-12 and higher education; 15% to one or more land grant universities in the State where the disposal takes place; 10 percent to one or more counties where the disposal takes place; and 10% to a special account in the treasury in order to increase access for hunters, recreational fishing, recreational shooting, OHV use, and other purposes.

This legislation is modeled after the Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act (SNPLMA). This public law has a proven track record of success. To date more than 35,000 acres have been sold, conveyed or exchanged in Nevada and sales have generated nearly $3 billion in revenue. The revenue sharing mechanism instituted by this law has benefitted education, enhanced recreational opportunities and public access, and achieved better management of public lands.

Although the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) maintains an inventory of land identified as appropriate for disposal, existing law does not require the BLM to dispose of identified lands on a regular or frequent basis. As a result, lands identified as potentially available for disposal under valid resource management plans are rarely disposed by the BLM. The Forest Service has several authorities to dispose of Federal lands, but such authorities are rarely used. SNPLMA is one of the few proven models that has allowed for an orderly process to make better use of lands not being utilized by the federal government.

By injecting transparency into this process and building on the successful SNPLMA model, Congress can better utilize all lands that belong to the American people while also yielding significant benefits for local stakeholders.

Should you have any questions or to add your support to this bill, please do not hesitate to contact Trevor Pearson at 202-225-2315 or Tervor.Pearson@mail.house.gov.

Thank you for your thoughtful consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

Paul A Gosar, D.D.S.
Member of Congress

H.R.3333 – The Hunting, Education and Recreational Development Act

(HEARD ACT)

The Hunting, Education and Recreational Development (HEARD) Act establishes an orderly process for the sale, conveyance and exchange of federal lands not being utilized by public land management agencies that have been identified for disposal. This legislation will yield significant benefits for education, sportsmen, agriculture and natural resource users as well as counties and states by establishing a revenue sharing mechanism that ensures a fair return for all.

The bill distributes certain revenues derived through this Act by returning 15% to the state where the disposal takes place for K-12 and higher education; 15% to one or more land grant universities in the State where the disposal takes place; 10% to one or more counties and county extension offices where the disposal takes place; and 10% to a special account in the treasury in order to increase access for hunters, recreational fishing, recreational shooting, OHV use, and other purposes.

According to the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service (CRS), the total federal estate exceeds more than 635 million acres. Because federal lands are exempt from local taxes, municipalities with large federal footprints (such as many counties in the West) face significant challenges funding education, infrastructure and emergency services as a result. The conveyance and revenue sharing process established by this bill would be a significant benefit to these communities.

The BLM has identified hundreds of thousands of acres for disposal that the agency is not efficiently utilizing. However, existing law does not require the BLM to dispose of identified lands on a regular or frequent basis. As a result, lands identified as potentially available for disposal under valid resource management plans are rarely disposed by the Bureau of Land Management. Similarly, the Forest Service has several authorities to dispose of federal lands, but such authorities are rarely used.

The HEARD Act is modeled after the Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act (SNPLMA). This federal law, enacted in 1998, has a proven track record of success. To date, more than 35,000 acres identified by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) for disposal have been sold, conveyed or exchanged in Nevada and sales have generated nearly $3 billion in revenue. The revenue sharing mechanism instituted by this law has benefitted education, enhanced recreational opportunities and public access, and achieved better management of public lands. SNPLMA is one of the few authorities that has allowed for an orderly process to make better use of lands not being utilized by the federal government.

By facilitating locally-driven solutions and injecting transparency, this legislation ensures that public lands will be utilized more efficiently while also yielding significant benefits for stakeholders.

Should you have any questions or to add your support to this bill, please contact Trevor.Pearson@mail.house.gov in Rep. Paul Gosar's office.

Implications of Assembly Bill 407

Assembly Bill 407 (1) proposes that University of Nevada Cooperative Extension (UNCE), a statewide program managed by the University of Nevada, Reno in partnership with federal and county governments, be split and managed by the University of Nevada, Reno and the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, effective July 1, 2017. This proposal has not been the subject of discussion between UNCE and the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, nor have the reasons for changing the current administrative structure been articulated.

The proposal has important implications for UNCE programs and services in Clark and the other 16 counties in Nevada. These include:

Estimated additional annual costs of $209,000–$941,000 to establish, at a minimum, leadership for a new three-county region (Clark, Lincoln and Nye counties) to be administered by the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, for fiscal and human resources support. The maximum estimate would be necessary to duplicate leadership for statewide programs that reach these and the rest of Nevada's counties. The proposal will require additional funds for leadership and administrative support in the other 14 counties to accommodate expansion of the current Northern Area. The proposal will create costs for coordinating and continuing statewide programs such as **4-H, Living with Fire, Master Gardeners, the Extended Food and Nutrition Program, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program**, and other **Nutrition and Family Development** programs. The bill contains no fiscal request to meet these annual costs.	***The proposal will require more funding and it is unclear where it will come from.***
Federal funding, allocated through the U.S. Department of Agriculture, has been reduced every year for the past five years. As written, the additional costs of establishing and maintaining two separate Extension systems incurred by AB 407 will have to be met by reducing federal and state allocations to counties not included in the proposed southern area. Federal and state funds in 2016 were $6.6 million, which supported UNCE specialists and county agents throughout the state and included services to Clark, Nye, and Lincoln counties.	***The proposal will reduce federal and state funds available for 14 counties not included in the proposed southern area.***
Cooperative Extension throughout the United States links local communities with global university resources. Extension assesses local needs through a formal, consultative process to develop locally relevant programs. UNCE's current programs in Clark (2,3) Nye, and Lincoln counties are based on published needs assessments (4). UNCE educators and specialists evaluate programs annually and adjust content and delivery methods to meet audience needs. Funds from all counties remain in and are only used in the county from which they were obtained.	***The proposal ignores Extension's well-established methods for meeting Nevada's needs with locally relevant programs.***

1 See https://www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/79th2017/Bill/5495/Text

2 See http://www.unce.unr.edu/counties/clark/files/pdf/2016ProgramHighlights.pdf for descriptions of programs delivered in Clark County in 2016.

3 See http://www.unce.unr.edu/counties/clark/files/pdf/2013SummaryofAccomplishments.pdf for a summary of programs delivered from 2013—2016 in County.

4 See http://www.unce.unr.edu/publications/assessments/ for published county and state needs assessments.

Nevada Revised Statutes 549.§010-070 *(5)* specify UNCE's general programming areas, including agriculture and horticulture. Damore et al (2017) *(6)* propose using funding obtained through the reorganization of UNCE to support the College of Southern Nevada, Nevada State College, the Desert Research Institute in Las Vegas and, above all, the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. UNCE currently collaborates with any institution willing to help meet local needs, based on the foundations of needs assessments, locally relevant programs, and strong working partnerships. UNCE currently works closely with University of Nevada, Las Vegas faculty on projects related to youth development, nutrition, healthful eating and active living, adult offender recidivism, and urban horticulture and food production. AB 407 presents no plans regarding University of Nevada, Las Vegas's capacity to meet the requirements of working with agriculture and horticulture.	***The proposal will use funding to support institutions that have no experience with UNCE programming.***
The drastic changes proposed by AB 407 the tens of thousands of beneficiaries of UNCE's Clark County programs. In 2016, this included more than 22,000 youth who participated in 4-H, more than 60 organizations with whom UNCE collaborated, 2370 individuals trained in workforce development, and more than 30 additional programs that directly benefitted Clark County. AB 407 has created concern among current UNCE faculty and staff in Clark County, who have not been consulted about the proposed change. Many have deep connections to Southern Nevada communities that span decades. All are committed to working with County Commissioners and other partners to meet the ever-changing needs of Nevada's growing population, especially in urban areas.	***The proposal is disrupting UNCE program delivery and creating needless concern among clients***
UNCE is rebuilding after budget reductions in 2010-2011 that led to substantial changes. This includes searching for a new UNCE Director and a Northern Area Director. Two years ago, UNCE hired a 4-H Youth Development Program Leader and recently hired a Statewide Events Coordinator to organize and assist in managing 4-H activities. The University of Nevada, Reno's administration has stated many times that the 2019 legislative session will include a request to enhance statewide funding for UNCE. AB 407 creates uncertainty about UNCE's future, which has reduced the pool of highly qualified applicants for the Director position. It has also compromised efforts to augment UNCE's nutrition faculty in Clark county.	***The proposal is disrupting plans to expand and improve University of Nevada Cooperative Extension***

5 See https://www.leg.state.nv.us/NRS/NRS-549.html.

6 Damore, D., R. Lang, F. Nasoz, W. Brown, C. Saladino. 2017. Rethinking Cooperative Extension in Southern Nevada, Lincy Institute Research Brief 3-2017. http://digitalscholarship.unlv.edu/lincy_publications/35/, last accessed 4/2017

Healthy Food Systems, Healthy People Implementation Update

July 27, 2017

(From conversation with Rick Mertens and Ian Maw)

1. Dionne Tombs, who gave a positive review of the implementation plan while she was Director of NIFA's Institute of Nutrition, is now the Director of the Office of Chief Scientist. Also, she has brought in an assistant from NIH who helped lead development of their Nutrition Roadmap, which is referenced in the plan. Thus, we are well positioned with REE leaders.

2. Farm Bill actions – Discussed with Vernie Hubert the best way to include this in the Farm Bill. No need for new authorization language, everything in the plan is doable under current authorizations. Therefore, working on incorporating HFSHP concepts of integration across systems into Farm Bill report language for all appropriate titles.

3. NIFA has indicated they are already spending >$30 million in this area under various competitive and capacity grants, but the vast majority of that is generally for work in single systems (ex. agriculture, food, nutrition, or health care), not across systems. Therefore, working on revising some current RFPs' language to incorporate HFSHP concepts and demonstrate the differences.

4. Summit/Workshop on HFSHP future directions and strategies. Would like to have funding support for this from NIFA, Foundation for Food & Agriculture, and healthcare industry. Will solicit co-leadership from committee for planning this on next conference call, probably from among human sciences members.

5. Next conference call will probably be second week in August.

Forest Health Initiative

July, 2017

Charge

The APLU Board of Natural Resources, in partnership with the APLU Board on Agricultural Assembly and the National Association of University Forest Resources Programs, is crafting an initiative to advance funding support and a structure for greater engagement related to forest health.

The Steering Committee is charged by APLU to oversee development of a white paper that:

- Articulates the importance of healthy forest ecosystems to the economy, society, and environment
- Identifies priorities for engagement of APLU, its member institutions, and strategic partners to improve forest health and further societal benefits
- Proposes organizational and funding strategies to advance progress in priority areas through alignment of academic institutions, public and private stakeholders, and strategic partnerships.

Following establishment of the Steering Committee, a Writing Committee will be formed to draft a document that aligns with the Steering Committee charge. The Steering Committee will oversee this process and provide guidance, direction, and editorial review of the document provided by the Writing Committee.

Tentative Outline

I. Executive Summary
II. Introduction
III. Committee Charge
IV. Justification
  a. Status of the Nation's forest health
  b. Importance of forest health to the economy, people, and the environment
V. Committee Process
VI. Program Priorities (background, goals, objectives, and potential outcomes/impacts for each)
  a. Impacts of forest health on forest products and forest production
  b. Forest health and water quality and quantity
  c. Urban environments and forest health
  d. Nature tourism and forest health
  e. Impacts of forest health on fish, wildlife, and the environment
VII. Funding Considerations
VIII. Partnerships
  a. Public and land grant universities
  b. Forest Industry
  c. NGOs
  d. State and federal agencies
  e. landowners
IX. Conclusions
X. Appendices.
  a. Glossary
  b. Committee and Task Force Memberships
  c. Linkages to existing efforts.
  d. Timeline

Steering Committee Members

- **John P. Hayes** (Chair), Dean, Warner College of Natural Resources, Colorado State University (BNR and NAUFRP)
- **Ron Hendrick**, Dean, College of Agriculture and Natural Resources, Michigan State University (Administrative Heads)
- **Karen Launchbaugh**, Director, Director of the University of Idaho Rangeland Center, University of Idaho (BNR and Range) INVITED
- **Keith Owens**, Associate Vice President, Division of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources, Oklahoma State University (BNR and NAUFWP)
- **Robin Shepard**, Executive Director, North Central Cooperative Extension Association (CES)
- Kimberly Babbitt, Associate Dean of Academic Affairs, College of Life Sciences and Agriculture, University of New Hampshire (APS)
- **Susan White**, Director, North Carolina Sea Grant and NC Water Resources Research Institute, North Carolina State University (BNR and Water)
- **Eric Young**, Executive Director, Southern Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors (AES)
- **Nosa Egiebor**, Provost and Executive Vice President, SUNY ESF (International Section)
- **Yadong Qi**, Interim Department Chair and Director of the Urban Forestry Graduate Program, College of Agricultural, Family and Consumer Sciences, at the Southern University (1890s)
- **Wendy Fink**, (Ex officio) Director of Food, Agriculture, and Natural Resources, APLU
- **TBD,** US Forest Service representative
- **TBD,** Forest industry representative