

NRSP-RC June 9, 2022, 9-10 am P.T.

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/85242674701?pwd=N3FDdnlaWEtFME5RSEtPcUEyRFBzZz09>

**Current Membership:**

<b>Chair:</b> Mark McGuire (WAAESD) <b>Past Chair:</b> Doug Buhler (NCRA)	<b>Delegates:</b> Shirley Hyman-Parker (ARD) Matt Wilson (NERA) Steve Lommel (SAAESD)
<b>Executive Vice-Chair:</b> Bret Hess (WAAESD ED)	Don Latham (CARET) Tom Bewick (NIFA)
<b>Administrative Management, Ex-officio</b> Jenn Tippetts (WAAESD; Recorder)	Mike Schmitt (ECOP) Gary Thompson (SAAESD ED)

**Committee Page:** <http://escop.info/committee/nrsp-rc/>

**Attendance:** Alton Thompson, Gary Thompson, Mark McGuire, Tom Bewick, Don Latham, Michael Schmitt, Doug Buhler, Matt Wilson, Bret Hess, Jennifer Tippetts (recording secretary).

- Welcome and Roll call-** Mark welcomed members.
- Review of NRSP3's [midterm review](#)** (hyperlinked) and supporting materials (link to annual reports in NIMSS here: <https://www.nimss.org/meetings/project/18621>)- Doug shared the status of the project. This project has been in maintenance funding mode for several years and the primary goals are to keep a credible platform and infrastructure data set accessible. Fifty thousand dollars each year is a great investment, especially with heightened interest on climate change. There is a MC committee that is established and linked to NADP that will be a powerful addition to the platform. The program was transferred from the University of Illinois to state lab of hygiene, affiliated with University of Wisconsin. This is a good match and more complementary.
  - There is work beginning on atmospheric pressure of PFAS that we will want to keep an eye on. If you have anyone working in this area, feel free to connect them to Doug. All state advisors and NIFA representative were very complimentary. Doug noted this is a solid project that should continue. Gary shared comments from Steve which questioned the report showing that the use of data has doubled, is there any information or metrics to show usage or engagement on website? Doug shared that he would be happy to follow up with Steve.
  - Gary moved to accept AA recommendation to continue project. Doug seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously.***
- Review of NRSP10's midterm review** (pending submission when the meeting materials were distributed) and supporting materials (attached; link to annual reports in NIMSS here: <https://www.nimss.org/meetings/project/18619>)
  - There have been no updates since the initiation. This project could be critical, but hard to prove without updates.
  - Gary shared that Steve is the AA for the project and discussed the value as a resource. The group understands that they need to graduate from off the top funding and they have a robust plan. Additionally, the group has secured some modest funding. They

would like continued funding until the time of project termination. Gary added there is an additional contribution of \$25,000 from SAAESD. Gary does not believe there is a question of the value of the database, but some analytics would be helpful with a plan for future funding.

- c. Bret shared that the AA from the West said that it took some pushing, and the group did not act on submitting a report until they knew they were undergoing a mid-term review.
  - d. The committee agreed that two messages need to be communicated: 1. A new funding model needs to be established or planned and 2. We need robust reporting, or the project will not be renewed.
  - e. Tom asked who NIFA had assigned to serve as the project's liaison. The representatives are new. Tom offered to work with the representatives, so they understand the importance of reporting. Tom recommended obligating fund but withhold until information is received.
  - f. Doug responded that this is an extreme example.
  - g. The new bylaws states that we can take the project from 5 years to 4 years of funding by terminating the project.
  - h. Bret noted that one report was filed yesterday that spans the past three years, however, we are still missing an AA review. Gary noted that we could make the motion to approve with a positive AA review.
  - i. ***Matt made the motion that the AAs conduct a mid-term review on the report that has been filed, contingent on a positive AA review then funding will be provided. If future reporting is not filed on time, then future funding will be terminated. A detailed business plan is also required outlining the plan for future funding model. Motion seconded and unanimously passed.***
4. **Review of NRSP1 [proposal to renew](#)** (NRSP\_temp1: Multistate Research Information Management and Impact Communications Program) and (Peer and AA reviews attached and link to NIMMS here: [https://www.nimss.org/review/for\\_project/18866](https://www.nimss.org/review/for_project/18866))
- a. Gary reported Steve thoughts indicating a need to be continued, but we need evidence of continued improvement. We have a contract with Clemson that is being renewed. Will the contract be competitive or is Clemson the sole provider?
  - b. The funding has changed because Sara Delheimer is not requesting an assistant, which reflects a savings.
  - c. Do we want to go out for bid? At the next NRSP1 management meeting we can ask them to discuss the merit of staying at Clemson or if we should consider going out for bid? It was discussed that NRSPs should build in an evaluation of long-term service contracts after three cycles of funding. The fiscally responsible thing to do would be to re-bid, but at a minimum NRSPs should justify continuing with sole source providers.
  - d. NRSP-RC would like the contract reviewed and potentially re-bid after the third funding cycle. The management team of NRSP-1 should begin the conversation and discuss the merits of incorporating this concept as a common practice.
  - e. ***The committee agreed to revise best practices to review contracts after three funding cycles, but also reserve the right to request contract review as the committee deems necessary.***
  - f. The three peer reviews were very complimentary, and their minor suggestions were incorporated into the proposal.
  - g. ***Matt made recommendation to approve NRSP1, with a sequential motion to update best practices to review contracts after three funding cycles. Motion seconded. Motion passed unanimously.***

## 5. Notice of intent to submit a proposal

“Building Collaborative Research Networks to Advance the Science of Soil Fertility: Fertilizer Recommendation Support Tool (FRST)”

- a. This was submitted after the deadline. Mark recommends reviewing and sending back comments for consideration for a future proposal.
  - b. Steve spoke with Deanna Osman, the NC State lead. He had numerous questions however, many concerns were alleviated after the conversation. Steve was concerned about lack of leadership from the West and mountain regions and discovered the writing committee is working to incorporate that leadership. Steve also was concerned with testing standards- the activities are to standardize recommendations across regions and the country.
  - c. Mark recommended that the project need to include a national scope and lab accreditation needs to be addressed. It is ambitious to have a single tool.
  - d. Don shared that he has used different labs, and even on the same farm, the difference in results were incredible. There is missing information on different soil textures and soil depth testing. There needs to be a standardization.
  - e. Mike spent his career developing soil testing recommendations. Accreditation is measuring nutrients in soil, but recommendations go all over. We are trying to address recommendations in this proposal, while national system is admirable, states have jurisdictions on a state-wide level. One of the biggest problems is that recommendations are based on reducing agronomic risk to the producer, but what is missing is environmental risk. If we do not include this, then state regulators will add their own environmental aspects. Additionally, from an Extension perspective, this had room for improvement beyond development of a two-page publication. They could develop something more elaborate.
  - f. We need to get information out in a meaningful manner. Extension needs to be front and center. Research has a significant component. How do we get agronomists to follow the recommendations?
  - g. The environmental aspects are critical, or we will continue to get pressure and lawsuits.
  - h. *The committee agreed that Mike should begin the list of recommendations and committee members will have an opportunity to contribute. The recommendations will be included in a letter or recommendation to submit.***
6. **Reminder of projects up for mid-term review next year:**
- **NRSP4:** Facilitating Registration of Pest Management Technology for Specialty Crops and Specialty Uses. Tom noted that this group gets up to \$50 million dollars from NIFA as competitive funds. The NRSP RC review should guide the competitive funding from NIFA moving forward. Doug noted that this would reduce additional work, although a more robust review may be required. The advantage would be a direct support line that complements the OTT MRF funding, which is consistent with the new expectations for NRSPs.
  - **NRSP9:** National Animal Nutrition Program. Bret represents NRSP9 as one of their AAs. The group is working very seriously on changing their business model and the committee’s recommendations to decrease reliance on OTT MRF funding. They have hired someone to conduct an impact analysis. Hopefully, this will be similar to NRSP4’s analysis.
7. **Reminder of projects up for renewal:**
- **NRSP8:** National Animal Genome Research Program has been in communication with the review committee during mid-term. They are working on additional funding to reduce reliance on OTT MRF funding.

8. **Other Business-** Mark noted the group can determine next January if we want to try to meet in person or continue via Zoom.
9. **Don requested an update to the Excel spreadsheet that outlines current and future project funding.**

DRAFT