

The ESCOP Chair's Advisory Committee

Monthly Conference Call

January 17, 2013 [4-5PM]

Attendees:

Mike Hoffmann, Chair
Carolyn Brooks, ED-ARD
Mike Harrington, ED-WAAESD
Arlen Leholm, ED-NCRA
Abel Ponce de Leon, Chair-NRSPRC
Bill Ravlin, Chair-Science and Tech. Committee
Dan Rossi, ED-NERA
Steve Slack, BAA-PBD Rep.
Eric Young, ED-SAAESD
Rubie Mize, Recorder

NOTES

Action Items:

1. Send suggestions for talking points at the Feb. 20 and 28 meetings to Mike Hoffmann - All
2. Send suggestions for other agencies/organizations that the ESCOP and ECOP leadership should be partnering with and possibly meet during their joint visit in Washington, DC. - All
3. Discuss inviting ACE as a liaison to the Communication and Marketing Committee and draft response to ACE – Arlen and Nancy
4. Share draft of pest management one-pager to Mike H. and Daryl B. – Mike Harrington
5. Discuss and devise an abbreviated NRSP midterm review form – EDs
6. Send Science Roadmap Synthesis Paper for review to Science and Tech. Committee and then to ESCOP Executive Committee – Dan and Bill
7. Draft agenda for the ESCOP Meeting on February 25, 9:30am to 12noon – Dan and Mike Hoffmann
8. Prepare response to PCAST using paper and arguments for capacity funding that was used 3 years ago, and send to EDs for comments – Dan Rossi

Notes:

1. ECOP-ESCOP Strategic Alliance Update – Mike Hoffmann/Dan Rossi
 - a. Talking points for February 20th meeting with Cathy Woteki and Daryl Buchholtz
 - Roadmap – where we are
 - Reinforce value of PCAST Report
 - ECOP will discuss their strategic plan
 - Partnership document that Sonny sent out – follow up and discuss appointment of the committee
 - Pest management working paper

b. Talking points for February 28 meeting with USDA-NIFA Science Leadership Council

There will be a NIFA seminar and a lunch meeting with Sonny Ramaswamy. The Leadership Council composed of senior NIFA executives will meet in the morning. Dan Rossi is still working on getting backgrounds for these meetings. Other meetings are being put together, perhaps with NSF and the Department of Energy. The President of the Nature Conservancy also wants to nurture partnership with the land grant.

Bill Ravlin was approached by Carolyn Whitaker VP at Ohio State and chair of the Council on Research Policy and Graduate Education of APLU that handles policy, accountability etc. She wants this group to be more integrated with the more active parts of APLU. Research collaboration was discussed at the APLU November meeting. There is an opportunity here for ESCOP to collaborate with this Council.

Mike Hoffmann also mentioned the possibility of meeting with the Farm Bureau that has its headquarters in Washington, DC. Send thoughts or other suggestions to Mike Hoffmann.

2. Partnership Committee Update – Mike Hoffmann

Mike Hoffmann sent the letter to Sonny R. offering our services to move ahead with partnership committee. He responded that he has the head of ARS on board. This will be discussed at the meeting with Cathy Woteki.

3. ACE Proposal – Mike Hoffmann/Dan Rossi (see attachment)

Everyone had a chance to see the proposal from ACE. ACE wants official membership to ESCOP. Arlen – Leholm's take is that it's probably OK as long as they understand that they're there to provide input. Mike Harrington recalled that ACE has approached ESCOP on a few occasions initially asking for funds. He also noted that Sarah Lupis and Sara Delheimer will be attending the ACE conference.

Dan Rossi and Arlen Leholm suggested to have an ACE Liaison to the Communication & Marketing Committee, with ECOP's agreement. Eric Young also suggested the Science & Tech. Committee. The C&M will have their monthly call and this will be discussed at their meeting. If the committee agrees then ACE will be invited to appoint a liaison. Mike Hoffmann suggested giving ACE a response from ESCOP and ECOP.

4. Budget/Farm Bill Update - Cornerstone

No report from Cornerstone.

5. Budget and Legislative – Jeff Jacobsen/Mike Harrington

The working group's paper was sent to ESCOP and ECOP for approval. The data table was corrected and IR4 removed as an essential element in the list of combined groups but still show it as an important component for national coordination. The paper also includes a proposal to create a steering committee formally appointed by ESCOP and ECOP with NIFA and ARS representation. B&L will have a call on Tuesday and hopefully will pass the report at that time.

How do we position this as a priority? The request from Jim Richards for a one-pager will be ready by the end of today and Fred Hutchison will correct the format before submitting. Mike Harrington will send the draft to Mike Hoffmann and Daryl Buchholz for approval.

Once B&L approves the working paper, BAC and PBD will endorse, and it should be reflected on our priorities and formally communicated to Sonny and others at USDA. This will be included in the ESCOP CAC Monthly Conference Call

meeting with Cathy. The composition of the working group can be shared with her. The paper would have gone through BAC before the Feb. 20 meeting with Cathy Woteki.

6. Pest Management Working Group Paper - Mike Harrington (see attachment)
See above

7. NRSP Guidelines – Mike Harrington
The revised guidelines are in final draft form.

There was discussion about the 3rd and 4th year review of NRSPs. The EDs need to come up with an abbreviated, simplified process for midterm reviews. The same lengthy format for brand new proposals is currently used.

Abel Ponce de Leon noted that NRSPs 4-6-9 are under review and the deadline is February 28. The results will be sent to the region in mid March. The decision is to stay the course this year. NRSP-8 is re-submitting for a new cycle.

8. Communications and Marketing - Nancy Cox/Arlen Leholm
Arlen reported about the national conference with Extension. There were 41 in the call, with several coming from AES. Hunt Shipman and Larry Katz facilitated the call.

The committee will have their face-to-face meeting on February 24, in conjunction with the CARET meeting in Washington, DC. k-global will conduct a training for CARET to help them connect with our marketing efforts and enhance the work they do for us.

At the next call, C&M will discuss the key targets of the committee. The Extension directors meet with k-global at their monthly regional calls and meetings.

9. Science and Technology - Bill Ravlin/Dan Rossi
1- Rubie sent out the multistate award call for the third time. Submissions are due on February 28 to the regional offices.

2- On February 19-20, in Washington DC, Dan Rossi and Bill Ravlin will meet with the Social Science Subcommittee. Mike Hoffmann can drop by the since he will be in DC this week. Dan or Bill will send the agenda to Mike.

3- The Science Roadmap synthesis paper is done, thanks to the Cornell folks. It will be sent out to the S&T members for review and then to the ESCOP Executive Committee.

Eric Young noted that Pest Management currently has a liaison (Frank Zalom) to the S&T Committee. According to Mike Harrington, the proposal is for ESCOP and ECOP to formally appoint an oversight committee -- Advisory Committee, Steering Committee or an Executive Committee. Members will come from the Pest Management working group. Dan Rossi suggested that there will still be a need for a liaison to ESCOP. Frank can continue in this capacity.

10. Agenda for ESCOP Meeting on February 25, 9:30am to 12noon, in conjunction with the CARET/AHS Meeting at Hilton Alexandria Old Town, 1767 King Street, Alexandria, Virginia 22314
[\[http://www.cvent.com/events/2013-joint-caret-ahs-meeting/event-summary-57888117b3514e2198e5f2714e69d681.aspx\]](http://www.cvent.com/events/2013-joint-caret-ahs-meeting/event-summary-57888117b3514e2198e5f2714e69d681.aspx)

Dan will prepare a draft agenda. He asked if there are critical issues, other than those discussed on this call.

Arlen suggested that Hunt should talk about key targets in Congress and also give an update on new committee leaders, etc.

Steve Slack can give an update on the program for the Joint COPS Meeting this summer. Mike Harrington noted that he had discussed the priority setting process with Robin Shepard. Can ESCOP and ECOP use similar instruments to get priorities? Extension thinks about program lines and Research thinks about specific research programs. This process becomes critical with dwindling funds. With the reduction in SNAP-Ed program, there will be a 48% cut in state allocations. 50 people will lose jobs in the NY-extension system. Mike Harrington was on call with the water quality people and he suggested using the same process as what we did with pest management.

11. Other Business

Mike Hoffmann did not send the letter to the deans (action item from the Dec. 2012 call) asking them to share the PCAST Report with their congressional staff. Mike and Dan prepared the letter but decided that institutions have university level units that directly contact their congressional representatives. There was sensitivity that it may become an issue in some states. ESCOP has not formally responded and ECOP is working on something more substantial mainly explaining what cooperative extension is. The common concern is that the report focussed on competitive and not formula/capacity. Should we come up with a joint statement on the importance of capacity fund? Should we take what we've done three years ago and just bring it up-to-date since our argument has not changed? Dan Rossi will work on a draft and share with the EDs for review and comments. Arlen noted that it's nice to have a 3rd party brag about what we do and let k-global milk it for all its worth.

There will be no ESCOP-CAC call next month. The next meeting will be at the ESCOP Meeting on February 25, 9:30am to 12noon, at the CARET/AHS Meeting at Hilton Alexandria Old Town, Alexandria, VA.

Proposal to ECOP, ESCOP and AHS to incorporate land-grant communicators into the APLU agriculture policy structure

Situation: Communicating the value, relevance and importance of our institutions' work is paramount to continued success as a system. Land-grant communicators play a vital role in effectively delivering that message to influential audiences. We work closely with APLU policy committees' contractors including Cornerstone and k-global, but have limited direct contact with policy committees. This disconnect often slows the system's response to urgent issues.

Proposal: We propose improving efficiency and results by including a land-grant communicator in a non-voting, advisory role in each of the subgroups – AHS, ECOP, ESCOP.

This year, the Association for Communication Excellence¹ instituted a liaison system to these groups by assigning an active, senior-level communicator to each policy committee chair and the BOAA chair. Each liaison is a communicator for the chair's home institution to help promote frequent communication, allow easy access and build upon established trust.

Inviting these liaisons to participate in policy committees' conversations can help:

- Capitalize on available communication expertise within the system
- Effectively leverage current communication and marketing assets
- Provide informed connections between the committees' contractors and communicators
- Identify preexisting assets, tools, training and messaging to inform future development of assets to benefit the system
- Create consistent messaging where possible within the system

The ACE Executive Committee appointed the initial liaisons. However, future liaisons could be determined by application, approved by the policy committees' leadership. The ACE Executive Committee will create, seek and screen applications, then present recommended candidates to committee chairs for approval.

The liaisons would participate in all meetings and electronic discussions pertaining to marketing and communication and would serve as primary contacts for Cornerstone and k-global for content and communication support.

Summary: Land-grant communicators can provide valuable insight to subgroups of the Board on Agriculture Assembly including ESCOP, ECOP and AHS. We appreciate your consideration of this proposal to fully leverage available expertise and assets to support your organizations' efforts.

Respectfully submitted,

J. Faith Peppers, President
Association for Communication Excellence

¹ The Association for Communication Excellence is an international association of communicators, educators and information technologists who extend knowledge about agriculture, natural resources, and life and human sciences.

NEW PEST MANAGEMENT PROGRAM

Working Group – Discussion Paper

{A summary of recommendations from the BAA Working Group on Pest Management}

Background

The Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities (APLU) Board on Agriculture Assembly (BAA), Budget and Advocacy Committee (BAC) supports “in principle” the Integrated Crop Protection Program proposed in the President’s FY2013 Budget. However, this terminology would appear to exclude many other efforts that play crucial roles in today’s society. The BAC recognizes the need to simplify the budget by consolidating lines, particularly within the Integrated Activities accounts of the NIFA budget. However, the BAC has expressed concern over diminishing fiscal appropriations for existing programs and/or in some instances the complete loss of effective programs altogether. The BAC has noted an erosion of previous funding from the agency within its Integrated Activities accounts. That reduction is estimated to be approximately \$34 M in the last five years. In addition, nearly \$23M in congressionally mandated grants targeting pest management issues across the country has been lost. This has resulted in a reduction in funding for Pest Management and related programs by nearly \$57M, severely limiting the development of solutions to pressing problems. The BAC forwarded its recommendation to the BAA Policy Board of Directors, and subsequently (May 2012) a Working Group on Pest Management program was formed. The following discussion paper has been developed based on discussions of the BAA Working Group on Pest Management.

Pest Management Program

The use of the term “Integrated Crop Protection Program” as described in the President’s Budget would focus on “crop production.” While noteworthy, this program would appear to exclude other critical pest management problems such as invasive species, insect vectors of human disease, pests in homes, gardens, lawns, schools, recreational facilities and public buildings, etc. Thus, this terminology would appear to exclude many related programs that play crucial roles in today’s society and limited opportunities to partner with other federal Departments and agencies.

The term IPM has been in use for a number of years and is widely recognized by scientists, Extension professionals, crop consultants and other practitioners as well a variety of stakeholders including those in production agriculture, public buildings, schools, libraries, as well as recreational facilities such as golf courses; however, it is less familiar to the general public and decision makers.

The Working Group strongly recommends the use of the term “Pest Management Programs” to fully encompass the nature of what is included in these recommendations. The rationale for using this term is that everyone has an idea of what a “pest” is, but doesn’t necessarily know what is meant by Integrated Pest Management (IPM) or “Integrated Crop Protection, or the context in which these terms are used. The goal of this effort is to not only reengage the above traditional stakeholders, but to educate and build support among the general public and decision makers who may not understand programmatic details. Throughout this paper, we will use the term “Pest Management” or “Pest Management Program;” integration is implied in either case.

Scope of the Recommendations by the Pest Management Program Working Group

A number of critically important Pest Management programs supported by USDA are administered by the nation’s Land Grant Colleges and Universities (LGUs) that help maintain America’s agricultural

productivity. Such efforts by LGUs involve direct assistance to producers in ways that are effective and efficient, and backed by strong support from farmers and stakeholder organizations across the U.S.

With the emergence of a renewed commitment to crop protection and integrated pest management the Working Group on Pest Management is offering recommendations that focus on both current and new programmatic approaches that will make our national response more effective, efficient, and collaborative. The Working Group identifies these core elements, or programmatic responses of national USDA Pest Management efforts, as “**essential elements.**”

Table 1. Estimated funding trends and needs*.

Essential Elements	Estimated 2013 Funding (\$1,000s)	Estimated Future Funding Needs (\$1,000s)
Competitive Grants Programs		
RIPM	\$2,362	\$2,362
EIPM Decision Support System	\$153	\$153
PMAP	\$1,402	\$1,402
CAR	0	\$1,400
RAMP	0	\$4,400
Extension – IPM (E-IPM)	\$9,918	\$9,918
Integrated Pest Management Pest Information Platform for Extension (IPM-PIPE)	\$115	\$150
Regional IPM Centers	\$4,000	\$4,000
Community IPM		NEW/TBD
Next Generation of Crop Protection Scientists		NEW/TBD
Total	\$17,950	\$23,785

* Not represented here are the funds for the IR-4 program totaling \$11,913,000

Importance of Pest Management Programs to National Food Security

The value of U.S. crop production exceeded \$200 billion in 2010 (NASS). Maintaining a strong agricultural industry requires a coordinated national network of research and Extension programs aimed at addressing weed, disease, invasive species, and arthropod management on the nation’s croplands. The following recommendations will position USDA’s Pest Management Programs as a primary response to protecting the nation’s food supply, while also improving the profitability of agricultural-related businesses and products. Further, these programs also enhance human and environmental safety by reducing threats from inappropriate use of pesticides.

USDA’s portfolio of support for Pest Management includes a range of programs and projects, the majority of which are delivered by LGUs. Examples include data generation for so-called minor use crops to enable essential pesticide approvals for limited markets, four regional pest management centers that focus the expertise of the LGUs on multistate and national scale problems, and locally-relevant Extension IPM programs and pesticide applicator training.

The Working Group acknowledges other critically important programs that leverage and extend the reach of the nation’s LGUs, yet they fall beyond the scope of these recommendations. For example, successful pest management programs must engage with complementary programs such as the National Plant Diagnostic Network (NPDN) which facilitates the detection, accurate diagnosis, and rapid communications associated with new pests that cross U.S. borders. Partnership between NPDN and Pest Management Programs help to mitigate the impact of endemic, emerging, and exotic pathogens and pests that attack agricultural, forest, and landscape plants in the U.S. In addition, efforts targeting special competitive grant programs help refine the focus of the LGUs to address critical issues that are

unique to different production zones (these include the IPM-PIPE program and the former CAR and RAMP programs).

Taken alone, none of these programs are individually responsible for the success of American crop production. However, collectively these Pest Management Programs significantly reduce production risks for growers and improve profitability, while providing for a safe and plentiful food supply with minimal impacts on human health and the environment. We argue that the success of American crop production would not be possible without these essential programs. We further argue that components of a more broadly defined pest management program contribute the health and well-being of all Americans.

National Funding for Pest Management Programs

The President's FY2013 Budget Proposal (not supported by Congress) would have eliminated a number of lines related to pest management totaling about \$38M and created a new Integrated Crop Protection Program with a tentative proposed funding of \$23 M exclusive of IR-4 (see table on page one). Funding for 2014 proposes two additional essential elements, community pest management and graduate student fellowships/undergraduate internships , without specifying amounts

Over the past five years, significant funding has been redirected, and/or combined from three sections of the NIFA budget: Research and Education, Extension, and Integrated Activities. Further, some \$2.6M has been redirected or unaccounted for, and two important programs, Crops at Risk (CAR) (\$1.4M) and the Risk Avoidance and Mitigation program (RAMP) (\$4.4M), have been eliminated in the last two years. In addition, congressionally targeted special grant funds to address plant diseases and pest management (approximately \$23M) have been cut. Given this recent history and in spite of need, additional federal funding reductions for crucial programs are likely in the future.

The Pest Management Working Group calls attention to the need to recapture the nearly \$34M in additional reductions and redirections that have occurred in the past five years in the USDA budget. This support is critical to our ability to respond to pest management problems at the local, regional and national levels.

NIFA Goals

The stated goal of the National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA) is to combine all related pest management efforts into a single coordinated national response. The agency has expressed intent to create a new program from the ground up in order to "respond to pest management challenges with coordinated region-wide and national research, education and extension programs, and serve as a catalyst for promoting further development and use of IPM approaches." This so-called Integrated Crop Protection Program is intended to foster regional and national team building efforts, communication networks, and enhanced stakeholder participation. The Working Group on Pest Management shares the desire for greater coordination, but does not agree with the need to "recreate" an entirely new program from the ground up. The Working Group also stresses the need to engage stakeholders in the process.

There is pressure across government to simplify the budget process by consolidating program lines where appropriate. There may also be many positive aspects to repackaging current pest management funding. A larger, banner-like Pest Management Authority should include many existing programming efforts. As such, USDA should give more emphasis, including funding, to support the needs of many essential programs that when combined enable a coordinated national response to pest management challenges. Too many previous decisions have appeared as defending smaller projects in ways that have ultimately pitted programs within the national pest management portfolio against one

another. Furthermore, a larger banner like “Pest Management Programs” may make it easier to increase funding because as a group of programs, as stakeholders may see themselves reflected in these wider goals and the local responses to problems that they bring about.

To succeed in creating a new Pest Management Program, at a minimum, there must be level funding; however, given the scale of the threats to U.S. food security, agricultural production and the health and well-being families and communities, there is most certainly need for additional funding. Never before has the need been greater for a comprehensive Pest Management Program for the U.S. The long list of chronic pest problems combined with the accelerating onslaught of new weeds, plant diseases and insect pests presents a relentless challenge. All pose risks to agriculture and food security, our natural resources and human health. Any new initiative will not be successful when it asks us to do more in response to these challenges but with less.

Engage Stakeholders

The Pest Management Program initiative needs to actively engage the stakeholders of the programs whose budget lines are being consolidated. To better address the needs of the nation and stakeholder concerns in the broadest sense, the program must also be very flexible, yet comprehensive, in supporting local problem solving. A new commitment to the Pest Management Program should recognize the tremendous capacity already in place across our states in local E-IPM programming, regional IPM Centers, the diagnostic network, and the IPM-Pipe. For a national effort in Pest Management to be successful, it must provide: (1) a comprehensive regional, state and community response that reaches local producers; and (2) competitive projects that support, and take advantage of local and state expertise.

The development of this new, nationally coordinated Pest Management Program needs to be much more inclusive; it cannot rely solely on input received during federal listening sessions. If we are to move forward in developing these concepts and shared common goals, there must be greater opportunity for stakeholder participation in establishing how a new Pest Management Program will be designed and implemented. Stakeholders should also be involved in identifying programs and resources that will be needed. Some redirection of effort is important; however, it is not necessary to recreate an entirely new initiative, especially one solely based on national coordination of limited term single function projects.

Budget Disposition/Location

The President’s FY2013 budget proposed a new Integrated Crop Protection Program within the Integrated Activities area of the NIFA budget. However, experience over the last few years indicates that Integrated Activities lines have been severely cut or eliminated. Any budget lines in the Integrated Activities account may be in future jeopardy, suggesting that it would be prudent to locate this program elsewhere. If the goal is budget simplification, all lines should move to the same location and it is essential that the affected programs be partners. Given that the majority of funds would come from Research and Education Programs and Integrated Activities, all elements of the new Crop Protection Program could be moved to the Research and Education Programs area.

Following the guiding principles outlined (below), this could be accomplished with full authority and functional intent of the legislation such that several of the programs highlighted above will maintain form and function. However, consolidation into a single budget line (within NIFA) should only be done in such a way to enhance coordination among the essential elements described in this working paper

(e.g., Regional IPM Centers and E-IPM). Such consolidation should not be interpreted as justification for overall budget reductions.

Furthermore, any consolidation must be contingent upon: (1) the allocation of additional (not redirected) funds for new programs such as Community IPM and Developing Next Generation of Crop Protection Scientists; and (2) additional funding to address an overall loss in operating funds from any new indirect allowances, should they occur due to changes in policy and/or budget location of specific program lines.

The concept of functional equivalency (described below) is critical to the success of this effort. It is important to protect program integrity, including maintaining current eligibility for accessing the funding. Without functional equivalency, many currently successful programs will only be asked to do more with less when, in fact, the need has never been greater for these programs.

Guiding Principles**

The following principles were developed and endorsed by the ESCOP and ECOP Budget and Advocacy Committees, and provide the foundation from which the Working Group on Pest Management has developed its rationale for this report.

- Protect/maintain the funding for E- IPM and Regional IPM Centers of the Land Grant Universities. This includes local capacity as well as competitive support for important programs and projects;
- Consolidate budget lines where it makes sense, doing no harm;
- Maintain intent (functional equivalency) of programs (e.g., integrated activities regardless of where the budget resides within the USDA/NIFA Budget);
- Expand our ability to integrate research, education, and Extension functions of the nation's Land Grant Universities in local and multistate problem solving; and
- Ensure regional multistate collaboration focused on sharing and cooperating among Land Grant Universities and NIFA.

Additional input and comment was obtained (and subsequently addressed) from COPs, BAC and PBD. In addition, the recommendations must also be acceptable to appropriators.

***These guiding principles were also reflected in the 2011 ECOP/ESCOP Task Force Report on Section 406 Programs, including recommendations that addressed a number of Pest Management activities supported in the Integrated Activities Accounts of NIFA.*

Functional Equivalency Defined

Pest Management Programs will be conducted and funded as provided for in legislation. While programs may be combined into a single budget line, each will maintain functional integrity, intent, and eligibility.

Essential Elements of a New Pest Management Program

Essential Element - Extension-IPM (E-IPM)

The Extension Integrated Pest Management Coordination and Support Program (E-IPM) works directly with agricultural producers, urban clientele, and other pest managers, providing education about sound pest management practices that meet economic and environmental goals. The E-IPM program is centered on locally-adapted, problem-solving, and is critical to fully integrating scientific

expertise with outreach that engages stakeholders about IPM. A strong E-IPM effort helps ensure that the work of other the Essential Elements (e.g., Regional IPM Centers) reaches producers and transforms their operations.

The E-IPM program has a long record of increasing the adoption of improved management practices through training, demonstration, and evaluation of impacts at the end user level. Each Land Grant Institution identifies an individual to be the primary institutional/state Coordinator. When taken together, these state leaders form a national network of more than 50 E-IPM Coordinators providing an essential cadre of experts on pest management. These coordinators are a critical bridge between local/county-based extension personnel and the research and Extension capacities of their institutions, and act as a catalyst for state and regional IPM programs. They translate needs into programs and then coordinate implementation back to the client base. E-IPM programming is based on an implementation strategy that rapidly addresses state/local/multistate needs, and existing and emerging pest problems. State-based plans and strategies are funded at various levels based on a national competitive review, and IPM Coordinators merge these funds with local funding sources to enable our national IPM capacities to operate efficiently. By addressing pest problems locally, E-IPM meets national IPM goals and larger geographic issues of significance. This network of interconnected state-based programs is critical for providing pest managers, producers and urban clientele with unbiased information on pest control tactics. The E-IPM program also has a strong commitment to measuring the outcomes and impacts of its work, and by doing so it is able to share its expertise and successful approaches to local IPM programs carried-out by Extension Agents throughout the nation.

E-IPM has been flat or declining (when adjusted for inflation) for many years, while other programs like Organics and SARE have increased. Other Essential Elements of the new Pest Management Program cannot function without Extension-IPM infrastructure in place in each state and territory. The Working Group recommends a large and significant increase in funding. Furthermore, the Working Group notes that any such federal investments leverage additional local commitment by incentivizing people and institutions to invest more in E-IPM.

Essential Element – Regional IPM Centers

The Regional IPM Centers maintain critical linkages to local stakeholders through the IPM programs of participating states and territories. These Centers develop and broker information about IPM research, education and Extension priorities for regions, commodities, and other environments where IPM is needed. They offer support to the extensive network of experts who respond to federal, regional and local inquiries about pest management issues of importance.

Each center has an advisory and/or steering committee comprised of IPM practitioners, often from both the agricultural and urban sector, industry, and other regional representatives. Committees meet regularly to provide critical guidance to help ensure that Centers are responding to priority pest management problems for the region. Each state has an IPM Coordinator who is typically connected to his/her respective Regional IPM Center, providing direct feedback on needs. Regional IPM Centers commonly have components that include: state and regional crop profiles, multistate pest management strategic plans on major problems, regional/national pest alerts on emerging issues, and regional/national training programs in cooperation with Land Grant Universities, NPDN, APHIS, and ARS. The Centers currently coordinate the competitive proposal review processes for the Regional IPM (RIPM) grants programs (\$2.8M), assuring that regional needs are met. The Regional IPM Centers are at the core of effective IPM programs across the Nation and must be maintained.

The Working Group recommends maintaining existing funding for the Regional IPM Centers, and further encourages additional support of these entities. Increased funding would create opportunities to support unique needs within regions. For example, each Center's core operations would be funded at similar levels across all regions; while a competitive pool could be established to help Centers address unique needs such as those that occur within difference cropping zones of the country.

Essential Element - Competitive Grant Programs

The development of a new Pest Management Program offers an opportunity to consider, more broadly, how competitive funding could be brought to bear on critical pest management and crop protection issues. Competitive funds are important to enhance the essential elements of IPM. The Working Group recommends that the new Pest Management Program recapture lost funding and then restructure former grant programs (e.g., CAR, RAMP, RIPM and/or other congressionally targeted special grant funds that have been recently cut). Such competitive grants could also target "Critical Emerging Issues" such as invasive species, expanding pest ranges, etc. (this is still under consideration by the Working Group).

A significant portion of this new competitive funding pool could be managed by the Regional IPM Centers. These Regional Centers have considerable experience in managing competitive grant programs with a clear understanding of local, regional and national needs. Furthermore, such regional management of competitive funds is found in other USDA programs like SARE. Regional coordination by the IPM Centers would insure stakeholder input into priorities and strengthen the relevance of funded projects.

More recently significant funding has been brought to bear of pest management issues within the Specialty Crop Research Initiative and Organic Research and Education as well as the Beginning Farmer Rancher programs. However, these are mandatory programs funded in the 2008 Farm Bill that have expired with no guarantee of continuation into the future and there is no specific charge relative to pest management issues.

Further discussion is needed to determine the scope of Competitive Grants, level of funding needed (e.g., critically important if the scope is to include a component to address "Emerging and Critical Issues").

Essential Element - Integrated Pest Management Pest Information Platform for Extension (ipmPIPE)

The ipmPIPE (<http://www.ipmpipe.org/>) is a monitoring network and early-warning system developed by the Land Grant Universities, USDA, and private groups to alert farmers to the presence of pest problems of area-wide importance. The ipmPIPE includes surveillance and monitoring networks, a web-based information management system with criteria for deciding when to apply pesticides, predictive modeling, and outreach directly to producers, often through the E-IPM network of state coordinators. The program's coordinated framework has been highly effective in helping our nation's producers to make informed decisions about pesticide application. First established for Asian Soybean Rust, ipmPIPE has become an essential tool for farmers and producers, guiding the use of fungicides. In its first year the ipmPIPE was estimated to have helped American farmers save up to \$299 million, according to an Economic Research Service report (Roberts et al. 2006). Subsequent savings approach \$1 billion.

Currently, there are seven ipmPIPE projects in operation: soybean rust, insects and diseases of legume and pulse crops, cucurbit downy mildew, pecan scab and nut case-bearer, onion diseases, southern corn rust, and, most recently, Western Specialty Crop PIPE that focuses on grape pests and

new *Drosophila* pests of stone fruit and small fruits.

Valuable data has been collected through the ipmPIPE; however, in recent years, it has become critical that the data captured by the various ipmPIPEs be readily accessible to extension specialists and agents as well as research scientists across the country. A central repository of data and models is needed that would house and make accessible all ipmPIPE data. Providing this core function will allow new ipmPIPE components to be added when they are developed. Through small investment, these stored data could provide a foundation for new research and outreach efforts.

Essential Element (new programmatic effort) – Community IPM

Community IPM includes managing pests in schools, homes, yards, office buildings, workplaces, and wherever pests that affect public health are found. Community IPM encompasses an extremely wide range of environments; places where people live, work, learn, play, receive care, and the public spaces (e.g., transportation, rights of way, etc.) that connect those environments. It also addresses sensitive structural environments where the pest threshold level is set at zero (e.g., hospital operating rooms, food processing plants, computer chip manufacturing plants, etc.). Through its far-reaching impact, Community IPM benefits nearly all U.S. citizens, from non-farm households in rural areas to office workers in the center of major metropolitan areas.

There is a growing network of Community IPM educators across the country. This network includes leaders in government, research, education, public health, and indoor air quality and pest management. For example, the National School IPM Implementation effort involves four regional working groups and more than 300 partners. These efforts have resulted in an average 71% reduction in pesticide use and 78% reduction in pest complaints, with no long-term increase in costs. In other public buildings, implementing an IPM-based contract for structural pest management services coupled with competent oversight of service providers reduced pesticide use by 93% and pest complaints by 89%, with immediate and dramatic reductions in the application of insecticide sprays, greatly reducing the potential for human exposure while enhancing health and quality of life for all.

Essential Element (new programmatic effort) – Developing the Next Generation of Crop Protection Scientists

Supporting the on-going and future needs for science and discovery in managing the nation's agricultural lands is critical to meeting challenges we see today and those we must prepare for, including those that are yet to be known. The Working Group recommends that the new Pest Management Program include a commitment to developing future scientists and expanding the capacity for science-based decision making by agricultural professionals. Such a commitment could be reflected in undergraduate internships, graduate student opportunities and in curriculum development by our Land Grant Colleges and Universities. All of the Essential Elements of a new Pest Management Program would be asked to develop specific strategies aimed at increasing the number of young people entering IPM and related fields in agriculture.

Enhancing Coordination and Improving Efficiency

Each Essential Element (described in this report) serves an important niche within the national IPM portfolio. It is acknowledged that coordination is taking place among state IPM coordinators, regional IPM centers, regional grants, and the IR-4 program. Many such projects supported by these Essential Elements already function well and with great efficiency. Therefore, maintaining **functional equivalency** in a combined budget line is critical.

However, there is a continuing need to enhance the ways in which expertise is combined to focus on problems. Further, it is important to show how current investments in those programs are leveraged within and across the Essential Elements (described above). Enhanced coordination and efficiency would involve role clarification, shared leadership, and structural changes that foster more cooperation and communication at the national, regional and state levels.

- **Regional** – Increase uniformity in the core support services of the Regional IPM Centers. Each IPM Center has a technical and applied research problem solving mission that is organized to address pest issues at the regional level. However, the Centers are currently generating unique contributions among the four regions that when combined have the potential to provide strategic contributions nationwide. Centers should also increase their leadership in the arena of multistate information sharing to rapidly distribute the benefits of programmatic advances and the methodologies that underlie successful pest management techniques. Centers could also expand support and collaboration with the E-IPM network (e.g., information sharing to supporting both biophysical and social science needs assessments). As previously stated, Regional Centers could also manage competitive grants that provide additional financial support to address emerging and special pest management problems.

- **State** - Each E-IPM program (within a state or institution) will have a clearly identified IPM Coordinator. All coordinators should meet annually within their respective regions for the purpose of cross-state sharing and multistate priority setting. This is a function that would also be supported/hosted by the Regional IPM Centers. Likewise Regional Center directors should be encouraged to meet as a team (probably at least annually). It is also noted that national-scale meeting/conference should be considered (similar to the National Integrated Water Program’s Annual Conference) for the purpose of national information sharing and fostering multi-state collaboration on pest problems. Furthermore, successful state coordination should also involve sharing with the many other programs, agencies and involved stakeholder groups working on IPM within our states.

- **National** – Creation of:
 - (1) A Pest Management Coordinating/Administrative Council appointed by ECOP and ESCOP. Creating an environment for “shared leadership and decision making” in national level decisions about program priorities and funding is very important to maintaining coordination among the Essential Elements of the new Pest Management Program. This council (leadership team) would be established with representation from the Essential Elements and likely include those who are members of the current National IPM committee. The NIFA-NPL (or NPLs) would be part of the council as advisors (not official voting members due to federal advisory committee rules). This national Pest management Coordinating Council would foster coordination and collaboration, internal decision-making, and priority setting among the Essential Elements that make up the new Pest Management Program. Importantly this committee would have connections to ECOP and ESCOP and the national budget priority setting processes. *NOTE: Effective and successful models for this type of shared leadership exist in the SARE and the National Integrated Water programs.*

(2) A National IPM Coordinator position, recognized within USDA (e.g., in the Undersecretary for REE Office). A 2001 report by the Government Accounting Office indicated that USDA had not provided any departmental entity with the authority necessary to lead its IPM initiatives. It further described that among six USDA agencies, state and land-grant universities, and EPA there was little or no coordination on IPM related activities. That report called on the agency to establish department-wide leadership, coordination, and management for federally funded IPM efforts. Such USDA (department-wide) leadership could include an office of IPM, staffed by a national IPM coordinator, with purview of USDA agencies and its mission areas that have IPM related programs. This concept is further endorsed by the National Roadmap for Integrated Pest Management (2004) and also by the IPM Institute. It is envisioned that the National IPM Coordinator would work closely with the above coordinating council, USDA-NPLs, other government agencies such as EPA, DOD, HUD, Interior, NIH, etc. where there are interests in pest management, insect vectored diseases and invasive species. This coordination would focus critical issues in pest management bringing to bear additional resources.

- **IR-4 (Interregional Research Project #4)**

The IR-4 program provides crucial support to specialty, and minor use crops by developing residue and other data that are required by U.S. EPA to facilitate the regulatory clearance of conventional reduced-risk pesticides and biopesticides. The efforts of IR-4 help sustain specialty and minor use crops through the expansion of pesticide labels to cover these critical needs. At the advice of the IR-4 Commodity Liaison Group and others, the Working Group reluctantly accepts IR-4's desire to be excluded from the combined Pest Management Program. This is based on concerns about the future identity of the IR-4 program, potential indirect costs that could reduce available funds and overall loss of program funds.

However, the Working Group recommends IR-4 continue to enhance its collaborative activities to assist in the national and global study of pesticide resistance baselines and monitoring systems for key pest targets and key active ingredients. Stronger integration of IR-4 with outreach efforts by the Regional IPM Centers, E-IPM Land Grant Research and Extension and other USDA agencies will increase efficiency and coordination of all of the programs.

**The ESCOP Chair's Advisory Committee
Monthly Conference Call
March 21, 2013 [4-5PM]**

Attendees:

Mike Hoffmann, Chair
Carolyn Brooks, ED-ARD
Jeff Jacobsen, Chair, B&L
Mike Harrington, ED-WAAESD
Arlen Leholm, ED-NCRA
Abel Ponce de Leon, Chair-NRSPRC
Jim Richards, Cornerstone
Dan Rossi, ED-NERA
Lee Sommers, Past Chair
Eric Young, ED-SAAESD
Rubie Mize, Recorder

NOTES

Action Items:

1. Include the following topics for the EDs Meeting in April - EDs
 - Infrastructure inventory in Land-grant institutions as requested by Sonny
 - NIFA Infrastructure and Capacity Task Force with Deb Sheely
 - Additional ESCOP Awards
 - Science Roadmap and Branding Issues
 - Workshop topics and best management practices for the ESS/SAES/ARD Meeting
 - Best management practices/topics for APLU Meeting with Ian Maw
2. Finalize ESCOP Response to PCAST Report – Mike and Dan
3. Contact Elizabeth Neubauer at Colorado State Univ. about her Land-grant infrastructure inventory and lay-out a feasible plan for the system – Mike and Dan
4. Response to NIFA Proposal on Acknowledgements – Mike Hoffmann
5. Approach ag. communicators and explore other ideas for a national impact reporting system – Mike Hoffmann and Daryl Buchholz
6. Send out budget priority survey to all regions – Mike Harrington
7. Draft description for additional ESS Award(s) and circulate to Science & Tech. members and EDs for comments – Dan Rossi
8. Send names for Forestry Research Advisory Council – Mike Harrington
[J. Keith Gillless (CA) is rotating for one more year, and Joyce Berry (Dean at Colorado State) can be reappointed for another term.]

Notes:

1. ECOP-ESCOP Strategic Alliance Update – Mike Hoffmann and Dan Rossi

- March 28th meetings with NIFA leadership

ESCOP Chair Mike Hoffmann has been working on a number of initiatives to strengthen ESS partnerships with other entities. He has worked closely with ECOP Chair Daryl Buchholz to strengthen a strategic alliance between ESCOP and ECOP. Mike and Daryl met with Cathie Woteki, USDA Under Secretary for Research, Education and Economics on February 20, 2013.

They also met with ERS leadership and with a group of NPL's. They also met with the NIFA Center for International Programs staff, the NIFA Science Leadership Council, and NIFA Director Sonny Ramaswamy on February 28, 2013. They also conducted a seminar for NIFA staff titled "Knowledge with a Public Purpose."

Eric Young reported that there was good feedback from the NPLs he met at a seminar, esp. the Q&A portion of Daryl and Mike's meeting with them.

At the meeting with Sonny, they revisited the Principles of Partnership and the recommendations. Sonny also directed Mike Hoffmann and Dan Rossi to conduct an infrastructure inventory. It is a huge task that will include status of laboratories, greenhouse, etc. It may be feasible to pick a sub-sample of labs from our institutions, their maintenance status -- how far behind we are from schedule, what we're doing well or what research activities are being hindered by the lack of maintenance in our infrastructure.

Institutions handle their inventories differently. There may already be partial inventories available. Montana conducts a comprehensive inventory every two years. Cornell had just completed theirs. Elizabeth Neubauer at Colorado State Univ. is working on spreadsheets with information on the Land Grant Institution Agricultural Experiment Stations/Research Centers. Dan Rossi had contacted her and she had responded. **Mike Hoffmann and Dan Rossi will layout realistic plan and share with everyone. The EDs can also discuss this topic at their meeting in April.**

Mike Hoffmann noted, for info only, that Simon Liu, Director of the National Agricultural Library NAL is working on knowledge/info management for handling huge databases. Dr. Liu wants to know what data sets to work with that are of interest to our Land-grant community.

- NIFA Infrastructure and Capacity Task Force

Deb Sheely is leading this group and will be looking at improving business practices. She will meet with all the EDs including Extension in April.

- NIFA Strategic Planning

The plan (short about 12 pages) should be ready by this summer and the community will have a chance to react.

- Additional Opportunities for Budget Consolidation

Aside from pest management there may be other opportunities for budget consolidation, but none were discussed. The agency was happy with the recommendations but we don't know exactly the results yet.

- Quarterly Topics for NIFA/ESCOP/ECOP/Other Partners Cooperation

The goal is to engage COPS leaders and NIFA leadership on a quarterly basis by teleconference as a regular means of communication and when need arises the frequency can be increased. It will be up to Mike, Dan and Daryl to move this along. NPLs have extremely limited travel budget, so Mike suggested communicating regularly with our respective state NPLs. Dan added that we can engage other key players and serve a facilitative role.

- ESCOP Response to PCAST Report Action Plan

ECOP had submitted their response. Wendy Wintersteen also responded. Sonny encouraged ESCOP to respond. **Mike is looking at a draft prepared by Dan. It will be circulated to the Executive Committee by end of next week, and then to all the Directors.**

- How to Operationalize the PCAST Report Recommendations

A proposal to form a committee to implement PCAST will be included in the letter.

2. NIFA Proposal on Acknowledgements – Mike Hoffmann and Dan Rossi

Comments received by Dan indicated that some organizations are already doing it, and those that don't do not have a problem including acknowledgements. There were no real objections. There was concern though that there are some institutions that use this fund solely for salaries and the faculty don't know the source of their salary so they may not catch on the acknowledgement requirement. Some institutions review but some don't, and many were diligent in past. This may come down as a mandate. We should be doing this all along and vote to put source of fund. A member commented that States allocate way more than NIFA but they don't require or ask for acknowledgement.

Three regions are meeting and will discuss this – there is support to include as best we can and encourage recipients of funds to acknowledge the source one way or the other. Mike will respond to NIFA.

3. Proposed National Impacts Reporting System – Mike Hoffmann and Dan Rossi

Reactions to date are quite lukewarm to negative. Majority felt that we are already reporting to Washington, so why do we need something else. The multistate impact statements being prepared from the West have gotten good reviews. ECOP is proceeding with a plan to do the same. Then we also have kglobal. Should we reach out to land grant communicators to dig a little deeper?

Lee Sommers noted that there was a national system to collect impacts in the past. Was it a success, a failure, why was it discontinued? Kglobal is effectively supporting other communication efforts and do we need another group?

Mike Harrington noted that this proposal came from the ag communicators group asking for funding to continue what Terry Meisenbach started in 1999 but was discontinued by his successor. There was a national database that people fed in, then a group of writers came to DC to massage the information. Mike cited, *"What we produce in West is what they need. There are 3000 Hatch projects nationally, so how do you do this?"*

The budget is tight, and clearly ESCOP cannot take on another impact reporting system. Both ESCOP and ECOP leadership do not see a lot of benefits on having another system, but would be willing talk to the ag. communicators group and see if they have other ideas. Arlen noted that they also need to integrate with kglobal and CMC efforts now.

4. Budget/Farm Bill Update – Jim Richards, Cornerstone

Jim reported that the Senate passed the CR yesterday and the House will be today. The CR for FY2013 that is making its way to the President is already reduced in the fiscal cliff, so the FY13 final will be minus the 5.1% reduction.

The process for the FY14 budget begins in two weeks, April 10 is the deadline.

5. Budget and Legislative – Jeff Jacobsen and Mike Harrington

- Pest Management One Pager

Mike H. worked with Fred Hutchinson, Mike Hoffmann and Daryl Buchholz to finalize the one pager. The committee had endorsed it and will pass it along to the Policy Board.

- Budget Priority Setting

The survey has been updated and will be distributed to the regions. The Northeast had discussed it and will be sent out tomorrow while it's still fresh in the Directors' minds.

Jeff noted that the committee refined the timeline at their Arlington meeting and the survey now includes questions across sections in the family.

Gary Thompson (PA) is replacing Tom Burr (NY) as the Northeast Delegate. Gary will serve as the committee's Chair-elect in 2014.

The committee's teleconference is next Tuesday.

6. Communications and Marketing – Nancy Cox and Arlen Leholm

- New CMC Members

The committee met at Arlington in February, and agreed to add two new members.

One from the Association for Communication Excellence - Faith Peppers from the Univ. of Georgia and ACE President; and one from the University Federal Relations - Justin Bryant from the Univ. of Texas. There was also discussion to have one from the Academic Section – Linda Martin of Ohio State Univ. will sit in at the C&M, to seek joint interest and if it makes sense for them to be a member. The committee thought this is a good approach.

- Theme Focus Areas C&M

The committee picked key messages that appropriators care about. Three were picked and will be highlighted one at a time: (1) Nutrition Research and Education, including obesity, and their impacts on health care costs, jobs, incomes, and more, (2) Adapting Agriculture across the entire supply chain to rapidly changing weather variability, and (3) A Risk Management theme.

7. Science and Technology – Bill Ravlin and Dan Rossi

- Additional Research Awards

Eric had sent the document that they use in the South. Bill and Dan have been exchanging ideas, and the draft description of the award for excellence will be sent to the committee and the EDs for comments. **It will also be discussed by the EDs in April.**

- Science Roadmap and Branding Issues

This needs to be discussed further in the context of the process that we follow at ESCOP on how we obtain input from the other sections. The Roadmap cuts across all functions. Steve Slack made the recommendation about having common themes, common issues, and using the same language/terminologies, branding the issues etc. that the faculty can put their arms around. **This will also be at the EDs April meeting agenda.**

8. ESCOP Recommendations for the Forestry Research Advisory Council – Eric Young

ESCOP needs to identify people to nominate as members.

Mike Harrington said that there are already ESCOP Reps. to FRAC and will send the names to Dan Rossi.

[Response from Mike Harrington: J. Keith Gilles (CA) is rotating for one more year, and Joyce Berry (Dean at Colorado State) can be reappointed for another term.]

9. Policy Board of Directors – Steve Slack and Eric Young

The PBD will meet next week, on Tuesday all day, in San Diego.

10. ESS/SAES/ARD Meeting Update – Steve Slack and Arlen Leholm

Ohio State will host and the main theme is Water Quality.

For Best Management Practices, a suggestion was made to have a 'gripe session' on account of the difficult period in federal funding we are currently experiencing. *How do we change the outcomes? Are we doing all we possibly can? What can we do differently, given the budget environment we're in?*

11. Other business

Mike Harrington alerted the members on the NRSP1 proposal being circulated and discussed at the regional meetings. There are 55 impact reports to do each year that cannot be done by a halftime position. NRSP1 committee asked them to submit the proposal. Feedback has been very positive with the outputs so far and we can't do more with less.

The NRSP1 Management Committee should submit it to the NRSPRC so they can consider it and take action when they meet in June. The regional reps. to the NRSPRC will bring the feedback from their regions.

Mike Harrington informed that APLU is soliciting topics for best management practices for the APLU Annual Meeting. He asked everyone to share their ideas. This will also be discussed at the EDs Meeting in April, and Ian Maw will be there.

The call ended at 5:06PM.

**The ESCOP Chair's Advisory Committee
Monthly Conference Call
April 18, 2013 [4-5PM]**

Attendees:

Mike Hoffmann, Chair
Carolyn Brooks, ED-ARD
Jeff Jacobsen, Chair, B&L
Mike Harrington, ED-WAAESD
Arlen Leholm, ED-NCRA
Abel Ponce de Leon, Chair-NRSPRC
Jim Richards, Cornerstone
Dan Rossi, ED-NERA
Lee Sommers, Past Chair
Eric Young, ED-SAAESD
Rubie Mize, Recorder

NOTES

Action Items:

1. Include the following additional items for the EDs and NMCC meetings next week- EDs
 - a. Response to PCAST report
 - b. Sonny's proposal for the Impacts database
 - c. Budget & Leg. Committee's budget priorities survey
 - d. Public Access to Federally-Supported Research and Development, Data and Publications
2. Send letter to Sonny asking him to encourage the NPLs to contact/visit their states on a regular basis, at least twice a year or call-in at meetings – Mike Hoffmann
3. Revise July ESCOP Agenda to include joint session with ECOP – Dan and Mike Hoffmann
4. Discuss 'futuring' activity with Bill Ravlin, and Science & Tech. Committee - Dan

Notes:

A. Action Items from March 21st CAC Call:

1. Include the following topics for the EDs Meeting in April – EDs [Done]

- Infrastructure inventory in Land-grant institutions as requested by Sonny
- NIFA Infrastructure and Capacity Task Force with Deb Healy
- Additional ESCOP Awards
- Science Roadmap and Branding Issues
- Workshop topics and best management practices for the ESS/SAES/ARD Meeting
- Best management practices/topics for APLU Meeting with Ian Maw – APLU extended deadline to mid next week

2. Finalize ESCOP Response to PCAST Report – Mike and Dan

Dan had circulated the draft and had gotten feedback and will incorporate them. Arlen said that the two Steves (Pueppke and Slack) are going to submit more input. Steve Pueppke gave a good presentation on the different views/impacts from the Land-grant family at the NCRA meeting. We have to respond given the fact that ECOP responded. The draft response will be discussed in more detail at the EDs Meeting.

3. Contact Elizabeth Neubauer at Colorado State Univ. about her Land-grant infrastructure inventory and lay-out a feasible plan for the system – Mike and Dan

Elizabeth is developing maps for the experiment stations. Mike Hoffman suggested that she sends it to a subset of SAEs. Mike also gave her constructive feedback. Eric has been corresponding with Elizabeth, and shared with Carol Brooks to update the 1890s info. Categories are not of equal scope and seem to have a strange array. Dan said she left off a couple of stations, but have not heard back from her recently.

Dan got an email from Wendy Fink, and concerned that there is duplication of efforts. Wendy is also looking at mapping all locations. Dan told her that there is already a similar activity at CSU.

Mike Harrington gave the info to Elizabeth some three weeks ago, and also have not heard back from her. Dan noted that it might be on hold. The EDs will discuss this at their meeting.

According to Eric, the Southern region already has and used the CRIS-subject of investigation.

Mike Hoffmann suggested to wait until we hear back from Elizabeth.

4. Response to NIFA Proposal on Acknowledgements – Mike Hoffmann

There is general agreement that it's a good idea. Mike Hoffmann had responded to Marty Draper, but also expressed that it is quite impossible to enforce.

5. Approach ag. communicators and explore other ideas for a national impact reporting system – Mike Hoffmann and Daryl Buchholz

Mike Hoffmann had a conversation with Daryl about this today. ECOP had been developing a portal for impact statements, and the system was developed with the same communicators. There is intent to have this portal useable for ESCOP and others. It is currently being tested within ECOP, and if we want, ESCOP can also test the system. Sonny requested \$80K to develop this system. Since it appears that the system is already built, the request is for an annual fund to maintain it. ECOP is willing to modify the portal to accommodate other users outside of ECOP.

Lee Sommers communicated with CSU communicator and Faith Pepper also confirmed that it's moving ahead.

Arlen noted that it creates some confusion because it was pitched at the CMC meeting as a separate system. Faith is the liaison to the CMC, so Arlen will check with her to confirm if this is the same or a separate system.

Mike Hoffmann commented that once the portal is open for us to investigate, ESCOP can decide if we want to participate or not.

Mike Harrington thought it's a separate system that Sonny is pitching, and is a reinvention of what we used to do 5-6 years ago, when we collected impacts in a database.

Mike Hoffman concluded that the system exists, and Daryl believes that this is the same as the Extension's portal. **Include this in the NMCC Meeting for further discussion.**

6. Send out budget priority survey to all regions – Mike Harrington

Mike Harrington had received feedback from Dan, Arlen and Eric. Comments that came back from region—

1. Why are there no priorities from the Science Roadmap?
2. Why did we select specific lines and not all lines for Research and Education?

The B&L Committee met in February and proceeded to develop the survey based on what they had at the time. Lines identified and selected from the integrated program areas had both research and extension. As for the Science Roadmap, these are science issues that are for consideration on the national level like AFRI. Last year's prioritization was based on the SR, but were too numerous, so only the top two from each area were picked.

Mike added that during Daryl Lund's time, inputs sought were the "hot button, what are current issues, likely priority areas under AFRI". Science issues are now the purview of the Science & Technology Committee. The B&L Committee had been collaborating with the S&T for the past three years. B&L will talk about this again at their call next week. B&L will need direction on how to modify the survey.

Mike Harrington announced that the survey was open on March 26, but no one had responded. The other EDs were not aware that it is now online. It was noted that response rate is better if the request to complete the survey came directly from the respective EDs.

Jeff noted that there are cross cutting, open ended questions that involve both experiment stations and extension, more integrated questions than we had in past surveys.

Mike Harrington reiterated that selected lines are of interest to both AES and EXT, and it's a moot point to discuss what lines can be combined. Mike Hoffmann said that Jerry Baron contacted him and saw that IR4 was not on the list, so he's asking why it's not considered a priority. Under Research and Education were Hatch, McStennis, Evans Allen and AFRI, so there was no slot for the IR4 program. It stood out because all the other integrated funds were in the pest management. The EDs will discuss the survey at their meeting next week. B&L will meet on Tuesday, and Mike Harrington will share what the committee will discuss/decide with the EDs.

7. Draft description for additional ESS Award(s) and circulate to Science & Tech. members and EDs for comments – Dan Rossi

The draft was received positively. Questions raised about the minimum years in service, etc. will be discussed by the EDs.

8. Send names for Forestry Research Advisory Council – Mike Harrington

[J. Keith Gillless (CA) is rotating for one more year, and Joyce Berry (Dean at Colorado State) can be reappointed for another term.] No additional names or discussion.

B. Public Access to Federally-Supported Research and Development, Data and Publications (see attached) – Mike Hoffmann

There was general agreement that ESCOP needs to respond or raise its concerns. Two directors from the South had contacted Eric asking if ESCOP will participate. Mike Harrington see this as a stumbling block. In his region, two well researched publications were held back because there were questions about the results, but mediocre publications get published with results acceptable to the public but no strong science behind them. Some areas are highly competitive and some people have no ethics.

Mike Hoffmann suggested sending someone from ESCOP to provide comments, but Dan noted that we need to collect comments, develop the response, and have it approved by the Executive Committee. Can the Science & Tech. Committee handle this? Dan was concerned about the approval process. Eric suggested using the full ESCOP membership with 3 Reps. from each region. Eric had started putting together an initial draft. He inquired if it should be for all federally supported research or just competitive or should it include capacity? Should the AHS/Deans respond? What about the BAA-PBD?

This level will be more effective. This can be discussed with Ian Maw next week, and Eric also suggested that Mike Hoffmann talk to PBD Chair, Bruce McPheron.

C. Interaction with NPL's – Mike Hoffmann

Mike Hoffmann reported that the NY-NPL had finally reached out to Cornell. He asked if the stations are satisfied with the frequency of their communication with their NPLs. If not, Mike will send a note to Sonny to encourage his NPLs to interact with their states, may be twice a year.

Mike Harrington commented that NIFA have travel funds but not enough to cover registration. It's a huge mistake limiting their attendance because of registration fees. In some cases, regions are willing to waive, if requested.

Arlen noted that Meryl still had good interaction with the directors at their meeting, by phone for half an hour. Dan added that NPLs should pick up the phone if they can't visit in person and ask how things are going. Lee had been holding quarterly conference calls at CSU with their state NPL, and commented that the level of interaction perhaps depends on the NPLs.

Arlen agreed for to Mike Hoffmann to prod Sonny to have the NPLs contact their states.

Carol commented that ARDs had not have problems with their NPLs, but ARDs have been going to them rather than NPLs coming to them.

D. Budget/Farm Bill Update – Cornerstone

No one from Cornerstone was able to participate in this call.

E. Budget and Legislative – Jeff Jacobsen and Mike Harrington

On FY14 budget, BAC had sent out a *Call to Action* requesting no lower than the 2012 level, consolidation of pest management and sustainable agriculture and an increase in SARE program. Supporting documents developed by Cornerstone are at www.land-grant.org website.

F. Communications and Marketing – Nancy Cox and Arlen Leholm

Hunt Shipman is the point person at Cornerstone and Darren Katz at k-global. There will be significant activities now that the President's FY14 budget is out.

G. Science and Technology – Bill Ravlin and Dan Rossi

Nothing new to report.

H. Policy Board of Directors – Steve Slack and Eric Young

The next meeting of the BAA-PBD is right before the Joint COPs Meeting in Kansas.

I. July ESCOP Agenda (see attached) – Mike Hoffmann and Dan Rossi

The draft has been shared with everyone. Mike Hoffmann urged everyone to submit agenda briefs so we can dedicate more time for discussion as opposed to reading reports. Eric inquired if the meeting will continue until Thursday morning. Dan replied that we didn't do that last year, and asked if we should have a joint session with ECOP.

The agenda will be changed if we plan to continue to Thursday AM. Dan suggested for the joint session with ECOP, to talk about the marketing initiative. Mike Hoffmann will discuss with Daryl B, and the EDs can discuss next week at their meeting.

J. ESS/SAES/ARD Meeting Update – Steve Slack and Arlen Leholm

Plans are moving along nicely. Steve had organized and have all the speakers lined up for the water quality session. The EDs are fine tuning the four topics for the breakouts.

K. Other Business

Mike Hoffmann suggested for the Science & Tech. Committee to look into a *futuring* exercise - looking at the next 20-30 years on what/who we should be hiring, planting the seed now so the faculty is in place to deal with future needs. Should it come from the Policy Board, to include ACOP, other COPs and have a systems approach?

Should we recreate the Task Force? Eric noted that the group was disbanded a year and a half ago. However, the Integration Task Force did lots of good things. The Futuring group had retired EDs and members of ESCOP & ECOP joint planning committees. It was moderately successful, but everyone felt that it would've been better if it was system wide, with the three functions – research, extension and teaching involved.

Approach the Policy Board, but will need funding for a Facilitator.

Mike Harrington mentioned a futuring workshop at Roanoke. It was great but didn't go anywhere. Fifty people participated.

Eric added there are 'intense' concepts out there, and can easily involve up to 300 people in a single meeting, and will not be cheap to organize.

Arlen suggested creating a national futuring task force. Start with a planning group by selected panel of key thought leaders from public and private industry. Do it differently than before.

Mike Hoffmann confirmed the value of such exercise but it needs to be focused and need to be done correctly. Arlen noted that what Mike Hoffmann had done in climate change is good, having series of meetings rather than a single meeting and organized by a core group with different levels of participation.

Eric agreed that it will work better when there is focus, and suggested a follow-up to the Roadmap, as a futuring activity around the three cross cutting themes. Arlen added technology to prevent catastrophe.

The Science & Tech Committee will meet on May 22 to discuss the National ESS Award. Rubie had contacted the regions to make sure that nominations are in by the first week of May.

Dan will discuss with Bill Ravlin, and the topic on 'Futuring' will be included at the Science & Tech. Committee meeting.

The call ended at 5:06PM.

Attachments:

1. ESCOP Response to PCAST Report
2. ESS Leadership Excellence Award
3. Flyer for Public Comment - Public Access to Federally-Supported Research and Development, Data and Publications
4. July ESCOP Agenda



EXPERIMENT STATION COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION AND POLICY

Experiment Station Section

The Board on Agriculture Assembly

National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges

March 21, 2012

Dr. John P. Holdren
Assistant to the President for Science and Technology
Director, Office of Science and Technology Policy
Eisenhower Executive Office Building
1650 Pennsylvania Avenue
Washington, DC 20504

Dear Dr. Holdren:

On behalf of the Experiment Station Committee on Organization and Policy (ESCOP), the representative governing body of the APLU Board of Agriculture Experiment Station Section, I commend the President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology (PCAST) on its "Report on Agricultural Preparedness and the Agriculture Research Enterprise." We strongly support the Report's recommendation that additional public investment is needed in agricultural research to adequately address the challenges our nation will be facing in the coming decades.

Further support for the PCAST recommendation for increased public funding for agricultural research, is found in a recent paper by Philip G. Pardey and Julian M. Alston, "For Want of a Nail: The Case for Increased Agricultural R&D Spending." (<http://tinyurl.com/8hj3t>) In the paper, the authors report benefit-cost ratios for public investment in agricultural research as 20:1 and higher. Based on their findings, they argue that: "A failure to increase publicly funded agricultural R&D will likely have long-term consequences for the sustainability of US agriculture in a competitive global environment and for the natural resources on which it depends."

We also note that the Report's findings are consistent with those of an ESCOP document, "A Science Roadmap for Food and Agriculture." (<http://www.nera.umd.edu/escop/scienceroadmapnov172010.pdf>) The Roadmap was the product of the input from more than 250 research administrators and land grant university scientists from a wide range of disciplines and institutions. These individuals participated in a process that identified seven Grand Challenges facing our nation and developed a systematic and detailed Roadmap to address them. The Roadmap presents specific research priorities needed to tackle these challenges into the next decade and to guide strategic public investments in research. The seven Grand Challenges outlined in the Roadmap can be summarized into three strategic issues: Food Security and Human Health; Economic Growth and Job Creation; and Sustainable Environmental and Natural Resources.

Additional resources from traditional and new and innovative sources will be needed to move the Science Roadmap and its recommendation forward. Such funding is not available in the current funding scenario. We believe that the new Innovation Ecosystem for Agricultural Research, as suggested in the PCAST report, provides the foundation for a new funding model for public agricultural research. The Report provides a number of strategic elements including rebalancing fundamental and applied research; more attention to regionalized research infrastructure; consideration of less emphasis on crops that receive significant investment from the private sector; enhanced commitment to funding mechanisms that emphasize scientific merit; and the creation of new research institutes. In addition, the Land Grant system will need to forge new partnerships to carry out its research and education mission. These issues are worthy of additional study. ESCOP plans to conduct more in-depth discussions of them and we would be pleased to be part of the broader process to study them.

We agree that an increase in federal investment in agricultural research is necessary across a variety of mechanisms and would welcome an increase of \$700 million per year. We were encouraged by the acknowledgement of the importance of additional investments in fellowships and infrastructure. The former will be critical to attract the best students into the disciplines needed to address these critical challenges. Lack of continuous investment in infrastructure due to decreasing federal and state funding have seriously limited the ability of our institutions to conduct state-of-the art science. Lastly, we also see a need for increased funding of Cooperative Extension to ensure that the results of research are put into practice. The research – extension partnership is fundamental to the success of our land grant university system.

We also recognize that such an increase, though laudable, is insufficient when compared to the serious challenges we are facing. For example, the recommended increase in USDA competitive grant fund from \$265 million to \$500 million is a good starting place. However, such a level would still be far below the \$700 million authorized in the 2008 Farm Bill.

While the report appropriately recommends increases in competitive funding, it is also vital to note the importance of capacity funding. Capacity funding provides a critical base of infrastructure that supports a national system of land grant institutions, which serve a very complex biological, social and economic food and agricultural sector. Such funding supports efficient, systematic, inclusive, and sustainable multistate collaborations due to its flexibility and continuity. It promotes ongoing engagement of the land grant system with its stakeholders – producers and consumers – and allows for continuous adjustment of program direction and objectives based on that engagement. In fact, a 2006 study by Huffman and Evenson showed that each unit of capacity funding for agricultural research had a larger impact on local agricultural productivity than a similar unit of federal competitive grant funding. (Huffman, W. E. and R. E. Evenson, 2006, “Do formula or competitive grant funds have greater impact on state agricultural productivity?” *Am J Agric Econ* 88:783–798)

Capacity funding is also a critical component of the overall portfolio of support needed to conduct high quality, innovative research. There are numerous examples of how capacity funds have been used by faculty to sustain cutting edge science and have been highly leveraged with funds from private foundations, corporations, the National Institutes of Health, National Science Foundation, and several USDA competitive grants programs. For example, at Cornell University for every \$1 in capacity funding allocated to Cornell researchers, an additional \$5.60 was leveraged from other sources. Not only do the

capacity funds help researchers address a multitude of problems, they also position them very well for additional funding.

Capacity funding further provides a bridge to maintain infrastructure, personnel, and competitiveness between successful grants. It gives land-grant university systems, through state and local cost-sharing, the capacity to support faculty at the state, regional, and local levels to address continuing as well as emerging needs. In other words, it is critical to maintain human and programmatic capacity to respond rapidly to crises and emerging needs, to make significant discoveries of new knowledge and technology, and to sustain high priority programs. The list of emerging needs is long and growing and includes invasive species and changes occurring due to climate change such as increases in extreme weather events, droughts and floods.

ESCOP supports the Report's recommendations for increased competitive funding. However, such an increase should not come at the expense of continued support for capacity funding. We believe a balanced increase in competitive and capacity funding portfolio available to agricultural research is the best path.

We look forward to the implementation of the PCAST recommendations and urge the Administration to quickly appoint the proposed committee to consider how to operationalize the recommendations. We look forward to providing input to and assisting the committee as it proceeds.

Thank you once again for an excellent report and for your consideration of these comments.

Sincerely,

Michael P. Hoffmann
ESCOP Chair
241 Roberts Hall
Cornell University,
Ithaca, NY 14853-5905
Phone: 607-255-2552
Fax: 607-255-9499
EMAIL: mph3@cornell.edu

Experiment Station Section Award for Excellence in Leadership

Purpose

To recognize those who have served the Experiment Station Section (ESS) and the national Land-Grant System with exemplary distinction. Through this person's leadership, he/she shall have personified the highest level of excellence by enhancing the cause and performance of the ESS in achieving its mission and the Land-Grant ideal.

Award and Presentation

The award shall be signified by the creation of a suitably inscribed piece approved by the Experiment Station Committee on Organization and Policy (ESCOP) Executive Committee and presented to the recipient or his/her proxy at the Association of Public and Land Grant Universities (APLU) annual meeting and will be further memorialized by a resolution to be read during the ESS fall meeting. The home institution shall be made aware of the recognition by formal letter from the ESCOP Chair to the Chief Executive Officer of the institution and its governing body (Board of Trustees, Board of Regents, etc.) with others copied as appropriate.

Eligibility

Eligible for this award are former or current Directors or Associate Directors, who have provided service in a State Agricultural Experiment Station (SAES) as assistant director, associate director, director, or as chief operating officers with equivalent but variant titles (e.g. vice chancellor, associate vice chancellor, associate vice president, dean for research) and/or as a regional executive director. This award is distinctive in its expectations and not necessarily coincident with retirement, election to specific office or any other specific professional benchmark.

Nominations

Nominations shall include a statement of accomplishments prepared by the nominator(s) unbeknownst to the candidate and supported by letters from three (3) to five (5) former or current members of the ESS. Other letters of support from the home and other institutions may be submitted with the discretion of the nominator(s). Nominations shall address the contributions of the nominee to the land-grant ideal through service to include offices held, committee assignments, other service and, in particular special and extraordinary service activities. Such service should include for example: active participation in affairs of the ESCOP; regional, national and/or international special assignments with distinctive performance that has advanced the mission of the ESS and the land-grant ideal; and research in the sciences related to agriculture. Specific examples of contributions may include the enhancement of cooperation across institutions, creation of model administrative systems useable by other institutions, and development of new strategic directions for ESS. Although testimony as to the nominee's



NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES

1863–2013 • Celebrating 150 Years of Service to the Nation

Two Planning Meetings:

[Public Access to
Federally-Supported Research and Development Data and Publications](#)

Meetings are free and open to the public, but registration is required

Public Comment Meeting: [PUBLICATIONS](#)

14 May 2013, 9 a.m. - 5 p.m.
15 May 2013, 9 a.m. - 12 p.m.

Auditorium
National Academy of Sciences
[2101 Constitution Avenue, NW](#)
Washington DC 20418
[Register Here](#)

Public Comment Meeting: [DATA](#)

16 May 2013, 9 a.m. - 5 p.m.
17 May 2013, 9 a.m. - 12 p.m.

Auditorium
National Academy of Sciences
[2101 Constitution Avenue, NW](#)
Washington DC 20418
[Register Here](#)

Organized by

DIVISION OF BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES AND EDUCATION

Sponsored by (among others)



ESCOP Meeting
July 24, 2013, 1:30 pm – 5:00 pm
Manhattan, KS
Room TBA

- 1:30 Welcome and Introductions – Mike Hoffmann
- 1:35 Approval of Minutes and Agenda – Mike Hoffmann
- 1:40 Interim Actions of the Chair – Mike Hoffmann
- 1:45 NIFA Update – Sonny Ramaswamy (TBC)
- 2:00 Cornerstone Update – Jim Richards/Hunt Shipman
- 2:15 Budget and Legislative – Jeff Jacobsen/Mike Harrington
- 2:25 Communications and Marketing Committee – Nancy Cox/Arlen Leholm
- 2:35 Science and Technology – Bill Ravlin/Dan Rossi
- 2:45 Break
- 3:00 Discussion/Best Management Practices I – “How new faculty positions are created and prioritized”
- 3:40 NRSP Review Committee – Abel Ponce de Leon/Arlen Leholm
- 3:50 Policy Board of Directors – Steve Slack/Eric Young
- 4:00 Reports from ECOP – Clarence Watson, ESCOP liaison to ECOP
Doug Lantagne, ECOP liaison to ESCOP
- 4:10 Nominations Subcommittee Report – Lee Sommers
- 4:15 2013 ESS/SAES/ARD Meeting and Workshop Update – Steve Slack/Arlen Leholm
- 4:25 Discussion/Best Management Practices II – “How institutions deal with unproductive faculty”
- 5:00 Adjourn

ESCOP-CAC Call
June 20, 2013 [4-5PM Eastern]

Here's the Draft Agenda:

A. Action Items from April 18 call:

1. Include the following additional items for the EDs and NMCC meetings next week- EDs

a. Response to PCAST report – Completed (see attached letter to Holdren)

Hoff- There is a response

b. Sonny's proposal for the Impacts database – in process (see Extension website:

<http://excellence.tamu.edu/>)

Hoff- work in progress and not sure if we can readily integrate on that

Rossi- Sarah agreed to serve in the group and will look at the site, but it's not complete. Is this best route for us. Lots don't apply to us, measure inputs/outputs, looks duplicative of POW report. What we need are good concise well written impact statements like those being generated now at WAAESD, with a searchable database. We can continue to evaluate what Ext. has or look at other alternatives. Ext. designed something that achieves multiple service but has extension in mind more a marketing tool than an informative tool.

Hoff- build our own but parallel or linked to their site

Harrin- inputs/outputs. EDs have talked about not seeing Ext. modifying this to accommodate us. Cathy in CFAR mtg. said that she gets info from ARS but not us. What we're doing is down the right track. Once committees see what we can do we can start getting good reports.

Rossi- is there way to link up to the Ext. site? Target what they need and also be able to use that information. There may be other ways of doing this to compliment our marketing efforts. Whatever we do here should feed into bigger picture.

Hoff- can use data in multiple uses. Cornell actually sends press releases.

Rossi- committee to evaluate the Ext. look at Ext. and also groups that can be creative thinking of alternatives. Want Sarah to continue to join this group but give them a broader charge.

Discuss at ESCOP Meeting and have a proposal that we can bring there with the Charge and Timetable.

Arlen- have somebody from k-global in that committee

Sarah- k-global need shift as congressional landscape shifts. They'll need database with stories that are important at certain moments.

Rossi- several will work on proposal, come up with plan with proposed membership, charge and timeline

c. Budget & Leg. Committee's budget priorities survey – survey completed and forwarded to directors (see survey at: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/B229ZQL>)

Hoff- survey is out, Harrington sent a reminder, have received 23 responses. Deadline is June 25

d. Public Access to Federally-Supported Research and Development, Data and Publications – See attached APLU brief

Hoff- APLU taking lead on that

2. Send letter to Sonny asking him to encourage the NPLs to contact/visit their states on a regular basis, at least twice a year or call-in at meetings – Mike Hoffmann - completed
3. Revise July ESCOP Agenda to include joint session with ECOP – Dan and Mike Hoffmann – completed (see attached Joint COP's agenda)
4. Discuss 'futuring' activity with Bill Ravlin, and Science & Tech. Committee – Dan – completed (see attached National Futures Task Force Proposal)
Hoff- proposal attached from Hoff and Steve Slack for McPherson

B. Budget/Farm Bill Update – Jim Richards or Hunt Shipman
Hunt- busiest day in DC in his memory,
Good news—Senate agri marked up at full committee, saw preliminary when it came out on Tuesday. Hatch 243M above, goal is to take us back FY12 is goal but senate also exceed 12 236M up to 243M, AFRI up to 316.4M. Evans-Allen is 52.485M and 33.96M McStennis 294 to 300 for Smtih Lever will give full report later this afternoon
Pest mgt. Senate went with proposal. Funded IR4 under research and ed at 11.9M

Mike- AFRI budget increase?- Hunt- continued support for competitive fund. Balance to grow capacity fund beyond what's expected. There is broad support for this. Seems that what we're doing is working. Have good message delivering it strongly using marketing effort and other network, bringing CARET and university assets to bear in more effective way.

Hunt- farm Bill for the 1st time in memory, the House defeated the Farm Bill. Was an open process, debated two days ago 300 amendments on the house floor votes 195 to 234. Taking additional funding from SNAP. Cuts to food stamps, changes to eligibility criteria. Amendment just before final passage, taking 10M more from SNAP programs through imposing stricter criteria, drove democrats away 62 Reps. voted against bill. Chairman Lucas just issued statement, they are exploring all options and are committed to get bill done. Committed to see it through. Means that mandatory dollars are on hold.

C. Meeting with NIFA and ECOP Leadership re Funding (proposed ROI paper) – Mike Hoffmann
Rossi- Ext. has push to stress capacity fund building it significantly. Is this something ythat we should be putting a lot of effort on. Hunt thinks that we should look at substantial increase that we are looking at in the priority lines. He thinks it's not very realistic. Put on rose colored galses and where agirc. go. Is this the last Farm Bill? Is there way to put new dollars? Is it sustainable?

Hoff- worth putting 2-pager for another 300M for capacity for FY15? Hunt said keep it for until we need it. We don't; want to appear greedy and should look as sensitive to the environment, be judicious sequestration is still on. Craft arguments around smaller number, ut it should be thoughtful and not convey lack of sensitivity or lack of appreciation for what's already being done. Don't look like ungrateful for what's given.

Hoff- there's one call, 2-pager but Hunts comments should be taken to heart, did not discourage us doing it internally 10M, 100M we can still proceed.

Harring- worried about “internal”. Had conversation with Shepard. Didn’t hear increasing capacity fund. Once there’s something written on the wall it gets carved in marble. Will have tall order with us.

Sommers- how does crafting paper fly with rest of system?

Harring- good question, Evans paper federal investment in ag research education etc. no distinction in smith lever and hatch. Perception is we can write nice ROI and lots written incl. by ERS and others, we can communicate the value of these funds without putting value on it. Hesitant to put \$100M in paper.

Rossi- has to be approved by BAC, Harring riding with Galey to Kansas.

Hoff- call on Monday and should have message to convey to Hunt. Put arguments together to develop framework but don’t put dollar value

D. Infrastructure Survey – Mike Hoffmann

Sonny asked Hoff directly. EDs have talked about this, not overwhelming amount of support. At least from earlier correspondence there is opportunity to raise fund, but very limited.

Sonny asked –one option is take sample that already have good inventory of their infrastructure for all basic science to use as example of the great need for upgrade in the land grants.

Harring—Eds discussed, 3-4M at every institution for ag in general. Renovations of labs, state of the art

Rossi- someone will seek funding from congress for competitive funding. Is this where we want our pie? If we were to prioritize our needs, capacity fund growth, competitive AFRI for research & education, then infrastructure. Rossi suspects 1st two will be higher. So in the end we want?

Harring- half a dozen question including deferred repair and maintenance

Rossi- easy for EDs to reach out to their directors and ask who already has the info.

Arlen – what percentage of infra come from state dollars? Seems like we got to focus on capacity and research dollars. An area that’s not very productive.

Sommers- come from private sources, even if you get federal dollars, you almost should have one building federally funded.

Mike – Rossi and Hoff get on the phone with Sonny and get it clarified, revisit what his thoughts are and articulate the obstacles we foresee, need justification, not a lot of effort but might be wasted and we prefer money to go to capacity and competitive.

Arlen- are there key staffers who can help him understand this? Look like wasted effort

Hoff- Steve Slack may be interested too join the call. We should close this or come up with the sample data he’s asking for. Maybe Meryl can help with this.

Slack- no one will refuse help with infras. Maybe due to fact that ARS had put together report and didn’t see us having that traction

Harring- heard that specifically

Hoff- status report from the system, to give congress better picture of what’s happening in real world.

Rubie- Dan, Steve and Mike Hoff.—will send email to Sonny and get call scheduled.

E. ESCOP Committee on Legislation and Policy Representative – Mike Hoffmann

Hoff- Steve Slack is already serving in non-voting role. Steve will be happy to replace Steve Pueppke as the voting representative. Want to know that we’re on home stretch. Steve

Puepke had changed his role at the institution so we need to replace him. Rossi don't know how active CLP will be.

Harring- have turned in all proposals two years ago. Alst report from Jim Hunt, 95% of what's proposed is in there. Don't anticipate much happening

F. Pest Management Coordinating Council (see attached proposal) – Mike Harrington
Harring- had phone call this week. In write up proposed council subcommittee in Science & Tech. Frank Zalom sole member of that. There is no counterpart in Extension. Exte group meet every fall. Those recommendations found their way to congress without weight of system behind them. Came out from IPM voice, rogue recommendation that had no support not vetted thru the system. Need to finalize this organization, discussed on Monday with Shepard, lemme to formalize this. There's conference call with Sonny and NPLs to take to next step, laid out where we've been and going. Hoff- will draw in Water to something similar to Pest mgtn.

G. Budget and Legislative Committee – Jeff Jacobsen and Mike Harrington
Just the survey

H. Communications and Marketing Committee – Nancy Cox and Arlen Leholm
Nancy- C&M will report more at Joint COPs. Mktg played active role in past 6 weeks and pleased where we are with effort and impacts.

I. Science and Technology Committee – Bill Ravlin and Dan Rossi
Rossi- proposals to bring to ESCOP – vote on multistate research award- deadline was yesterday 9 out 12 voting delegates received. All supported southern project recommended by committee. Exec. Comm. Approved

J. NRSP Review Committee – Abel Ponce de Leon and Arlen Leholm
NRSPRC met and will be voted on at fall meeting

K. National Plant Germplasm Coordinating Committee – Eric Young
Shared notes from that meeting --

L. July ESCOP Meeting (see attached draft agenda) – Mike Hoffmann and Dan Rossi
Send briefs July 12 deadline—email will be sent after this call
Focus meeting on discussion – 2 topics need facilitators, directors talk about how they relate 45mins for each item

M. ESS/SAES/ARD Meeting and Workshop Update – Steve Slack and Arlen Leholm (see agenda at meeting website: <http://www.oardc.ohio-state.edu/ess2013>)
Steve- sent out materials, get it out to directors and discuss at summer mtg. emphasize Tuesday to Thursday, structuring special session on Tuesday and breakout on Thursday, have people show up to those.

N. Other Business

ESCOP-CAC Call Notes
August 15, 2013

In Attendance: Hoffmann, Ravlin, Slack, Jacobsen, Chris, Leholm, Harrington, Ponce de Leon, Rossi, Mize

Notes:

A. Budget/Farm Bill Update – Jim Richards or Hunt Shipman
No report from Cornerstone.

B. Budget and Legislative Committee – Jeff Jacobsen and Mike Harrington
Nothing new to report from Manhattan mtg. Letter from Jacobsen and Hoffmann, forwarding results of survey to keep capacity fund. This is work in progress. No response on the query for ROI.

C. Impact Reporting Working Group Update – Dan Rossi
Appointing working group to evaluate alternative reporting systems specifically Extension. Eric attended meeting and had positive feedback. Had heard back from prospective members Bill Brown (TN) will chair but waiting to hear. Eric Young, Cathy Granthill (replacing Dr. Hyman-Parker) Dave Benfield (OH) and Sarah Lupis and Bill Miller (UMASS). Need confirmation from Bill Brown and Bill Miller. M. Hoffmann will send out letters of appointment with charge and time frame, report at APLU mtg. and final report at ESCOP Feb. 2014.

D. Pest Management Coordinating Council Update – Mike Harrington
Buchholz, Shepard and Hofmann conference call with NIFA- Fitzner and Marty Draper. Changes made on the program based on what we heard last week. Concerned with functional equivalency, not harm programs already working well. Agreed draft memo to Sonny, he endorses functional equivalency. Robin and Harrington drafted memo and added that PBD endorses this. Get initiative put together with 4-5 goals. Draft memo under review by M. Hoffman and D. Buchholz.

S. Slack was at meeting and Marty mentioned that NIFA is following functional equivalency.

M. Harrington- what we meant with FE programs will operate according to the legislation they were put together. May be put in another place, competition. More programs included but fewer dollars.

M. Hoffmann- did not receive response on specific questions.

S. Slack- make sure Cornerstone is involved.

M. Harrington-if this does not satisfy us then we will seek legislation solution. Robin is more under pressure. First time there's programmatic area, but broad perspective. We'll know more when RFAs come out.

E. NIFA Strategic Plan Response – Dan Rossi

Have asked for responses that went out to regions. Received two (Hoffmann and Russin) responses, with good and interesting observations. D. Rossi can summarize the two and send as ESCOP response, but may not reflect the body. If there's larger number then we can submit those.

Arlen L.– talked about it at Manhattan and suggested to include those comments.

M. Harrington- 2-3 bullets are internally focused, and says very little how they'll interact with us, and take input in a programmatic way. EDs can put something together relatively quickly. D. Rossi can work

on this and done by Tuesday next week. Dan forward to the EDs and draft something along with strategic planning. EDs will work with their Chair. Remiss if we don't respond.

F. Communications and Marketing Committee – Nancy Cox and Arlen Leholm

Arlen- PBD discussion on marketing effort. First Monday evening when PBD met and asked Bruce to set up a working group that will look at comm. & marketg. effort perhaps expand, but has not seen charge yet. Overall working better today than it's ever been, kglobal has been effective. PBD plans to expand to others. What next steps might be. Exec. Comm. of C&M will meet tomorrow to discuss strategy how to move ahead. Bruce is very supportive. Recommended to Bruce to come to ESS Meeting to listen to report of working group. Until we get charge cant say much more.

Rossi- need to receive approval – have motion to move forward to continue support of 300,000 and will be reduced if extension will no longer participate. Will this be delayed if we're waiting from PBD. Do we move motion forward to ESS.

Arlen- may include enhance funding, how serious PBD is in expanding effort. Had conversation with Cornerstone and Nancy, but until we have charge. Continued support from ESCOP is crucial. Was supposed to get charge 2 weeks ago, but Bruce has been busy.

Slack- we still need to take action at ESS Meeting coz PBD does not meet til November.

Arlen – working group recommendations need to be ready soon before Sept. mtg.

Rossi – suggests conditional approval.

Arlen- asked Nancy to invite Bruce – may have support from others and change motion.

Slack – be careful how you define Policy Board, as not everyone knows what's going on.

Arlen – people support effort, oppty and danger

G. Science and Technology Committee – Bill Ravlin and Dan Rossi

Nothing new since Kansas.

Received approval for the 2K. goal is to distribute copies at the ESS Meeting.

New Chair for committee, Bill Ravlin had served 3-4 years. We have names for Chair and Vice-Chair, effective October 1. Appointment by Hoffmann. Rubie to prepare appointment letter.

H. ESS/SAES/ARD Meeting and Workshop Update – Steve Slack and Arlen Leholm (see agenda at meeting website: <http://www.oardc.ohio-state.edu/ess2013>)

Slack- went over the program. Speakers confirmed.

Reception set, comments at 7PM

Meeting rooms all set for regional mtgs. And business mtg.

Cathy Woteki lunch speaker on Wed.

Wed. banquet interim president of OSU speaker.

4 discussion sessions – have names for sessions 1 & 2 speakers, but not 3&4.

70 people currently signed up.

Rossi – change #2 IR4 now will be #4 – send changes/switches to Slack and they'll revise the program

Slack – good to have pictures and short bios for speakers

Harrington- Wendy Fink suggested couple of people, and Linda will be good as well. Linda is at OSU so that's easy.

Chris checking if Woteki is confirmed. Slack did initial call to Woteki. Slack will follow up with Woteki.

I. Other Business -

- ESS Business Meeting Draft Agenda - Dan Rossi and Mike Hoffmann (see attached)
Short time period tried to fit what we have, and written reports for others.

If we move C&M presentation in the afternoon, then it'll not be on the ballot and just have show of hands after the report. 3 by 5 cards. Bruce can make it after lunch.

Chris had added award money in the ballot.

- New Deans/Directors Orientation – plan for a section meeting 1:00 – 3:00 on Thursday, 12/5/13
Eric suggested last session will be meeting of individual sections with new deans and directors to talk about issues of significance to sections as opposed to all deans and directors. Issue is how many people will hang on. Eric proposed an informal session. Research Dirs. will meet with Steve Slack. We can bring them up to speed on other issues. Chairs of major committees, but not sure if they're attending or not. Extension and AHS, etc.
Slack – ask them to mark what section they'll go to when they register. Last time they did it there were some people from NIFA and didn't sign up but they also deal with ESCOP, they can also meet as a separate section.
- Need for a September 19 CAC call – will meet few days later in Ohio, will not have it unless something critical comes up. Starting in October same date/time? Slack requested that we lock this in. (ask Chris if she wants to send the message to ESCOP-CAC)
- Harrington – may have observed differences 2% to 9% in Hatch, business officers have raised the issue. If not received final allocations, data available in NIFA website. Harrington will send to Dan. Turns out that there are things that people counted on like federal retirement etc. Funds Mngt. Branch did not communicate accordingly. Have draft email from Meryl that'll go out to system that talks about what happened. Will communicate clearly with us how they manage our money. Alaska Extension was cut Smith Lever by 9%. Tomorrow or Monday something will come from NIFA, Sonny upset when they can't communicate clearly to us.

Rossi- NRSPs breakdown in allocation? Harrington said they're not showing.

Ended at 5:01PM.

ESCOP CAC Call, October 17, 2013

Participants:

Eric Young, Carolyn Brooks, Steve Slack, Hunt Shipman, Laura (Cornerstone), Brett Hess, Christina Hamilton (recorder)

Outstanding Action Items (follow up from August 15 CAC call and Fall ESS Meeting):

1. Select an ESCOP representative on the Futures Task Force. Steve will send Chris Mike Hoffman's letter to update and send on to EDs. We are looking for an expression of interest, if task force is appointed by PBD.
2. Impact Database Working Group: Have we received confirmation from Bill Brown and Bill Miller? *Update as of 10/9: Bill Brown is chair, haven't heard back yet from Bill Miller. Members: Sarah Lupis, Dave Benfield, and Cathy Gant-Hill (1890), and Eric Young for support. Committee was charged by Mike Hoffman and is working. Will send to ESCOP a few weeks prior to APLU meeting in November.*
3. Pest Management Coordinating Council: Was initiative put together with 4-5 goals? They are *working on recommendations to send to ESCOP and ECOP. Include a discussion with NIFA on the fate of the consolidated line item going forward.*
4. Invite the Natural Resource Group to APLU PBD meeting to provide a brief overview of their new Roadmap. *Might be better for them to come to March meeting when there is more time and less hectic. Steve Slack will check with Eddie Gouge to see where they are on the November meeting.*
5. Science and Technology: Chair appointment done, who is Vice-Chair (as mentioned during 8/15 CAC Call)? *Marikis N. Alvarez, 1890-Delaware State Univ is the new Vice-Chair and was appointed by Mike Hoffman.*
6. ESCOP Leadership Award: Encourage regions to send announcement on to their members. Please contact Chris Hamilton in the NCRA if you need a copy of the announcement. *Done; all regions have sent this out.*
7. Science Roadmap: Need to have Eddie Gouge include copies in APLU meeting materials for PBD members (Dan and Rubie are contacts for additional printings). *Done: Rubie Mize having 75 additional copies printed for APLU.*
8. NRSP allocations for FY13 and sequestration. No further information available yet.

Draft Minutes/Notes:

1. **Interim Actions of the Chair – Steve Slack**

- a. Discussion with Mike Hoffman and Daryl Bucholtz on visits NIFA and other DC agencies. Arlen Leholm is starting to work on agendas for meetings between ESCOP and ECOP, Cornerstone, and kglobal on November 21.
 - b. ESCOP request to appoint a Futures Task Force to PBD meeting at APLU
 - i. Forwarded to Eddie Gouge and will be on APLU agenda
 - ii. Who do we want as an ESCOP representative?
 - iii. Chris will send a note to EDs for suggestions; Mike Hoffman has indicated an interest.
- 2. Re-Cap of Columbus, OH Fall ESS Meeting**
- a. Meeting went well, Chair Slack was pleased with hotel and facilities
 - b. All presentations have been posted on the ESCOP website.
 - c. Steve will send presentation links to PBD board list, Cathy Woeteki, Sonny Ramaswamy, and Meryl Broussard.
- 3. Budget/Farm Bill Update – Jim Richards or Hunt Shipman**
- a. Government reopened as of this morning (10/17/2013) with the debt ceiling increase in effect. Government funded through Jan 15, 2014 with a Continuing Resolution (CR) at \$986B. This is a compromise between Senate and House levels. Debt ceiling, written as \$ amount, estimated be reached in early Feb 2014. We may be back in this boat again in a few months.
 - b. Congress on vacation this week and next, so we won't have much sense of the appropriations process until late next week.
 - c. Farm Bill was not a part of this agreement, continue to assume that with the appointment of conferees removes procedural impediments, formal Farm Bill conference may be coming soon. Dairy cliff on Dec 31.
 - d. Q: Should we anticipate that the language written that will impact us will stay as-is? A: No reason to think this will change.
 - e. Steve Slack will stay in CLP role for now, until APLU meeting in November.
- 4. Budget and Legislative Committee – Bret Hess and Mike Harrington**
- a. Nothing new to report since Fall ESS meeting
- 5. NRSP-RC Update – Bret Hess**
- a. Nothing new to report since Fall ESS meeting, except one brand new proposal will be reviewed over the winter/spring.
- 6. Impact Database Working Group Update – Dan Rossi**
- a. See Action Item 2 at top
- 7. Pest Management Coordinating Council Update – Mike Harrington**
- a. See Action Item 3 above
 - b. Need to find out how NIFA will treat the consolidated line going forward
- 8. NIFA Strategic Plan Response – Dan Rossi**
- a. Feedback went from regions, through Dan, to NIFA.
- 9. Communications and Marketing Committee – Nancy Cox and Arlen Leholm**
- a. No report, nothing new since Fall ESS meeting in September.
- 10. Science and Technology Committee – John Russin and Dan Rossi**

- a. No report given

11. ESCOP Meeting at APLU Agenda Topics - All

- a. Monday, November 11 from 1:45 pm to 5 pm
- b. Please submit written reports in advance to allow time for additional topics
- c. Some topics to include:
 - i. Impact Reporting Database
 - ii. Futures Task Force
 - iii. Pest Management – Consolidated line item discussion with NIFA at APLU meeting
- d. Steve Slack will take a look and work with Arlen Leholm and Chris Hamilton to develop a draft to share with the CAC.

12. New Deans/Directors Orientation – Eric Young

- a. Registration low so far, expected to pick up soon.
- b. Eric sent a reminder out to ESCOP and ECOP EDs
- c. Steve Slack's primary role will be during the "section" section, during lunch on Thursday, 12/5. The intention is to keep it informal for questions and talk about what ESCOP does and how it serves.

13. Other Business:

- a. Next CAC Call scheduled for 11/21 (APLU Annual Meeting November 9-12)
- b. Steve Slack kindly requesting that all regions link to other regions' Impact Statement lists

New ESCOP Appointments, as of 10/1:

- a. Science and Technology Committee
 - i. John Russin as new Chair
 - ii. Marakis Alvarez as Incoming Chair
 - iii. Teferi Tsegaye as ARD Delegate
 - iv. Tom Burr as NERA Delegate
 - v. Joe Coletti as NCRA Delegate and Member of the Social Sciences Subcommittee for Ag. Econ.
 - vi. Philip Watson as Member of the Social Sciences Subcommittee for Ag. Econ representing the Western Region
 - vii. John Baker as NCRA delegate
 - viii. Nathan McKinney as SAAESD delegate
- b. Budget and Legislative Committee
 - i. Bret Hess as Chair
 - ii. Gary Thompson as NERA Delegate and Incoming Chair
 - iii. Ron Allen as WAAESD Delegate
 - iv. Jeffrey Steiner as WAAESD Delegate
- c. ESCOP Representative to the Committee on Legislation and Policy – Steve Slack

- d. NRSP Review Committee Chair – Bret Hess
- e. ESCOP Chair Elect – Bob Shulstad (SAAESD)
- f. Other appointments: Daryl Bucholz replacing Doug Lantange on ESCOP Committee

ESCOP CAC Call

December 19, 2013 at 4 pm Eastern Time

1 (847) 944-7654; 6797 028#

Participants:

Eric Young, Dan Rossi, Steve Slack, Bob Shulstad, Bret Hess, Mike Harrington, Alice Gomez (Cornerstone), Chris Hamilton

Outstanding Action Items:

1. Status of Futuring Task Force: Steve Slack has asked Mike Hoffman, with ED support from Dan Rossi, to lead the Phase 1 effort that will establish the charge, goals, etc. for the Committee with the responsibility to report back to the Policy Board at its March 2014 meeting. Also, a request for representatives from other sections represented on PBD has been sent asking them to assign a member to this committee. Steve and Eric are working on these messages.
2. Facilities Task Force Status: Sonny Ramaswamy asked ESCOP to lead an effort for the system to gather an assessment on status of facilities and to work with Sightlines on a survey and analysis. Steve has asked Mike Hoffman to lead and Dan Rossi to assist.
3. Impact Database Effort: Eric Young sent out the information on the results of the database task force. Eric Young and Chris Hamilton are working on a survey to vote in spending \$12,500 of ESCOP's Marketing reserve held at APLU to fund the initial development of the database at Texas A&M University. Survey/vote will probably be distributed after the holidays, although we now may wish to wait until the group sees the preliminary website.
4. Pest Management Coordinating Council: *Mike Harrington continues to work with them to develop formal committee membership.*
5. NRSP allocations for FY13 and sequestration. *Still awaiting a response from NIFA. Bret Hess and Mike Harrington will keep the committee updated as more information becomes available.*
6. Steve Slack will send a signed letter to Eddie Gouge of APLU approving the use of ESCOP Marketing assessment funds to pay for meeting room space and phone charges for the March 2, 2014 Communications and Marketing Committee meeting. Eric Young will work with Steve to send out this letter.

Minutes:

1. **Interim Actions of the Chair – Steve Slack**
 - a. BAC - Water Resources Working Group
 - b. ESCOP Priorities: The Action Items above illustrate our main focal points, Steve Slack also meeting with Jimmy Hennings and others in DC to work on priorities. Let him know if you have other thoughts.

- c. New Dean/Director Orientation (December 3-5): Thanks to Eric Young and colleagues for a great session. Evaluation survey and presentation links will be sent out by Eddie Gouge in January.
 - d. ESCOP/ECOP Chair visits
- 2. Budget/Farm Bill Update – Alice Gomez (representing Cornerstone)**
- a. Appropriations/Budget Overview
 - i. House and Senate budget conference negotiators reached a two year budget deal on 12/13. Provides a top line spending number for FY14 and 15. Also reduces sequestration cuts by \$63 Billion over the next 2 years.
 - ii. For FY14, the 302a allocations (amount of discretionary spending allowed) is a little over \$1 trillion. Defense and non-defense discretionary caps raised.
 - iii. Expect Appropriations process to return to regular order soon.
 - iv. Expect a lot of action between now and January 14, 2014. Subcommittees are working to strike a deal on the 12 appropriations bills, but the short time frame and House/Senate spending gap may be problematic.
 - b. Farm Bill
 - i. Ag Committee staff have worked on the issues they can resolve and have come up with a list that must be resolved at member level.
 - ii. The 4 principal farm negotiators did not come to DC this week, but Chairman Lucas has set Jan 6-8 for a full conference meeting to resolve the member level issues and optimistic that a full package will be brought to the floor by the week of Jan 13, 2014.
 - iii. Many of the issues relate to regulatory action, such as Country of Origin, Navigable Waters permitting (livestock, row crops effects), King Amendment and interstate commerce.
- 3. Budget and Legislative Committee – Bret Hess and Mike Harrington**
- a. House restored system back to FY12. Senate 2-2.5% increase depending on which capacity you look at and good increase in AFRI.
 - b. Related to Futuring exercise: B&L discussed a “Big Ask”, concentrating on Water and outcome of Water Working Group to infuse more money in to AFRI to support water program. Expect this maybe by FY16. Perhaps go back to the ESCOP roadmap and look at priorities for top two of seven priorities.
- 4. NRSP-RC Update – Bret Hess**
- a. Still waiting for a response from NIFA on why NRSPs were not reduced by sequestration, as requested.
 - b. NRSP7 requesting one year extension (as a one year proposal)
 - c. New project/proposal going forward with a full proposal for review. Proposal is in NIMSS and has gone out to reviewers. (NRSP_temp321)
- 5. Impact Database Working Group Update – Eric Young**
- a. Group has a call scheduled for Jan 14 to discuss the website development
 - b. More group calls coming up to talk more about website development, specifically to address input page for Research.

- c. We may want to delay vote until we get more information and preliminary look of website input page, etc.
- 6. Pest Management Coordinating Council Update – Mike Harrington**
 - a. Council to respond to the working group paper and communicate the committee's composition; it needs to be small, manageable, and trustworthy. They recognize the need to be formally appointed.
 - b. Mike Harrington is checking on the pesticide applicator training issue that affects Extension.
- 7. Communications and Marketing Committee – Nancy Cox, Dan Rossi**
 - a. Issues from December conference call:
 - i. Concerns about confidential information coming out of kglobal, so kglobal will revert to a verbal monthly report. Committee will discuss a long term solution during its March face-to-face meeting.
 - ii. Committee meets by phone again in January and again in March, but thereafter, they have decided to meet quarterly after March meeting, instead of monthly.
 - iii. For the March 2 meeting, they are looking into a conference room at the hotel, but this will cost \$300 for use of phone, etc. Nancy is asking ESCOP if we can cover this bill.
 1. Action Requested/taken: This request was put forth as a committee motion and approved. Chair Slack approves of this spending.
 2. Action needed: Steve Slack will need to send a signed letter to Eddie Gouge at APLU approving this expenditure.
 - b. The Western region has had a request from kglobal to highlight some specific projects, but there is nothing of use in the NIMSS reports. WAAESD will draft a letter about impacts to send to directors to help improve multistate reporting. Bill Brown will send on behalf of NRSP1, with some examples.
- 8. Science and Technology Committee – John Russin and Dan Rossi**
 - a. We still are distributing brochures for our Science Roadmap. Wendy Fink indicated that at least one other Section was considering such a document and that we might be asked to partner in that effort.
 - b. Nominations for the Multistate Research award are due February 28.
- 9. Other Business:**
 - a. Next CAC Call scheduled for 1/16/2014

New ESCOP Committee Appointments:

- Jim Moyer, WSU, replaced Ron Allen on B&L as WAAESD delegate
- Jim Moyer, WSU, appointed to NPGCC to replace Lee Sommers