

ESCOP Executive Committee

PALMER House – Chicago, IL

November 10, 2008

1:45-4:45pm

ACTION ITEMS

Agenda Item	Actions Taken
1.0	Approved: Agenda and Interim Actions – Steve Pueppke
2.2	Approved: De-activation of the ESCOP Communication and Marketing Committee
3.0	Approved: NIFA Recommendations document as final and to be sent to CSREES
11.0	Approved: Dr. Steve Slack as the ESCOP representative to the Farm Bill Committee
11.0	Approved: Cancellation of the November 18, 2008 ESCOP-CAC teleconference

MINUTES

Agenda #		Topic and Presenter
	1:45 pm	Call to order – Steve Pueppke (Chair)
1.0	1:50 pm	Approval of Agenda and Interim Actions – Steve Pueppke <ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Appointment of Dr. John Liu as an SAAESD Science and Technology delegate○ Appointment of Dr. Billye Foster as the WAASED representative to the Science and Technology Committee's subcommittee on Social Sciences○ Appointment of Dr. William Brown as the SAAESD representative to the ESCOP Budget & Legislative Committee
2.0	1:55 pm	2.1: Cornerstone and Podesta Annual Marketing and Public Relations

		<p>Updates 2008 – John Scofield/Cornerstone/Arlen Leholm</p> <p>2.2: ESCOP C & M recommendation to de-activate – Jerry Arkin/Arlen Leholm</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Motion to de-activate this committee was seconded and passed
3.0	2:25 pm	<p>NIFA Competitive Funding Priorities Recommendations – Greg Bohach/ Dan Rossi</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A motion was made to approve the NIFA Competitive Program Priorities document as final and to send it to CSREES. This motion was seconded and passed.
4.0	2:35 pm	Farm Bill/Federal Budget Status Report – Cornerstone
5.0	2:55 pm	Budget and Legislative Committee Update (BAC meeting outcomes, matching funds, and priorities) – David Boethel /Mike Harrington
6.0	3:20 pm	BAA-Policy Board of Directors Update – Nancy Cox
7.0	3:25 pm	REE Energy Science & Education Plan Update – Mike Harrington
	3:30 pm	Break
8.0	3:45 pm	CSREES Update and Discussion – Colien Hefferan
9.0	4:25 pm	Planning for the 2009 ESS/SAES/ARD Workshop – Clarence Watson/Eric Young
10.0	4:30 pm	March ESCOP Meeting – Steve Pueppke/Arlen Leholm
11.0		<p>Other Business:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ ARD Update (for information only) - Carolyn Brooks ○ Reconstitution of the Farm Bill Committee - Steve Pueppke and EDs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ A motion was made to appoint Steve Slack as the ESCOP representation to the Farm Bill Committee, this motion was seconded and passed.

12.0	4:40 pm	<p>Future Meetings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ ESCOP Winter Meeting – March 3, 2009 at the CSREES Waterfront Centre ○ Association of Research Director's 15th Biennial Research Symposium - March 28 to April 1 at the Atlanta Hyatt Regency, Atlanta, GA. ○ Joint COPs Meeting - July 29-30, 2009, The Marquette Hotel, Minneapolis, MN ○ 2009 ESS/SAES/ARD Workshop – Monday, September 14 to Thursday Sep 17 at the Sheraton Oklahoma City, OK.
	4:45 pm	Adjourn – Steve Pueppke

MEMORANDUM

TO: IAN MAW
MEMBERS OF THE SYSTEM COMMUNICATIONS AND
MARKETING IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

FROM: HUNT SHIPMAN

SUBJECT: PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS OF PODESTA GROUP ANNUAL
REPORT

DATE: OCTOBER 30, 2008

Cornerstone has reviewed the Podesta Group's (PG) report for 2008.

The report accurately and thoroughly addresses the accomplishments that the PG has achieved during the year and we believe that PG not only fulfilled its obligations under the scope of work, but also laid a solid foundation for this effort for the future.

As the PG report indicates, Cornerstone worked cooperatively to ensure that the maximum benefit is realized from the System's Communications and Marketing efforts. Cornerstone and PG worked collaboratively on each event and on other activities such as the USA Today article.

We anticipate that the change in administration and the potential for significant changes in the Congress will create new opportunities for institutions to educate stakeholders. Cornerstone will continue to work to ensure that the marketing program complements and enhances the overall objectives of the Board on Agriculture Assembly.

For 2009, we will continue to seek opportunities to publicize breakthrough research accomplishments and capitalize on previously planned events that we can highlight. We will also encourage PG to place a high priority on completion of the "Best Practices" document, which we believe may be useful for institutions to create their own events and/or maximize their results from current activities.

We would be pleased to provide additional information as you or the members of the Committee deem necessary.

To: System Communication and Marketing Implementation Committee (SCMIC)
From: Podesta Group
Date: October 31, 2008
Re: Podesta Group's Annual Report on Communications and Marketing Activities

The Podesta Group is pleased to provide an annual report to NASULGC and the System Communication and Marketing Implementation Committee (SCMIC) describing the progress and achievements made in the marketing and communication campaign for 2008. We have also included copies of the past two quarterly reports which compare these accomplishments to the scope of work laid out in the contract, as well as some of the relevant press clippings generated by the campaign.

Introduction

In April of this year, the Podesta Group was hired to enhance the understanding and knowledge among key stakeholders and the general public of the vital work being done and exciting discoveries being made at Land Grant Universities. The goal of this public education campaign was to utilize compelling message materials and politically targeted public relations activities to develop new champions and create a climate of support for NASULGC and SCMIC programs. By regularly deploying marketing materials in a strategic manner and utilizing grassroots public relations tactics, the campaign continues to highlight innovative research and extension activities to key decision-makers and thought leaders in the media and Congress. All activities and outreach are coordinated with Cornerstone Government Affairs and SCMIC.

National Media Outreach

Create 21 and USA Today

The Podesta Group identified the simultaneous passage of the Farm Bill with the inclusion of NASULGC's Create 21 initiative and the global food crisis as a salient news opportunity to highlight the work of university institutions and the relative stagnant state of federal funding for agriculture research and extension activities. The main message was that the legislative environment of flat funding for agriculture research continued while funding for other research agencies has rightfully grown substantially. In addition, we wanted to convey that much of the federally funded agriculture research has a positive impact on alleviating strains on the global food supply and availability. In order to capitalize on the heightened media interest in agricultural issues, the Podesta Group did the following:

1. Drafted message materials highlighting the impact of the Create 21 provisions on elevating the stature of capacity and peer-review research and extension funding, as well as the historical levels of agriculture research funding as they compared to other federal research agencies.

2. Research, compiled and formatted examples of relevant research for use with national reporters.
3. Targeted and pitched national reporters for possible profile stories on the state of agriculture research funding.

This work resulted in a lengthy, well placed story by *USA Today*. It was the lead story on the newspaper's website and was featured on the front page of the business section in the print edition. *USA Today* has the largest circulation of any newspaper in the United States, with more than two million copies circulated each business day. The headline of the article, "Money for Crop Research Just a Drop in the Bucket", is probably the most succinct and definitive measure of the success of the piece in reinforcing the primary message of the overall marketing campaign. Additionally, there are several other key components of the story worth noting:

1. The article included interviews with officials from five land grant institutions (Cornell, Kansas State, Michigan State, Purdue and Minnesota), nearly all of which were recommended to the reporter by the Podesta Group and Cornerstone. Officials were also prepped by Cornerstone and the Podesta Group on best messages to utilize and the tone and tenor of the likely questions from the reporter.
2. The article downplayed the role of earmarks in stagnant research funding; a theme the reporter initially seemed likely to feature more prominently.
3. The 1,600 word piece was three to four times longer than a typical story in *USA Today*, which is known for succinct reporting with stories that generally do not exceed 500 words.

The importance of this piece cannot be understated. After the piece ran it was circulated to relevant hill staff by Cornerstone and the Podesta Group will feature it in the fall edition of the e-newsletter. Lawmakers are often driven to action by the coverage of national issues and the perception that stagnant research funding at USDA played some role in the global food crisis should have a positive impact on funding decisions for the foreseeable future.

Specialty Crops/Organic Research and University of Connecticut

The Farm Bill also included mandatory funding for specialty crop and organic research. This was the first time a Farm Bill had included funds for these purposes which prompted concerns that the appropriators would cut these programs in order to offset other priorities in the agriculture appropriations bill. Working with Cornerstone, the Podesta Group drafted a sample press release that could be distributed by institutions that were likely to benefit from these new programs. University of Connecticut was identified initially as a top target to issue this press release and the Podesta Group worked with the regional directors to initiate contact with experiment station heads in Connecticut. The station heads subsequently put out a press release praising this new program and expressing optimism about the University of Connecticut's ability to vigorously compete for this new funding.

While this effort was successful in that an institution with a large presence in the district belonging to the Agriculture Appropriation Subcommittee Chairwoman issued a press release that was supportive of NASULGC funding priorities, the press release was not picked up by any publications in the state. In the future, the Podesta Group will work to improve coordination with the regional and state officials to include discussions with the appropriate communication and marketing officials at the relevant institutions.

Grassroots Events

Rep. Rodney Alexander and the Louisiana State University AgCenter

The core of the scope of work for the marketing efforts are a series of targeted grassroots public relations opportunities that seek to highlight the research and extension work of the land grant institutions with decision-makers in Congress. Targeted site visits are the cornerstone of this outreach and the first of these visits took place on July 6, 2008 with Rep. Rodney Alexander, a Member of the House Appropriations Agriculture Subcommittee, at the LSU AgCenter's Dean Lee Research and Extension Station. Rep. Alexander was deemed a key target because of the significant amount of research and extension activities that are funded in his district. Highlights of the visit include:

1. A balanced program that highlighted both the extension and research work of LSU AgCenter.
2. Significant media coverage by all of the media outlets in the area, which included a photo and positive story in the daily newspaper and two local television segments.
3. Lengthy on-camera media interviews with Rep. Alexander that reinforced the benefits of the federal capacity and competitive grant funding.
4. Positive feedback from both the Congressman's office and LSU AgCenter officials on the benefits of the visit.

As this report is being drafted several additional site visits are in the works with the goal of scheduling one or more after the election.

Marketing and Message Materials

Summer Edition of E-Newsletter

One of the main concerns expressed in the request for proposal produced by the ESCOP Communications and Marketing Committee was "a lack of a recognized identity" and the belief that too few are familiar with the work of the land grant system. In an effort to improve the "brand" of the land grant system, the Podesta Group launched an e-newsletter that provides short, timely stories on the creative and innovative work of various land grant institutions that is distributed to Congressional staff and national media. The newsletter, entitled *Innovations*, is distributed quarterly and each issue reflects a seasonal theme with the first edition focusing on summer. The layout and design of the first edition was vetted with SCMIC and numerous edits and revisions were made to accommodate the vigorous feedback from members of the committee. Each newsletter includes an op-ed piece written by a prominent member of Congress who has influence over NASULGC's legislative priorities. The first edition was well received with a view rate of almost double what we generally regard as a successful newsletter. Nearly thirty percent of recipients opened and read a portion of the newsletter. Other highlights include:

1. Op-Ed piece titled "Farm Bill Advance's Nation's Land-Grant Universities", written by Senator Tom Harkin, Chairman of the Senate Agriculture Committee and member of the Senate Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee. This piece was the most popular story included in the newsletter.
2. Recap of the Rep. Alexander's visit to LSU AgCenter, which was the second most popular article in the newsletter.

3. References to the work of the five land grant institutions, including a special focus on the 1890s institutions.

As this report is being drafted, a template and content is being finalized for the fall edition of the newsletter.

Accountability and Coordination

At the onset of the campaign, the primary focus of our work was developing systems and protocols that would increase the opportunities for institutions to highlight their work in a manner that would ensure all activities are closely coordinated with the necessary university officials. Working with the SCMIC we developed a metrics document that clearly defines the goals and objectives of the marketing campaign and establishes reporting requirements to track the progress of the campaign. Detailed quarterly reports are submitted to the SCMIC along with documents and press clips that are generated throughout the quarter.

PODESTA GROUP'S QUARTERLY REPORT FOR 7/1/08-9/30/08 FOR NASULGC

I. COMMUNICATIONS AND MEDIA OUTREACH

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

Worked with Texas A&M to develop a compelling story for e-newsletter on their work to aid the recovery from Hurricane Ike of affected communities. Researched and drafted pieces for e-newsletter which includes the compelling and timely work of several institutions.

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

Developed content for the fall edition of the e-newsletter.

3. Produce a high-quality, multi-discipline "best practices" publication featuring selected research, extension, teaching and international activities stories from across the country

Compiled examples of diverse research stories for possible inclusion in best practices publication and will use the November annual meeting to solicit additional examples.

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

Drafted invitation letter for Rep. Rothman site visit at Rutgers University.

5. Develop op-eds

Published piece by Chairman Tom Harkin (D-IA) in the quarterly e-newsletter.

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

Newsletter was sent in early September and was read by 30 percent of the recipients. This response rate is double the average threshold that is considered as a success. Featured stories from 5 land grant institutions including a special focus on work done at 1890s institutions. Begun preliminary layout of the fall edition and have drafted stories for inclusion.

7. Conduct an expedited, thorough communications assessment of existing marketing materials developed by NASULGC, USDA or other entities with knowledge of the university system

Not timely at this juncture and will commence after the November election.

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

Pitched agriculture research funding story to USA Today reporter for story that was published July 31st,

2008. (Attachment 1) Reporter featured quotes from officials from five land grant schools.

TARGET ACTIVITIES

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

Facilitated a visit by Rep. Rodney Alexander to the LSU AgCenter's Dean Lee Research and Extension Station on July 8, 2008. Event was covered by every media outlet in the area which included a positive story in the daily newspaper and two television segments featuring the work of the LSU AgCenter and the Congressman's visit. (Attachment 2) The visit was also covered by the LSU AgCenter's communications office which drafted a story and produced a video piece for their website. Engaged with several other deans to secure additional visits after the November elections and drafted invite letter for Rep. Rothman site visit which was sent by Rutgers University.

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

Published piece by Chairman Tom Harkin (D-IA) in the quarterly e-newsletter.

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

Not timely at this juncture.

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

Worked to secure a lengthy piece entitled Money for Crop Research Just a Drop in the Bucket in USA Today. It was the lead story on the paper's website and was feature on the front page of the business section in the print edition. The story included interviews with officials from 5 land grant institutions (Cornell, Kansas State, Michigan State, Purdue and Minnesota) nearly all of which were recommended to the reporter by Podesta and Cornerstone. Also secured three media stories related to the Rep. Alexander visit to the LSU Ag Center.

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

Not timely at this juncture.

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

Not timely at this juncture

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

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

peer-reviewed journal.

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

Not timely at this juncture

III. **MEETINGS AND CONFERENCE CALLS**

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

Marketing meetings and conference calls

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

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

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

Conducted several meetings with SCMIC officials and Cornerstone Government Affairs

3. ***Joint COPS meeting in July 2008***

Delivered a presentation at the Joint COPS meeting in Puerto Rico on the latest updates of the marketing plan and followed up with several Deans in attendance on possible site visits at their institutions by certain Members of Congress.

4. ***NASULGC Annual Meeting in November 2008***

Not timely at this juncture.

Agenda Item 3.0: NIFA Competitive Funding Priorities Recommendations – Greg Bohach/ Dan Rossi

Background Info:

- [Recommendations for NIFA Competitive Program Priorities](#)
- [NIFA Survey Results](#)

Action Requested: For discussion and approval.

Experiment Station Committee on Organization and Policy (ESCOP)

Recommendations for NIFA Competitive Program Priorities

Background

The ESCOP Science and Technology Committee established a subcommittee of G. Bohach, D. Rossi, J. Wade, D. Sheely, and C. Flora in March of 2008 to develop a process for identifying research priorities for the National Research Initiative (NRI). The subcommittee developed and received approval from the ESCOP Executive Committee to implement a survey of deans and directors of research, extension and academic programs in the 1862 and 1890 institutions.¹ The survey focused on the competitive research grants programs of the National Institute for Food and Agriculture (NIFA). These programs include both the Agriculture and Food Research Initiative (formerly NRI) and the new funding initiatives mandated in the 2008 Farm Bill (Biomass, Specialty Crops, Beginning Farmer and Rancher, and Organic Agriculture).

The survey instrument asked participants to rank the importance to their state of a number of issues related to the new mandated programs. It also asked them to rate the importance of the objectives of the seven challenges listed in the latest version of the Science Roadmap. Respondents were also asked to identify whether an integrated approach to the issues and objectives was important and finally to identify additional issues, objectives and challenges. The survey instrument was distributed on August 11 with a September 5 deadline.

There were 71 total useable responses to the survey. Of those 64 respondents identified their affiliations as follows:

- By type of institution:
 - 1862 57
 - 1890 7
- By affiliation
 - Experiment Station 37
 - Cooperative Extension 17
 - Academic Program 10
- By geographic region:
 - North Central 11
 - Northeast 21
 - South 21
 - West 11

¹ The Subcommittee would like to acknowledge the North Central Regional Center for Rural Development for developing and administering the survey and for data analysis.

The responses of the survey were analyzed and the results are provided in the appendix. They were also used as a basis for a workshop at the Experiment Station Section meeting in Traverse City, MI on September 24. The workshop used a series of breakout groups to allow attending directors to identify and refine the top three issues for each of the mandated programs and Science Roadmap challenge areas. The following recommendations and the survey results are intended to provide input into the development of the FY 09 mandated program FY10 AFRI RFA's.

Priority Recommendations

Mandatory Funding Priorities

Biomass Research and Development

- Improving biomass production (quality and quantity) and the associated transportation efficiency
- Assessing the environmental, sociological and economic impacts from the production of biofuels and co-products at local and regional levels to help ensure sustainability
- Developing technologies to improve processing efficiency of regionally appropriate biomass into by-products (including biofuels)

Specialty Crops Research Initiative

- Improving production efficiency, productivity and profitability over the long term (including specialty crop policy and marketing)
- Developing methods to prevent, detect, monitor, control, and respond to potential food safety hazards in the production and processing of specialty crops, including fresh produce

Beginning Farmer and Rancher Development

- Enhancing farm and business management including enterprise and business training, financial management, and diversification and market strategies
- Providing access to capital and/or land
- Developing focused programs on assistance to ethnic, immigrant, underserved and urban populations

Organic Agriculture

- Examining optimal conservation and environmental outcomes, including sustainability and energy efficiency, relating to organically produced agricultural products

- Developing pest, weed, and disease control strategies for organic production
- Assessing food safety concerns related to organic products (including produce, animal and aquaculture)

AFRI Priorities

Food safety and health:

- Developing strategies to detect and eliminate food borne illnesses, bioterrorism agents, and plant, human and animal pathogens
- Improving the nutritional value of food and create health-promoting foods
- Understanding the environmental factors that influence obesity and related diseases

Environmental stewardship:

- Developing more environmentally friendly crop and livestock production systems that utilize sustainable weed, insect, and pathogen management strategies, along with feeding strategies that promote environmental stewardship on and off the farm
- Finding alternative uses for the wastes generated by agriculture and devise production methods that generate less waste
- Developing better strategies to enhance energy efficiency in agricultural production systems

Economic Return

- Developing sustainable production systems that are profitable and protective of the environment, including finding ways to optimize the integration of crop and livestock production systems
- Developing strategies for integration of local regional, national, and global food systems to maximize the benefits to both US agriculture producers and consumer throughout the world, particularly underserved and immigrant populations

Communities and Families

- Stimulating entrepreneurship and business development in rural communities and new forms of economic activity built around regional trade associations, rural cooperatives, and local production networks
- Enhancing the problem-solving capacities of rural communities through leadership development, including urban-rural interface issues
- Analyzing the best ways to design youth programs to strengthen communities

Crop Production Systems, New Products and New Uses

- Encouraging change in farm practices that reduce the use of petroleum-derived inputs
- Increasing knowledge of the basic biology of crop plants to increase productivity with limited inputs including water and nutrients
- Improving crop quantities and qualities through agricultural production efficiencies

Local and Global Climate Change

- Diminishing the rate of long-term global climatic change by increasing the storage of carbon and nitrogen in soil, plants, and plant products
- Creating broad-based comprehensive models to assess the socioeconomic impacts, risks, and opportunities associated with global climate change and extreme climate events on agriculture and natural resources
- Minimizing the effects of long-term global climatic changes on production of crops, livestock, forests, and other natural resource systems

Animal Production Practices, New Products, and New Uses

- Developing innovative technologies for reducing the impact of animal agriculture on the environment
- Enhancing the value of food and other animal by-products for both the producer and consumer by using conventional and newly developed technologies and wastes that are socially and ethically acceptable
- Promoting animal health and well-being through enhanced nutrition, feed efficiency, utilization of non-traditional feeds, genetics and disease reduction

Nanotechnology

- Integrating nanotechnologies into agricultural and food production practices
- Employing nanotechnologies for environmental stewardship

Agricultural Water

- Developing technologies to improve production efficiencies of use, distribution and quality of water
- Evaluating and enhancing the recharge value of agricultural and forestry production areas
- Examining the policy and legal issues relating to water use, distribution and quality

General comment: The number of large CAP grants should be limited to enable funding of more medium size proposals.

Appendix – Survey Results

Mandatory Funding: Biomass Research and Development

Rate importance to your state						
	1=Low	2	3	4	5=High	Response Count
a) Developing technologies to improve processing efficiency of crop by-products.	7.0% (5)	11.3% (8)	19.7% (14)	23.9% (17)	38.0% (27)	71
b) Supporting the development of marketing infrastructure for crop by-products.	8.5% (6)	12.7% (9)	29.6% (21)	28.2% (20)	21.1% (15)	71
c) Improving crop biomass quantities, qualities, and agricultural production efficiencies.	2.8% (2)	7.0% (5)	11.3% (8)	23.9% (17)	54.9% (39)	71
d) Assessing the local and regional impacts of biofuels.	5.6% (4)	11.3% (8)	11.3% (8)	25.4% (18)	46.5% (33)	71
Should it be an integrated program?						
	1=Definitely not	2	3	4	5=Definitely should be	Response Count
a) Developing technologies to improve processing efficiency of crop by-products.	7.0% (5)	14.1% (10)	32.4% (23)	21.1% (15)	25.4% (18)	71
b) Supporting the development of marketing infrastructure for crop by-products.	5.6% (4)	14.1% (10)	22.5% (16)	29.6% (21)	28.2% (20)	71

c) Improving crop biomass quantities, qualities, and agricultural production efficiencies.	2.8% (2)	4.2% (3)	16.9% (12)	29.6% (21)	46.5% (33)	71
d) Assessing the local and regional impacts of biofuels.	7.0% (5)	11.3% (8)	8.5% (6)	21.1% (15)	52.1% (37)	71

Additional Issues:

- Economics of local biomass production (2)
- Impact on rural communities (2)
- Assessments and technologies for other sources of biomass (i.e. solid waste, agricultural waste) that are not crop based (2)
- Evaluation of marketing and transportation (2)
- Developing new sources of biomass and biofuels (2)
- Research (combining genomics, molecular genetics, molecular biology, and physiology) on the domestication of crops
- Impact on small producers
- Development of crop co-products
- Crop diversity ramifications
- Integration with alternative fuels or other renewable energy efforts
- Energy efficiency
- Bioenergy policy: the development of non-biased evaluation of environmental and economic impacts of biofuels.
- Developing human capacity to provide increased pipeline of broadly educated scientists, technology transfer agents and economists to meet the growing need of the biomass/biofuels sector
- Impact of potential pests on biomass production
- Determining how to assist producers transition from traditional row crops to biofuel crops
- Searching for low-input energy crops
- Developing efficient lignocellulose conversion
- Developing sustainable production systems for marginal lands

Mandatory Funding: Specialty Crops Research Initiative

Rate importance to your state						
	1=Low	2	3	4	5=High	Response Count
a) Research in plant breeding, genetics, and genomics to improve crop characteristics.	7.0% (5)	2.8% (2)	18.3% (13)	19.7% (14)	52.1% (37)	71
b) Identify and	2.8% (2)	2.8% (2)	18.3% (13)	39.4% (28)	36.6% (26)	71

threats from pests and diseases, including threats to specialty crop pollinators.						
c) Improve production efficiency, productivity, and profitability over the long term (including specialty crop policy and marketing).	4.2% (3)	5.6% (4)	12.7% (9)	29.6% (21)	47.9% (34)	71
d) Develop new innovations and technology, including improved mechanization and technologies that delay or inhibit ripening.	11.3% (8)	16.9% (12)	28.2% (20)	25.4% (18)	18.3% (13)	71
e) Develop methods to prevent, detect, monitor, control, and respond to potential food safety hazards in the production and processing of specialty crops, including fresh produce.	5.6% (4)	4.2% (3)	19.7% (14)	18.3% (13)	52.1% (37)	71
Should it be an integrated program?						
	1=Definitely not	2	3	4	5=Definitely should be	Response Count
a) Research in plant breeding, genetics, and genomics to improve crop characteristics.	14.1% (10)	15.5% (11)	22.5% (16)	16.9% (12)	31.0% (22)	71
b) Identify and address	5.6% (4)	2.8% (2)	16.9% (12)	36.6% (26)	38.0% (27)	71

pests and diseases, including threats to specialty crop pollinators.						
c) Improve production efficiency, productivity, and profitability over the long term (including specialty crop policy and marketing).	4.2% (3)	4.2% (3)	22.5% (16)	16.9% (12)	52.1% (37)	71
d) Develop new innovations and technology, including improved mechanization and technologies that delay or inhibit ripening.	11.3% (8)	15.5% (11)	26.8% (19)	26.8% (19)	19.7% (14)	71
e) Develop methods to prevent, detect, monitor, control, and respond to potential food safety hazards in the production and processing of specialty crops, including fresh produce.	5.6% (4)	2.8% (2)	23.9% (17)	23.9% (17)	43.7% (31)	71

Additional Objectives

- Developing markets for specialty crops (6)
- Develop and validate metrics used by trade and government to determine if GAPs are effective in controlling food safety concerns
- Need to identify alternative and novel uses for specialty crops.
- Coordination with corporate sustainability initiatives
- Conversion from traditional crops to specialty crops including insurance issues
- Broader definition of specialty crops such as non-subsidy crops
- Climate adaptation
- Aquaculture crops
- Crop improvement via molecular methods

- Develop improved controlled environment production of produce including hydroponics, aeroponics, tunnel greenhouses etc
- Developing human capacity with broad education in production, safety, distribution and consumer awareness through growth in educational programs
- Source to market transport
- Production practices for marginal land
- Biological control of pests and diseases
- Developing limited input sustainable production practices
- Partnership between Universities and private sector entrepreneurs

Mandatory Funding: Beginning Farmer and Rancher Development

Rate importance to your state						
	1=Low	2	3	4	5=High	Response Count
a) Providing assistance in acquiring land.	25.4% (18)	14.1% (10)	33.8% (24)	15.5% (11)	11.3% (8)	71
b) Developing innovative farm and ranch transfer strategies.	9.9% (7)	9.9% (7)	31.0% (22)	31.0% (22)	18.3% (13)	71
c) Providing enterprise and business training.	7.0% (5)	4.2% (3)	25.4% (18)	23.9% (17)	39.4% (28)	71
d) Developing model land leasing contracts.	18.3% (13)	21.1% (15)	29.6% (21)	21.1% (15)	9.9% (7)	71
e) Providing financial management training.	5.6% (4)	11.3% (8)	15.5% (11)	35.2% (25)	32.4% (23)	71
f) Developing diversification and marketing strategies.	5.6% (4)	2.8% (2)	29.6% (21)	29.6% (21)	32.4% (23)	71
g) Understanding the impact of concentration and globalization.	8.5% (6)	8.5% (6)	36.6% (26)	23.9% (17)	22.5% (16)	71
Should it be an integrated program?						
	1=Definitely not	2	3	4	5=Definitely should be	Response Count

a) Providing assistance in acquiring land.	14.1% (10)	21.1% (15)	31.0% (22)	5.6% (4)	28.2% (20)	71
b) Developing innovative farm and ranch transfer strategies.	2.8% (2)	14.1% (10)	31.0% (22)	12.7% (9)	39.4% (28)	71
c) Providing enterprise and business training.	5.7% (4)	5.7% (4)	27.1% (19)	17.1% (12)	44.3% (31)	70
d) Developing model land leasing contracts.	9.9% (7)	18.3% (13)	26.8% (19)	12.7% (9)	32.4% (23)	71
e) Providing financial management training.	5.6% (4)	7.0% (5)	19.7% (14)	25.4% (18)	42.3% (30)	71
f) Developing diversification and marketing strategies.	2.8% (2)	5.6% (4)	28.2% (20)	19.7% (14)	43.7% (31)	71
g) Understanding the impact of concentration and globalization.	7.0% (5)	9.9% (7)	32.4% (23)	19.7% (14)	31.0% (22)	71

Additional Issues:

- Developing diversified planning that include plant and animal agriculture and access to regional markets
- Farm mentorship
- Family/intergenerational relationships
- Multiple career options with farming and ranching
- Leadership development of young farmers and rural community innovators
- Assistance to ethnic, immigrant, underserved and urban populations

Mandatory Funding: Organic Agriculture

Rate importance to your state						
	1=Low	2	3	4	5=High	Response Count
a) Examining optimal conservation and	5.6% (4)	12.7% (9)	31.0% (22)	26.8% (19)	23.9% (17)	71

outcomes relating to organically produced agricultural products.						
b) Developing new and improved seed varieties that are particularly suited for organic agriculture.	8.5% (6)	16.9% (12)	25.4% (18)	33.8% (24)	15.5% (11)	71
c) Determining desirable traits for organic commodities.	5.6% (4)	16.9% (12)	28.2% (20)	31.0% (22)	18.3% (13)	71
d) Identifying marketing and policy constraints on the expansion of organic agriculture.	7.0% (5)	9.9% (7)	26.8% (19)	31.0% (22)	25.4% (18)	71
Should it be an integrated program?						
	1=Definitely not	2	3	4	5=Definitely should be	Response Count
a) Examining optimal conservation and environmental outcomes relating to organically produced agricultural products.	5.6% (4)	8.5% (6)	31.0% (22)	25.4% (18)	29.6% (21)	71
b) Developing new and improved seed varieties that are particularly suited for organic agriculture.	8.5% (6)	22.5% (16)	35.2% (25)	18.3% (13)	15.5% (11)	71
c) Determining desirable traits for organic commodities.	7.0% (5)	14.1% (10)	31.0% (22)	29.6% (21)	18.3% (13)	71

d) Identifying marketing and policy constraints on the expansion of organic agriculture.	5.6% (4)	7.0% (5)	29.6% (21)	28.2% (20)	29.6% (21)	71
--	----------	----------	-------------------	------------	-------------------	----

Additional Issues:

- Pest, weed and disease control strategies (5)
- Food safety concerns related to organic produce and aquaculture products including food safety and vendor certification (3)
- Consumer preference for organic and other alternative production methods (2)
- Organic agriculture at the farm scale (large commercial producers)
- Non-animal containing plant production systems
- Developing production systems that can be used on mid-sized farms
- Developing methods to increase production efficiency in organic animal agriculture
- Coexistence with high-technology agriculture
- Identifying inputs and their efficacy including mulch sources and efficacy
- Balancing supply and demand locally
- Product quality is another area of concern

Challenge Area #1: We can ensure food safety and health through agricultural and food systems.

Rate importance to your state						
	1=Low	2	3	4	5=High	Response Count
a) Eliminate food borne illnesses.	0.0% (0)	4.2% (3)	7.0% (5)	26.8% (19)	62.0% (44)	71
b) Develop technologies to improve the nutritional value of food and create health-promoting foods.	2.8% (2)	7.0% (5)	16.9% (12)	23.9% (17)	49.3% (35)	71
c) Understand the environmental factors that influence obesity and related diseases.	4.2% (3)	2.8% (2)	21.1% (15)	26.8% (19)	45.1% (32)	71
d) Develop ..	4.2% (3)	8.5% (6)	25.4% (18)	23.9% (17)	38.0% (27)	71

strategies to address agro-security, bioterrorism, and invasive species to protect producers and consumers.						
Should it be an integrated program?						
	1=Definitely not	2	3	4	5=Definitely should be	Response Count
a) Eliminate food borne illnesses.	5.6% (4)	4.2% (3)	11.3% (8)	25.4% (18)	53.5% (38)	71
b) Develop technologies to improve the nutritional value of food and create health-promoting foods.	2.8% (2)	5.6% (4)	22.5% (16)	28.2% (20)	40.8% (29)	71
c) Understand the environmental factors that influence obesity and related diseases.	2.8% (2)	4.2% (3)	12.7% (9)	28.2% (20)	52.1% (37)	71
d) Develop policy and strategies to address agro-security, bioterrorism, and invasive species to protect producers and consumers.	2.8% (2)	5.6% (4)	22.5% (16)	28.2% (20)	40.8% (29)	71

Additional Objectives:

- Improved tracking/discovery of point of origin of food-borne illnesses
- Develop regional markets that can balance the more vulnerable global shipment of food
- Understanding pathogens pathways for movement in the food system
- Rapid sensitive and accurate diagnostic assays to detect food contaminants
- Molecular effects and mitigation
- Controlling invasive noxious weeds in rangelands
- Food safety audits of food product systems involving local producers
- Child obesity research and extension programs

Challenge Area #2: We can provide the information and knowledge needed to further improve environmental stewardship.

Rate importance to your state						
	1=Low	2	3	4	5=High	Response Count
a) Develop better methods to protect the environment both on and beyond the farm from any negative impacts of agriculture through optimum use of cropping systems including agro forestry, phytoremediation, and site-specific management.	4.2% (3)	2.8% (2)	11.3% (8)	28.2% (20)	53.5% (38)	71
b) Find alternative uses for the wastes generated by agriculture and devise production methods that generate less waste.	2.8% (2)	4.2% (3)	11.3% (8)	33.8% (24)	47.9% (34)	71
c) Develop more environmentally friendly crop and livestock production systems that utilize sustainable weed, insect, and pathogen management strategies, along with feeding strategies that promote environmental stewardship.	1.4% (1)	1.4% (1)	21.1% (15)	29.6% (21)	46.5% (33)	71
d) Develop better ways both on and beyond the farm in order to enhance energy efficiency, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and sequester more carbon.	2.8% (2)	5.6% (4)	14.1% (10)	31.0% (22)	46.5% (33)	71
e) Develop better strategies, ecological and	4.2% (3)	11.3% (8)	21.1% (15)	36.6% (26)	26.8% (19)	71

systems models and policy analysis to address soil, water, air and energy conservation, biodiversity, ecological services, recycling, and land use policies.						
f) Analyze alternative ways agriculture and urban areas can collaborate on water use.	5.6% (4)	11.3% (8)	15.5% (11)	26.8% (19)	40.8% (29)	71
Should it be an integrated program?						
	1=Definitely not	2	3	4	5=Definitely should be	Response Count
a) Develop better methods to protect the environment both on and beyond the farm from any negative impacts of agriculture through optimum use of cropping systems including agro forestry, phytoremediation, and site-specific management.	4.2% (3)	4.2% (3)	16.9% (12)	26.8% (19)	47.9% (34)	71
b) Find alternative uses for the wastes generated by agriculture and devise production methods that generate less waste.	2.8% (2)	2.8% (2)	18.3% (13)	29.6% (21)	46.5% (33)	71
c) Develop more environmentally friendly crop and livestock production systems that utilize sustainable weed, insect, and pathogen management strategies, along with feeding strategies that promote	2.8% (2)	1.4% (1)	19.7% (14)	26.8% (19)	49.3% (35)	71

stewardship.						
d) Develop better ways both on and beyond the farm in order to enhance energy efficiency, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and sequester more carbon.	4.2% (3)	5.6% (4)	15.5% (11)	25.4% (18)	49.3% (35)	71
e) Develop better strategies, ecological and socioeconomic systems models and policy analysis to address soil, water, air and energy conservation, biodiversity, ecological services, recycling, and land use policies.	5.6% (4)	2.8% (2)	33.8% (24)	25.4% (18)	32.4% (23)	71
f) Analyze alternative ways agriculture and urban areas can collaborate on water use.	2.8% (2)	5.6% (4)	9.9% (7)	32.4% (23)	49.3% (35)	71

Additional Objectives:

- Develop strategies for optimizing environmental stewardship while minimizing its impact on food safety
- Dual use of surface/rainfall water and groundwater
- The balance between profitability and environmental stewardship
- Protecting natural resources "held in common", the public sector...who values the resource, who pays for optimum environmental stewardship

Challenge Area #3: We can improve the economic return to agricultural producers.

Rate importance to your state						
	1=Low	2	3	4	5=High	Response Count
a) Develop sustainable production systems that are profitable and protective of the environment.	0.0% (0)	5.6% (4)	14.1% (10)	31.0% (22)	49.3% (35)	71

including finding ways to optimize the integration of crop and livestock production systems.						
b) Develop strategies for integration of local, regional, national, and global food systems to maximize the benefits to both U.S. agriculture producers and consumers throughout the world.	2.8% (2)	11.3% (8)	29.6% (21)	33.8% (24)	22.5% (16)	71
c) Design improved decision support systems for risk-based management of farms, ranches, and forests/woodlots.	1.4% (1)	11.3% (8)	36.6% (26)	25.4% (18)	25.4% (18)	71
d) Find ways to improve on strategies for community-supported food and fiber production systems.	4.2% (3)	12.7% (9)	35.2% (25)	28.2% (20)	19.7% (14)	71
e) Enhance local food systems through minimizing transportation distances and costs.	5.6% (4)	8.5% (6)	23.9% (17)	31.0% (22)	31.0% (22)	71
Should it be an integrated program?						
	1=Definitely not	2	3	4	5=Definitely should be	Response Count
a) Develop sustainable production systems that are profitable and protective of the environment, including finding ways to optimize the integration of	2.8% (2)	5.6% (4)	12.7% (9)	22.5% (16)	56.3% (40)	71

livestock production systems.						
b) Develop strategies for integration of local, regional, national, and global food systems to maximize the benefits to both U.S. agriculture producers and consumers throughout the world.	7.0% (5)	12.7% (9)	23.9% (17)	26.8% (19)	29.6% (21)	71
c) Design improved decision support systems for risk-based management of farms, ranches, and forests/woodlots.	4.2% (3)	5.6% (4)	22.5% (16)	33.8% (24)	33.8% (24)	71
d) Find ways to improve on strategies for community-supported food and fiber production systems.	5.6% (4)	2.8% (2)	32.4% (23)	23.9% (17)	35.2% (25)	71
e) Enhance local food systems through minimizing transportation distances and costs.	4.2% (3)	8.5% (6)	23.9% (17)	22.5% (16)	40.8% (29)	71

Additional Objectives:

- Use of low cost, alternative inputs
- Expand effort beyond feed/forage producers, e.g. nursery, greenhouse, etc.
- Assistance to underserved and immigrant populations

Challenge Area #4: We can strengthen our communities and families.

Rate importance to your state						
	1=Low	2	3	4	5=High	Response Count
a) Stimulate	8.5% (6)	9.9% (7)	25.4% (18)	18.3% (13)	38.0% (27)	71

and business development in rural communities and new forms of economic activity built around regional trade associations, rural cooperatives, and local production networks.						
b) Build coalitions among environmental, labor, and community development groups to facilitate democratic social change to ensure that families have access to food, health care, education, and welfare services.	7.0% (5)	16.9% (12)	28.2% (20)	26.8% (19)	21.1% (15)	71
c) Enhance the problem-solving capacities of rural communities through leadership development.	9.9% (7)	14.1% (10)	19.7% (14)	28.2% (20)	28.2% (20)	71
d) Determine strategies to enhance the well-being of families and individuals.	8.5% (6)	4.2% (3)	33.8% (24)	35.2% (25)	18.3% (13)	71
e) Enhance local food systems.	2.8% (2)	7.0% (5)	21.1% (15)	36.6% (26)	32.4% (23)	71
f) Explore new and innovative civic engagement strategies that enhance the involvement of local people in the future direction of their communities.	9.9% (7)	18.3% (13)	31.0% (22)	19.7% (14)	21.1% (15)	71
g) Analyze the	8.5% (6)	14.1% (10)	16.9% (12)	33.8% (24)	26.8% (19)	71

design youth programs to strengthen communities.						
h) Examine the role and value of e-commerce and other information technology innovations in advancing the global access of small businesses, micro-firms, and small farm enterprises in rural America.	7.0% (5)	16.9% (12)	38.0% (27)	26.8% (19)	11.3% (8)	71
i) Examine the costs/benefits of adopting broadband capacity on the part of rural governments and other key institutions (such as educational system, rural hospitals, etc.).	15.5% (11)	25.4% (18)	25.4% (18)	26.8% (19)	7.0% (5)	71
j) Develop innovative ways to implement urban gardening for community building and economic development.	14.1% (10)	23.9% (17)	28.2% (20)	26.8% (19)	7.0% (5)	71
k) Examine the set of factors that can position rural areas to strengthen, expand, and attract knowledge-based economic activities (i.e. natural resource amenities, access to higher education institutions, etc.).	11.3% (8)	5.6% (4)	35.2% (25)	29.6% (21)	18.3% (13)	71
l) Determine the set of forces at play in the expansion of entrepreneurial activities in rural America.	14.1% (10)	15.5% (11)	25.4% (18)	26.8% (19)	18.3% (13)	71

m) Analyze the impact of demographic changes on rural America.	9.9% (7)	16.9% (12)	35.2% (25)	22.5% (16)	15.5% (11)	71
Should it be an integrated program?						
	1=Definitely not	2	3	4	5=Definitely should be	Response Count
a) Stimulate entrepreneurship and business development in rural communities and new forms of economic activity built around regional trade associations, rural cooperatives, and local production networks.	5.6% (4)	12.7% (9)	21.1% (15)	14.1% (10)	46.5% (33)	71
b) Build coalitions among environmental, labor, and community development groups to facilitate democratic social change to ensure that families have access to food, health care, education, and welfare services.	4.2% (3)	7.0% (5)	32.4% (23)	18.3% (13)	38.0% (27)	71
c) Enhance the problem-solving capacities of rural communities through leadership development.	7.0% (5)	11.3% (8)	21.1% (15)	16.9% (12)	43.7% (31)	71
d) Determine strategies to enhance the well-being of families and individuals.	2.8% (2)	5.6% (4)	29.6% (21)	23.9% (17)	38.0% (27)	71
e) Enhance local food systems.	2.8% (2)	1.4% (1)	21.1% (15)	29.6% (21)	45.1% (32)	71
f) Enhance...	5.0% (4)	9.9% (7)	35.2% (25)	22.5% (16)	27.4% (19)	71

and innovative civic engagement strategies that enhance the involvement of local people in the future direction of their communities.						
g) Analyze the best ways to design youth programs to strengthen communities.	2.8% (2)	8.5% (6)	19.7% (14)	22.5% (16)	46.5% (33)	71
h) Examine the role and value of e-commerce and other information technology innovations in advancing the global access of small businesses, micro-firms, and small farm enterprises in rural America.	5.6% (4)	11.3% (8)	32.4% (23)	23.9% (17)	26.8% (19)	71
i) Examine the costs/benefits of adopting broadband capacity on the part of rural governments and other key institutions (such as educational system, rural hospitals, etc.).	7.0% (5)	11.3% (8)	33.8% (24)	22.5% (16)	25.4% (18)	71
j) Develop innovative ways to implement urban gardening for community building and economic development.	7.0% (5)	8.5% (6)	26.8% (19)	23.9% (17)	33.8% (24)	71
k) Examine the set of factors that can position rural areas to strengthen, expand, and attract knowledge-based economic activities (i.e. natural resource	8.5% (6)	4.2% (3)	29.6% (21)	28.2% (20)	29.6% (21)	71

access to higher education institutions, etc.).						
l) Determine the set of forces at play in the expansion of entrepreneurial activities in rural America.	9.9% (7)	11.3% (8)	29.6% (21)	25.4% (18)	23.9% (17)	71
m) Analyze the impact of demographic changes on rural America.	8.5% (6)	15.5% (11)	31.0% (22)	16.9% (12)	28.2% (20)	71

Additional Objectives:

- Urban urban-rural partnerships
- Assistance to urban populations

Challenge Area #5: We can develop new and more competitive crop production practices and products and new uses for diverse crops and novel plant species.

Rate importance to your state						
	1=Low	2	3	4	5=High	Response Count
a) Conceive new markets for new plants and their by-products, and new uses for those crops, including, but not limited to, energy production.	5.6% (4)	5.6% (4)	18.3% (13)	38.0% (27)	32.4% (23)	71
b) Develop technologies to improve processing efficiency of crops and their by-products.	2.8% (2)	8.5% (6)	26.8% (19)	38.0% (27)	23.9% (17)	71
c) Support the development of...	7.0% (5)	8.5% (6)	38.0% (27)	25.4% (18)	21.1% (15)	71

infrastructure for crop by-products.						
d) Improve crop biomass quantities, qualities and agricultural production efficiencies.	2.8% (2)	5.6% (4)	28.2% (20)	29.6% (21)	33.8% (24)	71
e) Reduce the use of petroleum-derived inputs.	2.8% (2)	4.2% (3)	15.5% (11)	32.4% (23)	45.1% (32)	71
f) Address ways of using agriculture to mitigate climate change.	5.6% (4)	4.2% (3)	29.6% (21)	33.8% (24)	26.8% (19)	71
Should it be an integrated program?						
	1=Definitely not	2	3	4	5=Definitely should be	Response Count
a) Conceive new markets for new plants and their by-products, and new uses for those crops, including, but not limited to, energy production.	4.2% (3)	8.5% (6)	33.8% (24)	19.7% (14)	33.8% (24)	71
b) Develop technologies to improve processing efficiency of crops and their by-products.	8.5% (6)	12.7% (9)	33.8% (24)	23.9% (17)	21.1% (15)	71
c) Support the development of marketing infrastructure for crop by-products.	8.5% (6)	4.2% (3)	31.0% (22)	28.2% (20)	28.2% (20)	71
d) Improve crop biomass quantities, qualities and agricultural production efficiencies.	2.8% (2)	5.6% (4)	28.2% (20)	29.6% (21)	33.8% (24)	71
e) Reduce the use of petroleum-derived inputs.	2.8% (2)	4.2% (3)	15.5% (11)	32.4% (23)	45.1% (32)	71
f) Address ways of using agriculture to mitigate climate change.	5.6% (4)	4.2% (3)	29.6% (21)	33.8% (24)	26.8% (19)	71

crop biomass quantities, qualities and agricultural production efficiencies.						
e) Reduce the use of petroleum-derived inputs.	5.6% (4)	4.2% (3)	21.1% (15)	28.2% (20)	40.8% (29)	71
f) Address ways of using agriculture to mitigate climate change.	4.2% (3)	8.5% (6)	32.4% (23)	21.1% (15)	33.8% (24)	71

Additional Objectives:

- Increased knowledge base of the basic biology of crop plants to increase productivity with limited inputs including water and nutrients
- Development of new niche crop products

Challenge Area #6: We can lessen the risks of local and global climatic change on food, fiber, and fuel production.

Rate importance to your state						
	1=Low	2	3	4	5=High	Response Count
a) Diminish the rate of long-term global climatic change by increasing the storage of carbon and nitrogen in soil, plants, and plant products.	2.8% (2)	8.5% (6)	25.4% (18)	38.0% (27)	25.4% (18)	71
b) Create broad-based, comprehensive models to assess the socioeconomic impacts, risks, and opportunities associated with global climate change.	9.9% (7)	9.9% (7)	43.7% (31)	22.5% (16)	14.1% (10)	71

and extreme climate events on agriculture and natural resources.						
c) Integrate long-term weather forecasting, market infrastructures, and cropping and livestock management systems to rapidly optimize domestic food, fiber, and fuel production in response to global climatic changes.	4.2% (3)	19.7% (14)	36.6% (26)	23.9% (17)	15.5% (11)	71
d) Minimize the effects of long-term global climatic changes on production of crops, livestock, forests, and other natural resource systems.	4.2% (3)	8.5% (6)	38.0% (27)	25.4% (18)	23.9% (17)	71

Should it be an integrated program?

	1=Definitely not	2	3	4	5=Definitely should be	Response Count
a) Diminish the rate of long-term global climatic change by increasing the storage of carbon and nitrogen in soil, plants, and plant products.	5.6% (4)	12.7% (9)	26.8% (19)	26.8% (19)	28.2% (20)	71
b) Create broad-based, comprehensive models to assess the socioeconomic impacts, risks, and opportunities associated with global	9.9% (7)	12.7% (9)	42.3% (30)	14.1% (10)	21.1% (15)	71

climate change and extreme climate events on agriculture and natural resources.						
c) Integrate long-term weather forecasting, market infrastructures, and cropping and livestock management systems to rapidly optimize domestic food, fiber, and fuel production in response to global climatic changes.	7.0% (5)	14.1% (10)	35.2% (25)	25.4% (18)	18.3% (13)	71
d) Minimize the effects of long-term global climatic changes on production of crops, livestock, forests, and other natural resource systems.	7.0% (5)	2.8% (2)	43.7% (31)	21.1% (15)	25.4% (18)	71

Challenge Area #7: We can develop new and more competitive animal production practices and products and new uses for animals.

Rate importance to your state						
	1=Low	2	3	4	5=High	Response Count
a) Develop innovative technologies for reducing the impact of animal agriculture on the environment.	2.8% (2)	5.6% (4)	12.7% (9)	38.0% (27)	40.8% (29)	71
b) Enhance the value of food and	5.6% (4)	5.6% (4)	31.0% (22)	39.4% (28)	18.3% (13)	71

products for both the producer and consumer by using conventional and newly developed technologies that are socially and ethically acceptable.						
c) Develop new and enhanced technologies for the improved efficiency and welfare of animals that are processed for food.	7.0% (5)	5.6% (4)	35.2% (25)	33.8% (24)	18.3% (13)	71
d) Improve conventional technologies as well as develop new technologies to improve the efficiency of animal production.	9.9% (7)	8.5% (6)	28.2% (20)	26.8% (19)	26.8% (19)	71
e) Enhance the reintegration of crops and livestock.	2.8% (2)	11.3% (8)	26.8% (19)	29.6% (21)	29.6% (21)	71
f) Develop novel uses for animal waste at, and away from, the site of production.	4.2% (3)	7.0% (5)	21.1% (15)	35.2% (25)	32.4% (23)	71
g) Promote animal health and well-being through enhanced nutrition, genetics, and disease reduction.	1.4% (1)	4.2% (3)	15.5% (11)	38.0% (27)	40.8% (29)	71

Should it be an integrated program?						
	1=Definitely not	2	3	4	5=Definitely should be	Response Count
a) Develop innovative technologies for reducing the impact of animal agriculture on the environment.	4.2% (3)	4.2% (3)	18.3% (13)	32.4% (23)	40.8% (29)	71
b) Enhance the value of food and other animal products for both the producer and consumer by using conventional and newly developed technologies that are socially and ethically acceptable.	8.5% (6)	2.8% (2)	31.0% (22)	21.1% (15)	36.6% (26)	71
c) Develop new and enhanced technologies for the improved efficiency and welfare of animals that are processed for food.	5.6% (4)	4.2% (3)	33.8% (24)	28.2% (20)	28.2% (20)	71
d) Improve conventional technologies as well as develop new technologies to improve the efficiency of animal production.	5.6% (4)	7.0% (5)	29.6% (21)	22.5% (16)	35.2% (25)	71
e) Enhance the reintegration of crops and livestock.	4.2% (3)	8.5% (6)	28.2% (20)	19.7% (14)	39.4% (28)	71
f) Develop...	5.0% (4)	3.0% (2)	33.0% (24)	35.0% (25)	35.0% (25)	71

novel uses for animal waste at, and away from, the site of production.						
g) Promote animal health and well-being through enhanced nutrition, genetics, and disease reduction.	2.8% (2)	7.0% (5)	23.9% (17)	31.0% (22)	35.2% (25)	71

Additional Objectives:

- Dealing with high feed costs
- Utilization of non-traditional feeds
- Identify animal production systems to enhance the environment

New Challenges:

- Replacing expertise of retiring scientists
- Water related issues, to include water quality, runoff, erosion, water use-efficiency, urban vs rural use, recreational use, fisheries, etc
- Strengthening medium sized, integrated crop and animal agriculture
- Regional marketing opportunities
- Better integration of programs at the experiment stations with programs being conducted internationally
- Nanotechnology
- Enhancing science, engineering, technology and math education and careers among our youth
- Balance between economic development, agriculture, forest land, and open space
- Community, youth and family issues
- Human capital development
- Identifications of microbiological enzymes that degrade plant cell walls
- Carbon credits education as means of income generating for rural agriculture
- Integration of more sophisticated technologies into agricultural processes (e.g. nanotechnology) for environmental stewardship
- Environmentally controlled (greenhouse, hydroponics etc.) agricultural production systems for local markets
- Alternative crops to corn and soybeans for bio-fuel production
- Agricultural and natural ecosystems services
- Best management practices
- Climate change mitigation and adaptation
- Increased efficiencies in energy use

Item 5.0:

**Budget and Legislative Committee Report
ESS Priorities for FY 2010 and 2011 Budgets
Presenters: David Boethel/Mike Harrington**

Committee Membership: The EDs have worked with their respective regions to identify a full complement of members and terms. In addition, efforts are underway to identify new liaison members from The Board on Human Science and the National Association of University Forestry Research Programs. Current AES members: Orlando McMeans (ARD), Carolyn Brooks (ED-ARD), CY Hu (WAAESD), Michael Vayda (NERA), Tom Klindt (SAAESD), Bruce McPheron (NERA), Steve Slack (NCRA), Jeff Jacobsen (WAAESD), John Kirby (NCRA)

SECTION PRIORITIES FY 2010

The Budget and Legislative Committee completed the priority setting process for the 2010 budget cycle. Using the FY 2009 priorities, as a starting point break out discussions were held at the 2007 ESS Annual Meeting in Philadelphia to identify new/emerging issues. This was followed by an on-line survey to which there were 50 responses.

Overarching Priorities:

- The Directors continue to indicate that maintaining capacity for research through base funds (Hatch, Evans-Allen, McIntire-Stennis, and Animal Health) is the top priority by a 3:1 margin over moving funds into competitive programs.
- Increasing funding for the NRI with emphasis on integrated activities is also an important priority
- The Directors did not favor focusing formula funds on specific topics in order to gain increases in these funds but did favor matching new formula funds for specific initiatives.

Ranked Research Priorities:

1. Biobased Economy; Food, Nutrition, Health and Well-Being (Tie)
2. Environment
3. Food Agrosecurity

NEW ISSUES FOR 2010

Several new items of concern had arisen since the original 2010 priorities were set. Thus, questions pertaining to these were included in the FY 2011 survey which has just concluded.

Specialty Crop Research Initiative

Did your institution have difficulty meeting the matching requirements for the Specialty Crop Research Initiative?

Response	n	%
Great difficulty or unable to submit	20	42
Some difficulty	24	50
No difficulty	4	8

CSREES Priorities for 2010

CSREES has advanced several issues as priorities for the 2010 Budget to focus attention on specific issues. It suggested that there be future efforts to harmonize both issues advanced by the agency with those of “the family” to afford a unified message.

Priorities for 2010:

Issue	% Supporting (H+MH)
1. Sustaining production of agricultural bio-feed stocks for biofuels and other bioproducts, including the impact of expanded production on water use, soil fertility, and related environmental conditions. Analysis of expanded use of biofuels and other products is also needed in regard to food and feed prices and availability, domestically and worldwide.	85
2. Managing the consequences and contributions of agriculture practices in global climate change, particularly through educating students to assure they have agricultural and land management skills necessary to effect change.	59
3. Enhancing understanding of community and behavioral attributes of human nutrition to inform nutrition education and guidance programs.	47
4. Assuring the availability, quality, and diversity of a well-educated agricultural workforce throughout the 21st Century through strategic investments in minority serving institutions including establishing an endowment to fund Hispanic serving institutions with agricultural programs.	27

SECTION PRIORITIES FOR FY 2011

The Budget and Legislative Committee conducted a preliminary survey as a prelude to the ESS Annual Meeting. There were 57 responses with the following results are as follows:

Overarching Priorities:

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

Changing the BAA-Budget and Advocacy Committee Process

Heretofore each section submitted several (or more) priorities into the BAC process, which, unfortunately, resulted in a rather long list making it difficult to communicate priorities to decision makers. In light of this, the BAC has been working to develop a much shorter list of priorities as well as approaches to future budgets. To this end the ESCOP Budget and Legislative Committee has obtained input on the “next \$100 million program”.

Approaches for Future Budgets

Approach	% Supporting (H+MH)
Focus on major increases for the Agriculture and Food Research Initiative (AFRI).	84
Use themes to allocate AFRI funds; Beyond AFRI use themes to justify increases in	61

other lines.	
Use a variation of the CREATE-21 philosophy (i.e. 70:30 split, small 1862s, 1890s, 1994s etc.) to allocate increases among the BAC's priority programs (lines).	59
Align lines under themes and apply increases.	33
Abandon the use of themes and set program priorities as in recent past.	27

What is the next \$100 Million Program?

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

Additional Suggestions:

1. Build human capacity development into the large programs/themes.
2. Mitigating the impacts of climate change in agriculture
3. Control of Invasive Species
4. Food & Biosecurity
5. The cost of transportation and environmental impact with mitigation by appropriate more regional/local supplies
6. Shifting from high impact to lower impact production systems
7. Basic and applied plant science, particularly for those fruits, vegetables, and cereals of agricultural importance within various regions of the US
8. Expand the germplasm item into a broader 'technology innovations in agriculture.' that's more inclusive and keeps a broader presence of the elements of innovation, discovery and new technologies
9. Water is the next generation's oil

CREATE-21 Philosophy

The philosophy developed during the formation of CREATE-21 for requesting increased funding supported proposals advocating a 70:30 split of new funds between competitive and capacity programs respectively.

Do you continue to support this proposed split?

Yes – 77%

No – 23%

Additional Comments:

1. I don't think we will ever sell a significant increase until it is primarily for competitive programs.
2. As long as all groups can compete on a relatively level field. I certainly do not support this if competitive grants are going to require matching funds. Our institution has trouble meeting the formula funds match and has no additional funds for matching.
3. Generally, but prefer service line adjustments for capacity programs rather than unilateral policy of 30%. The formulas are not based upon current conditions in that they are 65 years old.
4. 20:80
5. Capacity or formula funds are extremely important to give capacity to support ongoing needs supportive of agriculture production, food systems and related environmental areas

6. Capacity programs have been level-funded for decades, while competitive programs have at least received some increases. New monies should be allocated preferentially to capacity programs, as these are woefully underfunded and will address different but critically important priorities that will not be addressed through competitive approaches.
7. From the perspective of a small state, and the northeast, it is critically important to increase formula funds as fast (50:50) as competitive funds to adequately meet emerging regional and state needs that are not addressed by "national priority" funding. This is especially apparent with the results of the 1st round specialty crops program: the projects were distributed to consortia \$985K to \$6.6 million.
8. So long as the 70% are in addition to the base support, not in place of it.
9. Clearly an ongoing need to maintain capacity, but we are well aware that the "easiest" (obviously a very relative term) sell is competitive programs.
10. Would prefer a 60:40 or 65:35 split.
11. OMB and OSTP have a mindset about competitive funding, and I believe that this is the best way to accommodate that concern while increasing the base programs.

Agenda Item 6.0: Policy Board of Directors Update

Presenter: Nancy Cox

Background Information:

The BAA Policy Board of Directors will meet on Tuesday, November 11 after the NASULGC Annual Conference. Below are agenda items for this meeting. Any comments or questions related to these agenda items and/or suggestions of additional items to bring to the PBD are welcome.

- Budget and Advocacy Committee
- Farm Bill Committee
- Food Systems Leadership Institute
- 2009 Agricultural Science and Education Exhibition Reception on Capitol Hill
- Task Force on System Integration
- Task Force on Emerging Issues/Future Directions
- Proposal from NASULGC on Indirect Costs
- CARET's Strategic Plan Implementation
- Nominations for REE Under Secretary and NIFA Director

Action Requested:

None, information only

Item 7.0: REE Energy Science Strategic Plan Implementation
Presenter: Mike Harrington

On September 5-6, 2007 USDA-REE held a planning session to begin the process of developing an Energy Science Strategic Plan to guide activities over the next 5 years. Some 100 people representing ARS, ERS, CSREES, OMB, university faculty attended this facilitated workshop. This was followed by an opportunity for broad input on the draft plan. The final [Plan](#) with its four major goals was posted in March on the REE website. The goals are:

- **Goal 1: Sustainable Agriculture and Natural Resource-Based Energy Production**
- **Goal 2: Sustainable Bioeconomies for Rural Communities**
- **Goal 3: Efficient use of Energy and Energy Conservation**
- **Goal 4: Workforce Development for the Bioeconomy**

A second REE Energy Summit, September 29-30, 2008, focused on development of effective partnerships that will be essential in focusing key resources, human, physical as well as fiscal necessary to achieve the vision outlined in the Plan. This workshop also had broad participation from USDA, DOE, the universities and industry.

Part of the overall plan includes the Bio Energy Awareness Days (BEAD I and II) which have been held in Washington DC. The most recent event had broad participation from the Land Grant Universities.

Implementation of the Strategic Plan is a huge task. To this end there are 31 action teams working on various components of the plan. Each Goal is led by a team; each action team has various interested participants. Action teams have been meeting via conference calls and in some cases face to face meetings. As might be expected some groups are farther along than others. There is good university participation on the various action teams; however some people e.g. the EDs are working on more than one team.

Goal	Action Teams	LGU Participants
I	14	18
II	5	8
III	9	9
IV	5	10

We will be working to bring additional members to the actions teams in the coming year.

For information only

Agenda Item 9.0: 2009 ESS/SAES/ARD Meeting and Workshop

Presenter: Clarence Watson and Eric Young

Background:

The fall Experiment Station Section business meeting, regional meetings, and SAES/ARD workshop have traditionally started with a reception on Sunday evening and continued until noon on Wednesday. Many ESS members have expressed a desire to begin this meeting on Monday so that most attendees could avoid Sunday travel. Also, in recent years a significant number of members have departed prior to or during the Wednesday morning sessions. The following revised schedule is proposed for the 2009 fall meeting to address these issues. An evaluation of the new schedule will be done following the meeting to determine if these changes were desirable and effective.

**Draft Schedule
September 14 – 17, 2009
Oklahoma City, OK**

MONDAY, September 14, 2009	
3:00 – 5:00 (or 6:00)	Regional Meetings
6:30	Opening Reception
TUESDAY, September 15, 2009	
7:00	Breakfast
8:00 – 12:00	ESS Business Meeting
12:00	Lunch
1:30 – 5:00	Workshop Session I
	Dinner on your own
WEDNESDAY, September 16, 2009	
7:00	Breakfast
8:00 – 12:00	Workshop Session II
12:00	Lunch
1:30 – 4:00	Workshop Session III
4:30	Load buses for National Cowboy and Western Heritage Museum
5:00	Museum Visit and Closing Dinner

THURSDAY, September 17, 2009	
7:00	Breakfast
8:00 – 10:00	Meeting room available if needed

Action Requested: Comments and suggestions on the proposed schedule.

Agenda Brief: Association of Research Directors (ARD)

Presenter: Dr. Alton Thompson, ARD Chair

Background Information:

The ARD held its Summer Meeting at North Carolina A&T State University June 25 – 27, 2008. This meeting followed the AEA/ARD Land Grant Conference which had been held on June 8 – 11, 2008 at the Memphis Convention Center in Memphis, TN. The theme of the ARD and AEA conference was “The 1890 Land Grant System: Addressing Universal Issues through Science and Engagement” and the purpose of this second joint conference was to provide a forum for interactions and subsequent partnership commitments within the 1890 Land Grant System in four areas of national priority: Youth Development, Food Safety, Obesity and Wellness, and Renewable Energy. The ARD has now begun vigorous planning of the 15th Biennial Research Symposium, which the a primary aim of continuing the momentum of the 2008 AEA/ARD Conference. The goal of the 1890 Research Symposium is “To provide a forum for interactions, knowledge sharing, building networks for expanded partnerships and to showcase the talents and achievements of the 1890 community.” The first ARD symposium was held in 1976 to showcase the varied accomplishments of the 1890 research scientists and students and the ARD looks forward to repeating the success of the Fourteenth (14th) Research Symposium which engaged 633 registrants. The topic areas for the 2009 symposium are: Food Safety Human Nutrition and Health, Renewable Resources and Environmental Stewardship, Small Scale Agriculture and Rural Development, Emerging Technologies, and Human Sciences. It will be held at the Atlanta Hyatt Regency in Atlanta, GA on March 28 – April 1, 2009. For more information, please see www.ard1890symposium.org.

During this year’s NASULGC meeting the gavel will be passed from the 2006-2008 Chair, Dr. Alton Thompson of N.C. A&T State University to the 2008 – 2010 ARD Chair, Dr. Orlando McMeans of West Virginia State University.

Other Business: Reconstitution of the Farm Bill Committee - Steve Pueppke and EDs

With the passage of the Farm Bill this year, the current term of those representatives on the Farm Bill Committee (FBC) ceased. The Policy Board of Directors has appointed a new chair of the committee, D.C. Coston (North Dakota State University) and as you know, he is giving fine leadership to the Farm Bill Implementation Assistance Committee. However, we do need to reconstitute the membership of the FBC standing committee.

In accordance with the BAA Rules of Operation the committee is comprised of the following membership:

"The FBC shall consist of: a Chairperson designated from the Administrative Heads Section by the Chair of BAA Policy Board of Directors (PBD) ; and one representative each from the Academic Programs Section, Experiment Station Section, Extension Section, International Programs Section, 1890 Extension Administrators, 1890 Research Directors, the 1994 Institutions, CARET, the NASULGC Non-Land-Grant Institution member, a liaison from the PBD, the Chair of the Budget and Advocacy Committee, and other members as deemed appropriate by the PBD. Members of the FBC shall serve for a two-year term with no limit on reappointment."

Action Requested: We are asking each of the BAA units with representation on the Farm Bill Committee to designate an individual for appointment to the FBC. We would like to have the names of those individuals prior to the meeting of the Policy Board of Directors at the NASULGC annual meeting (Tuesday, November 11), if at all possible. Please send the names to Fred Cholick and/or Eddie Gouge.