

**ESCOP Budget & Legislative Committee**  
**Monthly Conference Call Notes - Draft**  
**January 27, 2015**

Participants:

Gary Thompson (NERA; B&L Chair)	Jim Moyer (WAAESD)
Karen Plaut (NCRA)	Jeff Steiner (WAAESD)
Tim Phipps (NERA)	Mike Harrington (ED-WAAESD)
Jon Wraith (NERA)	Rick Klemme (ECOP B&L)
Bill Brown (SAAESD)	Jim Richards (Cornerstone)
Saied Mostaghimi (SAAESD)	Paula Geiger (NIFA)
	Bob Holland (NIFA)

**Approval of Agenda** – approved by acclamation

**Approval of November 25, 2014 Meeting notes**– approved by acclamation

**Cornerstone Report**

Jim Richards - 2016 Budget is due out next Monday. Expecting 1809s to be made whole allowing for the addition of Central State, also expecting some addition to the 1994 lines. Anticipate level funding for other programs.

**Setting ESCOP BLC Priorities for 2016-7**

**Jim Richards' Advice**

**Going Forward:** What can the ESCOP B&L committee do to help drive us to a focused ask? We've always talked around the edges and there has been little or no effort to recognize the political environment or create a broadly supported effort such as the Water Security Initiative, which impacts all of the U.S. Integrated programmatic approaches are needed that focus on a specific line (or limited lines) and also speak to program deliverables through targeted messaging at the grassroots level. Specifically, the B&L committee can lead by developing a model of "advocacy infrastructure" that focuses on tactical approaches to a targeted "ask" for the Water Security Initiative in FY17.

How might we use the ESCOP Science Road map to drive programmatic change? To this end, water was seen to be one of the undergirding factors relating to all of the 7 Challenge areas. A major water initiative was proposed and approved by the BAC and Policy Board of Directors with Robin Shepard and Mike Harrington facilitating a group of 40 research and extension professionals. The report was finalized in August 2014 and distributed to members of the BAA by Policy Board Chair in December 2014.

A preliminary discussion of the Water Initiative was presented to Sonny Ramaswamy in May and again later in the summer. It was clear from the May discussion that most of the NIFA Budget initiatives for 2016 were already on paper and mostly cast. We need to be more proactive by having budget initiatives on the table 2 years in advance; e.g. January, 2015 for FY 2017.

**Specific steps to be taken:** Position the initiative during 2016 with messages aimed at grasstops to create the dialog back home with the aim of getting the initiative into the 2017 Budget. There must be concerted effort to effectively communicate the initiative to specific audiences. Already there have been multistate water groups seeking the report to inform discussions in the respective states.

The report entitled “National Initiative on the Improvement of U.S. Water Security” was distributed via email to members of the BAA in December with encouragement to share broadly with faculty and staff. Mike Harrington and Robin Shepard have developed a 2 page summary of the report. They are working with Cornerstone to modify, accommodate a photo or two and for the AHS-CARET meeting.

It was recognized that the Water Security Initiative may take several years to implement.

**Healthy Food Systems, Healthy People Initiative** –5 action team leader have been contacted and the leadership is awaiting responses. Nominations to serve on the individual task forces are currently being sought via email requests. Efforts are still in progress to enhance the research components of this initiative. Agencies other than USDA may be likely targets.

**BLC Return on Investment White Paper** – Rich Klemme confirmed that Extension is looking for impactful stories to populate their efforts. During this call it was suggested that we look for impacts relating to water possibly as a means to tie the “ask” to outcomes. Examples of regional or local impacts (~250 words & pictures) were considered to be more effective than numerical ROI statistics. The goal is to have a one page executive summary along with the final report by March, 2015.

**Upcoming meetings**

**Face-to-face breakfast meeting on March 3 in Washington, DC**

**Next Call Feb 24, 4 pm EST will be cancelled in lieu of the March 3 meeting.**

**Job Jar**

Who	What	Status
Mike	Solicit B&L and other for impacts/outcomes of water programs	
Mike	Complete Water Exec Summary one pager	
Mike	Work with Robin on the ROI Document, possibly including outcomes related to water programs	

**ESCOP Budget & Legislative Committee**  
**Meeting Notes – Draft**

7:00 – 8:00am, March 3, 2015  
Hampton Room (East Lobby)  
Omni Shoreham Hotel, Washington DC

Participants:

Gary Thompson (NERA; B&L Chair)	Ernie Minton (NCRA)
Tim Phipps (NERA)	Jeff Jacobson (NCRA)
Bill Brown (SAAESD)	Mike Harrington (ED-WAAESD)
Saied Mostaghimi (SAAESD)	Rick Klemme (ECOP B&L)
Jim Moyer (WAAESD)	

**Approval of Agenda** – approved by acclamation

**Approval of January 27, 2015 Meeting notes**– approved by acclamation

**Discussion of developing the “advocacy infrastructure” for the Water Security Initiative**

The meeting focused on a series of questions that were intended to elicit discussion about what the committee could do to provide leadership in developing an “advocacy infrastructure model” that focuses on the tactical approaches to a targeted “ask” for the Water Security Initiative in FY17 and others beyond. An emphasis on the connections between food and water will define the focus of this work. A recent kglobal focus group regional and national survey indicated that water security is a priority topic that resonated with the focus groups.

A number of action items were identified:

- Inventory the multistate water projects and where appropriate, develop impact statements for each. **Mike Harrington**
- Inventory federal grant programs that fund food and water research. Summarize the kglobal focus group and national survey results on water. **Gary Thompson**
- Define the components of an “advocacy infrastructure” in cooperation with Cornerstone and kglobal. The goal is to develop a framework to consolidate a national story around the capacity and needs for food and water. **Subcommittee members: Saied Mostaghimi, Ernie Minton, Karen Plaut, Mike Harrington.**
- Develop impact documents for water issues in each region. The documents should include a brief background, capacity within the region, and action items with a focus the needs. Identify state or regional water research centers, including university water institutes or centers. **Subcommittee members: Bill Brown and Saied Mostaghimi (SAAESD), Tim Phipps (NERA), Jim Moyer (WAAESD), Ernie Minton (NCRA).**

A number of other issues on the topic were discussed, including the design of performance targets for the “big ask.”

Rick Klemme provided an update on the Healthy Food Systems, Healthy People Initiative. Five action teams have been formed whose members have committed to 3 year terms. The group is interfacing with several focus groups and considering programs supported by federal agencies in addition to NIFA. The steering committee is meeting in Atlanta in May. ECOP B&L is supportive of this committee's efforts in developing the advocacy infrastructure and can serve as a sounding board for ideas.

**Handout:** Executive Summary Draft – National Initiative on the Improvement of U.S. Water Security

**Next Call March 31, 4 pm EDT - 970-491-2612.**

**ESCOP Budget and Legislative Committee  
Monthly Conference Call  
March 31, 2015**

**NOTES**

**1. Call to Order and Roll Call**

Present:

Gary Thompson (Chair)

Bill Brown (SAAESD)

John Wraith (NERA)

Jeff Steiner (WAAESD)

Mike Harrington (WAAESD, Executive vice-Chair))

Emir Albores (NIFA)

Bob Holland (NIFA)

Robin Shepard (NCEA)

**2. Approval of the Agenda**

The agenda was approved by acclamation.

**3. Approval of the March 3 meeting notes**

The meeting notes were approved by acclamation.

**4. FY 16 Budget Update – Cornerstone**

Skipped—no one from Cornerstone was available for this call.

**5. Progress report 1 – Inventory of multistate water projects (Mike Harrington)**

There are 15 active water multistate projects (irrigation to policy) in NIMSS. There were number of projects related to water management and quality. Mike highlighted several of the projects that will be terminating in September of 2015; impact statements will be written soon thereafter. Mike also provided a list that summarizes the status of all water projects. He searched for AES water projects in REEIS and found 8,678 records and 1,271 AES projects with “water” as the search query. There were 2620 impacts for 793 projects. We will have to be selective about what constitutes an “impact” from this database.

Gary Thompson suggested the group decide how to categorize these projects and then select a few to highlight. Mike suggested figuring out what we want to highlight and then finding some for each state. He also suggested asking AES Directors for this information. Mike noted that the ESCOP/ECOP CMC is focusing on water issues in 2015. He suggested that this committee be able to feed information to kglobal.

Darren Katz from kglobal will be on the B&L 4/28 call to briefly discuss the message testing report, but more importantly the how the committee can work with kglobal in developing the advocacy infrastructure model.

Gary reported that Tim Phipps is reaching out to the directors in the NE region to have them help to identify a few impact statements related to water each. Bill Brown raised the significant issue of the committee's strategy and felt that we should focus on what has been done and the difference that our research is making both in terms of water quality and quantity.

**6. Progress report 2 – Inventory of federal Agriculture and Water research grants (Gary Thompson)**

Water is written into several NIFA initiatives. NSF is also getting into water through interactions of food systems with water and energy and the innovations at the nexus of food, water, and energy. They have workshops going on now and are asking for \$75M for the nexus in FY16. USAID has a call out about water and food, one of the grand challenges for development. There are also a number of EPA programs.

The Research EDs met with NIFA senior executive staff. They were asked if they'd rather have money for facilities or the water initiative. This suggests that the water initiative is alive and well. Also, the cost for facilities upgrades will be very high, while the water initiative would put more programs into play.

Bob Holland encourages the committee to review the FISMA RFA for support of water projects as well as the Vertical Ag Programs (hydroponics) coming out next year.

Bob Holland will update the committee on the "Big Ask from NIFA's Perspective" as an agenda item for the B&L 4/28 call.

**7. Progress report 3 – Summary of kglobal focus group & national survey results on water (Gary Thompson)**

This is an interesting report that focuses on four regions, Washington DC, and likely voters. It focused on water security and nutrition and health. Different regions had very different responses. Water security is considered extremely important to likely voters. Nutrition resonated in the individual regions. Water security topics may be more understood broadly (vs. health and nutrition). Scientists were considered credible when discussing water security.

Bob Holland suggested that the committee pay attention to all programs that relate to the "Big Ask" as duplication of effort at both state and federal levels is an issue. He also suggested that the budget be tightened up a bit.

**8. Progress report 4 – Defining components of an “Advocacy Infrastructure” (Saied Mostaghimi, Ernie Milton, Karen Plaut, Mike Harrington)**

A one-pager was distributed (two versions, but only one was distributed to the committee in advance). This would be part of the advocacy infrastructure. It was designed to provide an overview of the Water Working Group white paper that was visually pleasing but captured all of the essential issues. It has not yet been distributed. Mike is not sure who needs to approve this document before it can be distributed. APLU will likely need to review prior to release.

**9. Progress report 5 – Regional impact documents for water issues (Bill Brown, Saied Mostaghimi, Tim Phipps, Jim Moyer, Ernie Minton)**

Regional Associations have not been spending a lot of time discussing the “Big Ask” during spring meetings. Mike noted that all Dean/Directors received the white paper in January, but faculty/scientists have probably not seen the white paper, but it could impact them.

**10. Healthy Food Systems, Healthy People Initiative update (Rick Klemme)**

Rick was not available for this call.

It was suggested that Clare Heiser from the CDC be asked to participate on the HFSHPI steering committee. Gary Thompson will speak with Clarence Watson about that request.

**Gary Thompson adjourned the meeting at 4:55pm (EST).**

**ESCOP Budget and Legislative Committee**  
**Monthly Conference Call**  
**Tuesday, April 28, 2015, 4:00 PM EDT**  
**970-491-2612**

NOTES

**1. Call to order Gary Thompson**

**2. Roll call, Introductions – Mike Harrington**

John Wraith  
Jeff Jacobsen  
Mike Harrington  
Gary Thompson  
Darren Katz  
Jeff Steiner  
Hunt Shipman  
Bob Holland  
Ernie Minton  
Bill Brown  
Robin Shepard  
Rick Klemme

**3. Approval of minutes and agenda – Gary Thompson**

Minutes from last month's call were approved.  
Agenda for today's call was approved.

**4. Cornerstone Update – Hunt Shipman**

House appropriations committee met last week in full committee, putting forward the energy and water bill. The agriculture subcommittee's allocations are \$230M less than the amount received in FY 2015. Unclear when the house ag subcommittee will take up bills, could be late May or early June; suspected that they won't move very far at all this year. Crop insurance subsidies are a concern. Food stamp cuts may also come through the appropriations process. Ag bill may get bundled up with some others. Senate will be several weeks behind any House action.

**5. Summary of kglobal focus group & national survey results on water - Darren Katz**

Kglobal spent some time with folks in all the groups discussing the need to test messages around water, food and nutrition, and other topics. Produced 2 instruments: 1) qualitative focus groups that provided in-depth discussions and regional views, and 2) A quantitative survey of 1800 likely voters nationwide. Focus groups of different target audiences around the country included former congressional staffers, UMD-College Park, Atlanta, Chicago, and San Francisco. Water was more significant than food and nutrition to all the survey groups. When there was more in-depth discussion and explanation during the focus groups, food and nutrition was elevated in importance. Water and water-related issues are very understandable and don't require a lot of explanation. Also found with focus groups that there are substantial regional differences related to water security; CA focus group viewed it as especially significant.



Discussed fracking and water rights. Both were controversial and inspired a lot of passion and discussion. The quantitative survey of 1800 likely voters indicated that scientists are the most credible communicators about water and water security. Respondents indicated that federal funding should be maintained or increased for research and extension. In a head-to-head “competition” water security issues were more valued with 81% stating that water was more important than food and nutrition. In general, respondents in the western region found water issues to be more relevant, prevalent, etc. Respondents (64%) linked food and water security, which was encouraging. Need to message in both directions—water as it relates to food security and food security as it relates to agriculture.

Impact statements have been terrific and very effective. Challenge is to ensure that we have enough of them and that they cover the topics that are needed. People care about what is happening in their community so it's important to share successes locally. Also, taking those individual stories and wrapping them into a national narrative to illustrate the value of agricultural research and extension broadly. Members of congress are especially interested in this message—how issues play out locally and the national scale as well.

**6. NIFA Update, esp. Water Initiative – Bob Holland and Meryl Broussard**

Sonny met with the EDs and asked questions about the Water Initiative, especially about anticipated outcomes and impacts. There were some hints about regional centers, but nothing definitive. The water initiative is getting a lot of interest in NIFA and USDA and will be a priority for some time. There was some indication about the current dollars spent on water projects. An inventory of funding for water research has been conducted, although details of the inventory were not presented. The inventory suggests that there is some \$68M spent on water research—not sure what period of time this covers. A deeper dive for more information will take place in the next 2-3 weeks. A draft response is being prepared from NIFA to the policy board.

Later this week, there will be an opportunity to see “Data Gateway” on the USDA website. You will be able to access information on water, climate variability, etc. through this new portal. Most RFAs are out. A response to the crop consolidation issue is also being drafted.

**7. Report from Advocacy Infrastructure Subgroup – Mike Harrington reporting (Saied Mostaghimi, Ernie Milton, Karen Plaut, Mike Harrington)**

Subgroups were created to begin to develop an advocacy infrastructure. Came in on the water issue in the middle—probably should have had this conversation a year ago. Still some value to entering the conversation now, and also to codify approaches for “big asks” for the future. Also want to look at going beyond the “big 7” that are advocated for every year.

Subgroup has discussed ~6 ideas: 1) identifying the issue to a broad group, 2) identify gaps and expertise required to fill gaps, 3) how to get buy-in, 4) understand the politics from local to national, 5) create action plans that include vision, goal and strategy, 6) generate educational materials that can be broadly used to build the case. Understanding the desired outcomes and monitoring progress is important. Anticipate having something to share with the committee by next week.

**8. Possible survey to identify current high priority water activities/impacts (e.g. 2-3/state) – Mike Harrington**

Was discussion of conducting a survey about existing activities that would scale up to national or trans-national levels. Need to look in the national impacts database to see if there is sufficient information there first. Could ask for existing documents or links to information online. Bob Holland suggested to see if that information is on the new USDA site, as previously mentioned.

It would be helpful for kglobal to have information like this. Communications through kglobal cannot be construed as advocacy, but are education only. Bill Brown said that impacts statements on water was discussed at the southern regional meeting and examples are being solicited from various institutions based on the U Florida example. The goal is to look broader than individual projects. Ernie Minton suggested that a survey might be more effective than soliciting information from individual institutions. Mike will report more about the survey at the next teleconference. 107K records with "water" in REEIS.

**9. Identification of expected outcomes for the Water Initiative – Mike Harrington**

Agenda item not discussed

**10. Joint ESCOP-ECOP effort needed to codify a process for bringing forward lines not in the 7 priority lines – Mike Harrington**

The prior discussion of codifying a process to promote funding for programs beyond the 7 traditional priority lines was expanded upon. Examples include: Pest Management Program and Rural Development Centers. Both have lost considerable funding and buying power, the RDCs should be at \$20 million). Increases were obtained in each of three years when EFNEP was an Extension priority.

**11. ECOP B&L—Rick Klemme**

The ECOP B&L committee's focus has been budget updates, whole child/SNAP, working collaboratively with ESCOP on water, and using local impact stories to educate/advocate. Waiting for report on crop and pest management expenditures. A letter was sent a month ago regarding concerns about erosion of funding from consolidated lines. An update was given on the healthy foods/people initiative. Next week in Atlanta the 5 action teams are meeting face-to-face. A goal for the action teams is to discuss engaging the research community.

**ESCOP Budget and Legislative Committee**  
**Monthly Conference Call**  
**May 26, 2015**  
**NOTES**

**1. Call to order – Mike Harrington**

**2. Roll call, Introductions – Mike Harrington**

- Karen Plaut (NCRA)
- William (Bill) Brown (SAAESD)
- Saied Mostaghimi (SAAESD)
- Tim Phipps (NERA)
- John Wraith (NERA)
- Jeff Steiner (WAAESD)
- Mike Harrington (WAAESD)
- Paula Geiger (NIFA)
- Bob Holland (NIFA)
- Eddie Gouge (APLU)
- Jim Richards (Cornerstone)
- Jeff Jacobsen (NCRA)
- Rick Klemme (NERA)
- Steve Slack (Policy Board)

**3. Approval of minutes and agenda – Mike Harrington (see attached)**

Minutes and agenda were unanimously approved as presented.

**4. Cornerstone Update (Jim Richards)**

Congress is in recess right now; returning on June 1 for a 4 week stretch. House to do Ag subcommittee mark-up on June 18<sup>th</sup>, full Ag committee markup on the 24<sup>th</sup>. Won't be on the floor before the July 4<sup>th</sup> recess. Right now, House allocation is \$100M below and Senate is \$200 M below FY15 enacted and may have a hard time writing the bill. Ag will likely end up in a mini/omni/omnibus in the fall.

**5. NIFA Update – Bob Holland**

Have provided NIFA liaisons to regional groups; a few new people so be sure to check. Sonny R will be sending out comments on the BAA Water Initiative and the Crop Protection/Pest Management Question, including budgets. NIFA is receiving a lot of questions about programs and support; spending a lot of time answering these questions from Congress regarding the budget and programs. Also working on 2017 budget preparation. On June 4<sup>th</sup> is the ECOP/NIFA retreat—the genesis of this started when Dr. Otto was still there, requested by ECOP. After Dr Otto left, Sonny asked for a meeting and a summary report was generated. On the 4<sup>th</sup>, NIFA and ECOP representatives will meet to discuss this document. The document concerns resolving mutual concerns of ECOP and NIFA.

APLU Liaisons: [http://nifa.usda.gov/sites/default/files/resource/NIFA\\_liaisons\\_APLU.pdf](http://nifa.usda.gov/sites/default/files/resource/NIFA_liaisons_APLU.pdf)

State Liaisons: [http://nifa.usda.gov/sites/default/files/resource/npl\\_liaison\\_list\\_2014.pdf](http://nifa.usda.gov/sites/default/files/resource/npl_liaison_list_2014.pdf)

**6. ECOP Report (Rick Klemme)**

Steering committee for Healthy Foods/Healthy People met to discuss priorities generated from a AES-wide survey. Two main content areas: interface of ag food systems and nutrition, and nutrition and health systems. Trying to prioritize this, staying cognizant of inventorying LGU and NIFA efforts. Implementation and action teams met in May, prior to the steering committee meetings, and they are continuing to move forward, developing logic models, identifying gaps (chronic disease management). Continue to look at products and educational programs that might come out of these two main areas.

**7. Report from Advocacy Infrastructure Subgroup – Saied Mostaghimi (see attached draft)**

Background: this B&L subcommittee was formed to draft a framework for advocacy infrastructure for future initiatives. Have developed a draft document—tried to be brief, avoid being prescriptive. Draft was provided to committee prior to call. A draft was shared with Cornerstone and received positive feedback from both Hunt and Jim.

May want to get ESCOP B&L to read through it and eventually adopt it. BAC may or may not want to also adopt it.

The ECOP B&L will put this on their next agenda.

Suggestions for improvement should be sent directly to Dr. Mostaghimi by Tuesday, June 2<sup>nd</sup>.

**8. BAC Charge to ESCOP And ECOP to develop a process to addressing budget items not among the seven priorities (see attached) – Mike Harrington**

Draft provided to committee prior to meeting.

There is need for a process to advance an issue that may/or may not be section-specific and unrelated to the 7 standard items that are always advanced. Examples include EFNEP, Water, Pest Management, and Rural Development Centers. There is a need for greater coordination and planning further in advance (2 years at least), based on recent experiences. The goal is to have a unified voice—have other sections endorse efforts of others.

Mike will get this and the Advocacy infrastructure document in the queue for ECOP.

**9. Survey of water activities/impacts – Mike Harrington**

On the recent National Impacts Database Call. At the upcoming ACE meeting, there will be a training session about writing impact statements and they will be taking on “water” as an example. They will develop a national-level statement about water quality/quantity. Likely will use impacts database as a starting point for this effort; there is a concern that there are more activities/outcomes vs. impacts. In the past, 5-7 writers and a few editors would meet in D.C. to synthesize national-level impact statement about issues of importance.

Mike is considering doing a survey that asks for one impact related to each of the water security areas identified in the Water Working Group white paper. Southern Region tried this and only got one response. There was some discussion of other approaches. Overall, concern is that databases (REEPort, CRIS, etc.) contain fragmented information. The goal is to mesh this with

what Faith Peppers and the other writers are doing to lead to a “big ask” on water—this would help to illustrate what’s been accomplished so far, here are the gaps, what could we do and where could we take the program.

Was suggested to find stories by watershed/congressional district.

NIFA will be responding to the Water Working Group document soon. NIFA has asked what the outcomes/impacts of the investment might include.

Mike will continue to work on a strategy for moving forward with collecting information on water impacts.

**Next Call June 23, 4:00 pm EDT, call in # 970-420-2612**

**ESCOPE Budget and Legislative Committee  
Monthly Conference Call  
June 30, 2015  
NOTES**

**Participants**

- H.M. Harrington
- Gary Thompson
- Bob Holland
- Ernie Minton
- Jeff Steiner
- Jeff Jacobson
- Eddie Gouge
- Ian Maw
- Karen Plaut
- Rick Klemme

**1. Gary Thompson (Chair) called the meeting to order.**

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"

**2. Approval of minutes and agenda – Gary Thompson**

Only correction was to the date of the next call (should have been June 30<sup>th</sup>). Minutes were unanimously approved. The agenda for today was unanimously approved.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"

**3. Cornerstone Update - Jim Richards, et al.**

No one from Cornerstone was on the call. [Mike Harrington summarized the Cornerstone report from the June 23 BAC call.](#) The house subcommittee did its markup last week. We are flat-lined on [all of the capacity lines](#)~~everything~~. The [competitive](#) increase proposed for Hatch ~~and~~ Smith-Lever was not included. Everything is the same as the current year, including the 1890s, which means that their allocation will be split by N+1 due to the addition of a new institution.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"

**4. NIFA Update, esp. Water Initiative Response – Bob Holland**

NIFA has ~~not had a chance to completed their internal~~ review ~~and the response yet.~~ NIFA would entertain any further comments through this process. Right now, NIFA has nothing new to report. NIFA is focused on the FY2017 water program budget, ~~which and~~ remains an important part of the upcoming budgeting process.

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"

Jay Akridge and Barbara Allen-Diaz (Policy Board of Directors) will soon be sending a response to NIFA's analysis. There were several \$100 million spent on various projects that appear to have some aspect or mention of water in them in each of the last five years. However, there is no real coordination of these water efforts into a comprehensive national program, as was proposed in the Water Security initiative.

Jay Akridge has asked to meet with Sonny and Bob Holland (at Joint COPs) to clarify what the real underlying issues might be and how we might work together to advance the initiative.

NIFA expects to have another webinar about the centers for excellence and the commodity board. [Bob reminded the committee of the mass email acknowledging USDA support and that additional information related to this will be forthcoming.](#)

NIFA RFAs will be posted in one location on the website—look for that in a few days.

##### **5. Report from Advocacy Infrastructure Subgroup - Saied Mostaghimi, Ernie Milton, Karen Plaut, Mike Harrington**

The [advocacy infrastructure sub](#)group received input [since the last call](#) and finalized their document. [Gary Thompson thanked the members of the subgroup for their work in generating the document.](#) Mike Harrington summarized the document (previously shared via email). [The document was built as a generic tool that could be used widely to develop an advocacy approach.](#) Karen Plaut suggested that

[Evaluating this tool using the Water Initiative would be a good exercise to determine whether additional components are needed.](#) [Several members indicated that some additional minor wordsmithing could be done.](#)

Additional comments should be sent to Mike Harrington.

One of the intents of this effort was to promote the water project, but a generic approach is better. Using this process 2-4 years in advance will help.

~~There were members of extension and research in both the Pest Management and Water Working Groups. They were endorsed by the BAC, PDB and on up the line. The strength of both documents comes from working together. The one flaw of the IPM document is that it lacked a specific "ask" for funding.~~

[Gary Thompson raised the issue of next steps regarding the "components of a strategic advocacy campaign" document. Several alternatives were proposed, including adoption by the ESCOP B&L; forwarding to the BAC for discussion; or combining this document with the information in the "BAA Process for advancing new budget initiatives" document \(agenda item 6\).](#)

[Rick Klemme reported that both documents were being reviewed and discussed at the upcoming ECOP B&L committee call next Wednesday. His sense of the committee is that they are on board with the documents and does not anticipate many changes. He asked that we might consider including language for both capacity and competitive funding \(1e in the document\).](#)

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"

[Rick Klemme said there were members of extension and research in both the Pest Management and Water Working Groups. They were endorsed by the BAC, PDB and on up the line. The strength of both documents comes from working together. The one flaw of the IPM document is that it lacked a specific “ask” for funding.](#)

The committee agreed [to review input from the ECOP B&L and](#) that the two documents should be combined into one.

Rick Klemme reported that the 7 lines get varying interest, depending on who is looking at them. Cornerstone keeps an eye on all 7 lines. There are still issues with the budget lines. ECOP, ESCOP, [and](#) AHS need to voice a common interest [and](#) engage in an advocacy campaign.

Comments from ECOP, etc. need to be addressed [and the two document melded into a single document](#). [We](#) would like to present this process at the Joint COPS meeting in the July.

**6. Joint ESCOP-ECOP effort needed to codify a process for bringing forward lines not in the 7 priority lines. (expect to combine with #6 into a unified process) – Mike Harrington/Gary Thompson**

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"

**Next steps:** ECOP BLC will submit feedback on the two separate documents. Comments will be addressed and then the two documents will be combined. Mike and Robin Shepard will develop a combined document for discussion at Joint COPS.

**7. Water Impacts – Mike Harrington/Gary Thompson**

Faith Peppers and others from ACE were going to work on impact statements during the recent ACE conference. Mike [Harrington](#) looked at the national database and determined that there wasn't much there from SAES. A copy of the memo sent to all AES Directors requesting impact statements for water research was provided via email. Updates have been provided so it's likely that additional impacts are in the database. The communications [groupfolks](#) will wait until after the July 10<sup>th</sup> deadline to begin their work on this.

**Next regular call: July 28, 4:00 pm EDT**



**ESCOP Budget and Legislative Committee**  
**Monthly Conference Call**  
**July 28, 2015**

**NOTES**

**1. Roll Call – Mike Harrington**

Ernie Minton (NCRA)  
Karen Plaut (NCRA)  
Carolyn Brooks (ED-ARD)  
William (Bill) Brown (SAAESD)  
Saied Mostaghimi (SAAESD)  
Jim Moyer (WAAESD)  
Mike Harrington (WAAESD)  
Bob Holland (USDA-NIFA)  
Ian Maw (APLU)  
Hunt Shipman (Cornerstone)  
Jeremy Witte (Cornerstone)  
Jeff Jacobsen (ED-NCRA)  
Dan Rossi (ED-NERA)

**2. Approval of June minutes and agenda – Gary Thompson**

June minutes and agenda for today were unanimously approved.

**3. 2016 Budget update – Cornerstone**

House and Senate appropriations have approved respective versions of Farm Bill which will fund USDA starting Oct. 1. Funding for the six BAC priority lines and AFRI remained the same as last year with one exception: the House bill includes \$10M increase for AFRI. There is a need for a global budget agreement going forward. Crop protection line (consolidation of several lines) has had lingering concern about indirect costs—half of those participating followed the BAC request to not charge indirect. There was a request again this year to fund this under Section 3D. The Senate has agreed to this. The unintended consequences of this were discussed during the Joint COPS meeting last week. Further conversations in DC with NIFA and Mike Harrington and Robin Shepard will hopefully reach a workable solution.

A hypothetical solution to the problem might include an increase to the fund to make up for indirect charges. Hunt cautioned that its likely to be a zero-sum game.

USDA-NIFA is looking into the interpretation of 3D flexibility. Bob Holland should have an answer to the question regarding funding flexibility under Smith-Lever 3D that might allow research lines to be funded.

**4. NIFA Update – Bob Holland**

A point of clarification regarding upcoming webinars: Aug 6<sup>th</sup>: 11:30 eligible commodity boards, 2:30 PM is for partners. Farm Bill Centers of Excellence webinars on August 20<sup>th</sup> 27<sup>th</sup>—more information on the NIFA website. Look for the NRC report in a couple of weeks and the opportunity to comment. Policy people have been asked to review Section 406 and Smith-Lever 3D regarding flexibility. 2017 budget is pending with the Department. Expect to submit a budget to OMB in early September.

**5. Joint B&L Committees update on the Issues Development and Strategic Communications/Advocacy – Gary Thompson, Rick Klemme, Mike Harrington**

A subcommittee drafted a document to codify a process for moving new strategic programs forward. At the same time, we were charged with developing a process for advocating for new budget initiatives. Both are out in draft form. The two are being combined into a single document. The ECOP B&L committee discussed this during their last conference call. ECOP is on board with this plan.

Sarah Lupis provided some edits. Mike Harrington, Robin Shepard, and Gary Thompson are currently reviewing and refining.

The document has not been shared widely as it is still a work in progress. Can share with Sonny and Bob for feedback once the combined document is a little more finalized.

**6. ESCOP-ECOP B&L Chairs meeting – Gary Thompson/Rick Klemme**

How do we advocate for current lines that are not new? Is that a different process or should we work that into our existing document? Learned recently that Texas A&M hired Rick Merton. Have been having discussions about how to speak more directly with OMB about how we can really continue to invest in a portfolio of capacity/competitive dollars that are well beyond the funding that NIFA receives—their top-line funding is not nearly enough to address the myriad concerns regarding the food system. Want to make sure that the ECOP and ESCOP chairs, Gary, and Mike and Robin are fully aware of what's going on.

Discussed possibility of having ECOP and ESCOP B&L committees meet together. Although agendas tend to be very different, thought that there would be benefits of occasional joint meetings. Would be an opportunity for a face-to-face meeting at the upcoming 2016 ESS/CES-NEDA meeting. No special meetings would be scheduled—this would just happen during times when members are already co-located.

Unanimous approval for planning future joint meetings.

**7. Water Meeting with Sonny Ramaswamy and path forward – Mike Harrington, Bob Holland**

Pointed to a need for us to identify potential outcomes/impacts. Need to describe existing projects/investments. Agreed to follow up with several people who will write short problem statements and potential outcomes. Impact statements are in the hopper. The original document was missing some description of potential outcomes for each of the issue areas—the leaders of the water working group are writing these. Copies will be shared with this committee.

**8. Request for High Priority Water Impact Statements**

Several have been received. Working to ensure that all of these are being entered into the National Impact Database. ECOP voted to fund and ESCOP deferred on funding an initiative for communicators to gather to write national impact statements on water and other topics. Need coordination to ensure that writing doesn't negate the need for funding.

**Next Meeting:** Wednesday, September 30, 2015, 6:30 AM during breakfast. Look for the reserved table.

**ESCOP Budget and Legislative Committee Meeting**  
**September 30, 2015**  
**6:30 am Breakfast**

- Call to order, approval of agenda – Gary
  - The agenda was unanimously approved
- Roll call – Mike
- Approval of July 28 minutes – Gary
  - The minutes from July 28 were unanimously approved
- New initiatives document update – Gary, Mike
  - The document will go to today's ESS business meeting as a seconded motion from this group for approval.
- Cornerstone Report –Hunt Shipman
  - Today, Hunt will cover: funding is still uncertain, speaker Boheners resignation blurs the path to that end.
  - The Crop Protection move from 406 to 3D-we still need to have a follow-up meeting with NIFA. Mike and Robin Shepard will strive to do this next week. Does it make as much sense to include a provision in 406 to address the IDC concern. The continuing resolution will expire in early December so early October is a good time to address this.
  - The bigger picture: if Grambling State is allowed to join, there are concerns that there will likely be a flood. Some strategic discussions on how to address this, how USDA addresses this are really needed. Discussions about the 1890 family have been unique. This committee is charged with advocating for capacity funds, so this is something we will discuss further. It is also something the CLP is discussing.
- NIFA Update/ Sonny Ramaswamy webinar on matching funds, unspent funds – Bob Holland
  - \$100M comment: land grants are leaving this on the table. This statement reflected a snapshot of one point in time, 2010-2015. So, the past two years of funds may not have been distributed. Best to look at 2010,2011,2012 numbers—those would be the only years that matter. NIFA sends notices about unspent funds. Finally, not all programs are administered equally. Appropriations duration varies. The actual number is available in mid-October. In the past, there have been some residual 1862 capacity funds; same for 1994s and 1890s. In some cases, it's a matching issue. There are also issues with subcontracts.
  - Matching: prior to the 125<sup>th</sup> anniversary, there were concerns about matching. Black Enterprise published an article about matching that sparked a lot of discussion. Even the White House got involved. USDA is trying to collect data to have a more informed discussion. Survey will be completed by Jan 1. A couple states have been looked at, and it doesn't seem, for these states, that there has been as much of an issue with matching

funds as has been purported. 18 states are being surveyed. Due to time constraints, the report can be shared after congress sees it.

- 1862s are not expect from match. Catastrophic events (e.g., climate), good faith effort to meet the match requirement, financial failure of the state are the exemptions. Tuition waivers cannot be used as match. 2016 RFAs will also attempt to gather more information on match.
- Return on Investment White Paper: Still in progress. State impact statements (capacity funds) are needed and then the report will be summarized into a shorter document.
- AFRI Funding and Transaction Costs Study – Mike distributed a spreadsheet that summarizes transactional costs of competitive programs. Includes data from the AFRI synopsis reports. The funding shortfall minimum was \$387M in FY12. Success rate is pretty good, if calculations are correct. Transactional costs reflect the amount of time a single investigator takes to develop a proposal, the number of proposals submitted and some assumptions about salary. More complex proposals likely cost more because there are administrative costs. Three reviewers, sometimes a recorder are also included in transactional costs. It may take a week to review a single proposal. Ad-hoc reviews are also sometimes required. How do success rates effect the triage approach to proposal development? Administration of multi-institution grants is a big issue. Is it possible to get similar data for other agencies to compare? Paula Gieger (USDA) can provide some numbers. The committee agreed to continue looking into this issue over the next couple of months.
- Jim Moyer testified yesterday in Congress with several others, including Doug Buhler. One thing asked was how things can be streamlined. Indirect costs came up—where do they go and what are they used for.

**ESCOPE Budget and Legislative Committee  
Conference Call Notes  
October 27, 2015**

- **Call to order, approval of agenda**  
The agenda was unanimously approved.
- **Roll call**  
Attending: Gary Thompson, Ernie Minton, Bill Brown, Saied Mostaghimi, Jon Wraith, Tom Holtzer, Paula Geiger, Jim Richards, Jeremy Witte, Ian Maw, Mike Harrington
- **Approval of Sept 30 minutes**  
The minutes from Sept 30 were unanimously approved.
- **New initiatives document update**  
Alan Grant, BAC Chair, presented the ESCOP- and ECOP-approved document to the BAC at its meeting on Oct 20. The document was approved as presented by the BAC and will be forwarded to the Policy Board for adoption.
- **Crop Protection update**  
The consolidation of pest management lines had had unintended consequences, namely the allowance of indirect charges in the Extension Pest Management Program. Last year, VPRs were asked to waive IDC charges; however, but over 50% of institutions failed to do so. According to the NIFA General Counsel, moving of the program under Smith-Lever 3d (while negating indirect charges) would preclude funding of *any* research and all programs would need to be re-competed.  
  
Robin Shepard, Jim Richards, Jeff Jacobsen and Mike Harrington recently met with NIFA pest management staff to seek solutions. The conclusion is to leave the program under 406 (currently placed) and legislatively exclude the Extension Pest Management program from IDCs. The legislative solution has been used in the past with the specialty crop initiative. Jim Richards has provided language to congressional staff.
- **Cornerstone Update**  
There is a proposed budget agreement that would cover 2 years – FYs 16 & 17 (a so called Murry Ryan 2.0) with a no sequestration provision. The bill would provide an additional \$25 billion each for discretionary and non-discretionary spending for FY 16 (\$50 billion total) to be spread over the 12 appropriation bills, with \$15 billion (\$30 billion total), respectively in 2017. There may be some difficulty with the bill in the House.
- **NIFA Report**  
Paula Geiger reported that NIFA has been responding to OMB questions on the FY 17 budget request. Pass back from OMB is expected soon.
- **ECOP BLC report**  
Doug Steel reported that ECOP is working a new document stressing the outcomes and impacts of Extension activities. There is a new model for eXtension based on subscriptions. At the

national meeting in St. Louis, an initiative was begun to identify 200 innovations from Extension work that could also integrate research connections with Extension. ECOP is also mindful of 1890s matching requirements and the recent and ongoing requests by institutions to become LGUs, e.g. Central State University and Grambling.

- **Competitive Grants Transaction Costs Study**

Mike provided questions that are germane to the development of an overview of transactional costs. Committee members are asked to provide comments on these. Also provided was a spreadsheet showing data from the AFRI synopsis reports. The funding shortfall minimum was \$387M in FY12.

The estimated transactional costs reflect the amount of time a single investigator takes to develop a proposal, the number of proposals submitted and some assumptions about salary. More complex proposals likely cost more because there are administrative costs. Three reviewers, a recorder are also included in transactional costs. Ad-hoc reviews are also used at times. Some members questioned the time estimated that individual faculty member spent on proposal development. Mike reported that the 6 weeks estimate was the consistent response from grantsmanship workshop participants over 10 years.

Discussion centered on the proposed outcomes of this activity. Interested parties might include VPRs, Deans, Directors and funding agencies. The primary outcome would be to fully understand the transactional costs of competitive grants, including those costs that are borne by the academic institutions. This information could also be used in support of increasing the NIFA budget to its fully authorized (not allocated) amount of ~\$700 million. There was also discussion about other funding agencies than NIFA and to included compliance issues as a component.

Action items:

- Gary will contact his assistant dean, Rama Radhakrishna, who has survey expertise to assist with question and survey development.
- Paula Geiger (NIFA) will provide costs for panels, etc.
- Mike will try to get similar program data for NSF and NIH.
- Bill suggested that Council on Government Relations (COGR) may have done a similar study. Mike will check with CSU offices in this regard.

The committee agreed to continue looking into this issue over the next couple of months.

- **Discussion of requests for LGU status**

There was a short discussion of the requests from institutions to become a LGU. Central State University in Ohio was added as an 1890 last year with no additional resources to the overall 1890 budget allocations. The Louisiana legislature has recently passed a resolution requesting Grambling State University be admitted as an 1890 institution. There have been inquiries from other institution to be considered as 1862 institutions. There was a general consensus of the committee that this is an important topic for consideration, possibly in partnership with the ECOP B&L committee. It was recommended to review the legislation that created the LGU system along with the need to be proactive regarding the central missions of LGUs. Mike will send the enabling legislation to the Committee.

- **Next Call: November 24, 4:00 pm EST**

**ESCOP Budget & Legislative Committee Meeting**  
**November 24, 2015**  
**NOTES**

Participants:

Gary Thompson  
Bill Brown  
Mike Harrington  
Bob Holland  
Hunt Shipman  
Jeff Jacobsen  
Ernie Minton  
Karen Plaut  
John Wraith  
Hunt Shipman  
Jeremy Witte

Rama Radakrishna

Gary Thompson called the meeting to order. Mike Harrington called the roll.

Gary introduced Rama Radakrishna, a social science survey expert, who will help with the B&L survey on competitive programs transactional costs.

Mike noted a couple of corrections to the minutes from the last meeting. The corrected minutes were unanimously approved. Today's agenda was unanimously approved.

Cornerstone Update: Waiting on an omnibus appropriations bill. Funding levels proposed in the House and Senate proposed level for most & slight increase in AFRI. There might be more dollars available to the agriculture subcommittee. Anticipate something by next week. The current CR expires on December 11, 2015. Also anticipate some relief for the 1890s to address the addition of a new school to that group. Also looking for resolution to the indirect charge situation from the appropriations subcommittee that will likely be included in the final version of their bill. With the exit of John Boehner, he said he was going to deal with unfinished work of the house so that the new speaker (Paul Ryan) didn't have to deal with it. A budget agreement that facilitated a path forward on appropriations includes 2 years of non-defense spending for FY16 & FY17. The agriculture subcommittee will get a piece of \$25 billion and then \$15 billion dollars in FY16 & FY 17 respectively.

NIFA Update: Letter detailing the 2016 AFRI awards has gone out. Questions should be directed to Cynthia Montgomery at NIFA. Also looked into Panel Cost--Sonny would like to receive a formal request for that activity. NIFA is moving ahead with an 1890 matching study. Letters will arrive on 1890 campuses soon. The Undersecretary has asked for a task force to look into the 1994s withdrawal from APLU and find a way forward.

ECOP Update: There was an ECOP call this week. There was an overview of the APLU meeting, discussion of the Healthy Food, Healthy People Initiative.

APLU Update: FY17 priority lines were discussed with BAC. Looked at the FY16 requests and are still waiting for the president's budget. Will compare to what has been proposed in previous years and will promote the better of the two budgets. In the event that we see a line higher in the FY16 appropriations, we would take the highest of the FY16 BAC priorities or the FY16 appropriations or the FY17 budget request--go with the highest number throughout. There was discussion of supporting the 7 priority budget lines. The 1994 component (one of the budget lines) was an issue because the 1994's have withdrawn from APLU. However, they are still part of the LGU system. They feel they can advocate for their line and increases in capacity funding better independently of APLU. They felt that their issues were lower priority for the BAC. So, FY17 priority lines will not include 1994 Research and Extension. There is concern about the 1890s capacity. There was a slight increase to accommodate the inclusion of Central State--want to be sure this is included in FY17 and beyond. The insular institutions have asked for increased capacity--looking for about \$4M (up from \$2M). They have lost significant earmarks and have real infrastructure needs that go above and beyond; will see how the FY16 and president's budget shake out and then decide if we will advocate for that increase. There was much discussion about SNAP and SNAP Ed. The treaty on international germplasm is pending in line behind 6 other treaties. There was much discussion of the expansion of the LGU system. Grambling has petitioned for inclusion. The CLP has come out with a definition of a land-grant (included in today's materials). However, it was decided that this is probably not the best approach because it provides a potential check list for aspiring institutions to use to bolster their bid. Was decided not to move forward with a defining document, but rather a definitive statement will be developed saying that there is no need for additional institutions. There was also discussion about a 1-pager on the LGU identity and its role as an internal policy document. Last week, Shirley Hyman-Parker asked for input and edits on this document (due November 30th); members are encouraged to review and comment by the deadline. Starting to discuss the upcoming Farm Bill (2018). Cornerstone will develop a survey regarding issues in the Farm Bill that will go to COPS membership that will serve as a basis for discussion. Also had an ESCOP Exec. Comm. meeting. Gary and Mike presented a summary of B&L activities.

Competitive Programs Transactional Costs Initiative: Mike has spoken with several vice-presidents for research about this. It is a cost they have not really thought about. Mike shared his list of questions with the VPR at CSU to see if there were questions we might have missed. One question that has come up--does it really take a researcher 6 weeks+ to develop a proposal (yes, based on ad-hoc survey of water researchers). Mike has been searching for similar synopsis data for NIH and NSF. Apparently Yale Univ. has done some work on this. Last time, discussed scope and desired outcomes of this activity. Concerned about being so broad that we can't get the job done. If we work with NIFA, we can use our natural partnership to try and understand how this would contribute to the overall goal of increasing the allocation to NIFA--this might be a good place to start. There was concern about limited the focus to NIFA because there wouldn't be anything to compare to. Input from Rama: The question is "What do



you want to get out of this study? What is the scope (faculty? departments? 2 states per region as a pilot?)? If the goal is to get an estimate, maybe work on pre and post-award phase. Build questions around each phase--data gathering (prep), submission, review, award. Then post award: program, progress, termination. Can do a single survey for all respondents by adding an "N/A" category to all questions, or can do separate surveys for different categories (VPRs, faculty, etc.). Select randomly 2 states from each region--then work with VPRs, sponsored programs, extension, research, and faculty at each institution to have them complete a short survey that is broken into those pre and post-award categories. Noted that there are a wide variety of funding rates even within AFRI. Also need to consider resources that go into capacity that support competitive as well. There was discussion of how indirect costs are calculated by institutions. Subcommittee will look at: How do we define questions, what kind of answers do we need, how will it be useful to us. Gary and Rama will write up a proposal for the Committee to review.

Chair Elect: will come from the Southern Region. Leadership change will occur at the next ESS meeting.

Next Call: January 26, 2016, 4:00 PM Eastern Time, 970-491-2602.