

ESCOP NRSP-RC: <http://escop.info/committee/nrsp-rc/>

05.31.2023

5:15 pm – 9:00 pm PT

06.01.2023

7:15 am – 2:30 pm PT

Grand Sierra Resort, Reno NV 89523

Committee Members:

Chair: Mark McGuire (WAAESD)

Executive Vice Chair: Bret Hess (WAAESD ED)

Members:

Steve Lommel (SAAESD, incoming chair)

Gary Thompson (SAAESD ED, incoming executive vice chair)

Blair Siegfried as proxy for Matt Wilson (NERA)

Carolyn Lawrence-Dill (NCRA)

Erdogan Memili (ARD)

Robert Mattive (CARET)

Tom Bewick (NIFA)

Mike Schmitt (ECOP)

Ex-officio:

Jennifer Tippetts (WAAESD Administrative Management, Recording Secretary)

Attendance: Steve Lommel, Mark McGuire, Bret Hess, Blair Siegfried (proxy for Matt Wilson), Bob Mattive, Tom Bewick, Mike Schmitt, Carolyn Lawrence-Dill, Gary Thompson, Jennifer Tippetts (recording secretary).

- I. **Welcome/Introductions** - Mark welcomed members and introductions were made.
- II. **Purpose of NRSP and current funding commitments-** Mark reviewed the purpose of the meeting. NRSP still has room for funding and will review a few new projects today. See file for Timeline for full funding commitments and timeline.
- III. **Virtual presentation of proposal to renew NRSP8** - Noelle Cockett delivered a presentation and had to catch a plane, leaving no time for Q&A. See NRSP 8 File for PPT.
- IV. **Discussion and recommendations for NRSP8-** It was recommended that they need a new name and a new number to help define the project moving forward. However, NRSP8 needs to be retained for consistency in NIMSS. It is important to keep the identity of NRSP8. Others noted that the title is what is important. The goal is to have NRSP_Temp_8 become successful enough to not need NRSP8 funding. The ROI is significant and NRSP8 has done a great job of leveraging their funds. The challenge is to separate the NRSP8 funds from leveraged funds; who gets the credit and how do you differentiate between them? NIFA had not funded the animal side yet but are starting to see the benefits of the big system wide side and animals will catch up with the plant sector. The revision is significantly better than the original proposal. Is this a good model to provide best practices? The NE region is concerned that there is not enough detailed evaluation of the project and has suggested adding a requirement to show a mid-term impact or evaluation. Another suggestion is to bring in an outsider to conduct the evaluation. There have been great impacts, but the next steps can take the project much further. We need to take the project in steps, the science impacts have been immense. **Should impacts be rolled into the guidelines in the future?** The West suggested that the annual reports should focus on adoption. How have other scientific communities accepted and adopted the tools? The communication section was weak. They said they wanted to reach out into the

community, but nothing was defined as a mechanism. They had twenty-two support letters from the industry. NRSP RC should ask how they plan to engage more broadly. There is no purposeful cross communication across the species. They all listen and attend, but they could work at a higher level for integration and alignment. The target audience was not necessarily industry. What is the value of what is being provided? Is there a need by industry?

Mike moved to accept the NRSP_TEMP_8 proposal and budget. Steve seconded the motion. Carolyn provided a friendly amendment to recommend a different title to the project to convey the new focus of the project but keep NRSP8. Discussion point to relay to AAs: an evaluation or impact analysis will be expected at midterm review. Motion approved unanimously.

- V. **Virtual presentation of proposal to establish NRSP11-** Deanna Osmond presented. See NRSP 11 file for PPT

Q&A

Are the 1890's involved, or should they be? Not yet, but they should be at some point in the future. Deanna is not aware of any that currently conduct soil fertility work.

Is the State Department of Ag a client? The State Department of Ag also works with soil specialists at the University. Are the historical P&K data sets in the University? The data resides with LGU's not the state departments.

As the team has developed the support tool, how will substantial varietal differences be built in? Soil fertility has not ever focused on varieties. It would be immensely complicated and difficult to track varieties. Currently track specific crops not the variety. The soil tests do not look at the yield, just if it can supply enough nutrients to feed a crop.

As the tools are adopted by companies selling fertilizer, they are making assurances that it will be enough for specific crops. Is there a missed opportunity because the recommendations are not satisfactory for the needs? Deanna shared that they have learned over the years that only files are provided and other groups make the recommendations and there is no basis for the algorithms. FRST members think there would be a great service to farmers and NRCS if the LGU recommendations were up to date just for corn.

Is there an expectation for continued funding after the first five years? Deanna stated that there is a need to continue to support the infrastructure to maintain but might not be at the level we are at now.

What about data sharing from the people that you need the data from. What are the tactics to get data shared? Deanna shared that they have continued to work with data sharing specialists, some have been very generous. They are hopeful that individuals continue to share. Do you have collaborators in the UK, like you do within the US? Deanna shared they are not working with the UK but working with the National Ag Library.

How are private data going to be incorporated? Deanna noted that it is hard to get data from the universities, but it is even harder to get it from the private sector. Some of the companies run soil fertility trials and some do not.

FRST may want to reach out to NRSP 9 as they have an extensive data set that was

captured from private laboratories. Their leadership might be able to shed light on how they obtained private data.

Considering historical data sets, how accurate are those data since analytical techniques and other measurements at the time they were collected have changed. Deanna shared that it is a very large data set, and we know that there is an aspect of user judgment on how far back you want to take data. Soil depth is an aspect that the committee is working through to have consistency.

VI. Discussion and recommendation for NRSP11- This is a revised proposal and there has been a lot of responsiveness to reviewers and NRSP RC over the past year. Coordination of the regional multi-state projects at national level culminated in a much stronger proposal.

For them to be real and relevant there needs to be billions of data points, can they create something that is usable?

There are challenges but there is a solid plan for progression. The question is about funding expectations and longevity.

The project is taking baby steps and back filling data from 70 years ago to make it usable. Variable rate applications are hard to track and manage and are not practical. They are not trying to fertilize crops, but bringing soil fertility to a certain level, and be able to presents results across the country.

The team is promoting this project as a recommendation tool. Soil fertility is their focus, but not how they are presenting the project.

Recommendations can be difficult to meet expectations. People want more localized recommendations. Will the expectations of the tool be too broad? Industry needs to be involved because people look to industry for recommendations. Just because we collect data does not mean that the data will influence the public. Can these issues be addressed, or should the social sciences be engaged?

There is miss-management of nutrients in Pennsylvania. There were not any recommendations for environments that suffer from over-fertilization.

Carolyn made a motion to provisionally accept and review how they accept these comments before we make a final recommendation to the members. Deadline of mid-August. A response is sufficient. How are they going to manage expectations with the tool? The response must address social, regulatory, environmental, and industry issues. Request intent for funding in the future? Gary seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously.

Blair agreed to bring this back to NERA and find a representative to serve as AA.

VII. Virtual presentation of intent to submit NRSP proposal- Brad Gaolach

See NRSP Proposal File

Have researchers been engaged up front? Brad shared that this is extension based, but community driven.

This could benefit from more conversations and started as extension and industry driven.

Many urban programs have been based on urban pests. Is that a connection where you can incorporate research? Brad shared yes it has been a consideration, how can experts in those areas engage on the larger level and share the data. Can we build a pipeline to research and extension?

Are there already some projects that have been successful and sustainable around urban ag? Were those projects beneficial to their communities? Brad shared that there are robust areas in green storm water infrastructure coming from research in Washington. Urban extension has been gaining traction in ECOP nationally, but there is a lot more opportunity in infrastructure. If we could engage research it would be mutually beneficial to both ECOP and ESCOP.

Are there opportunities in urban forestry and thermal load in urban areas? Is there enough known or is there a research opportunity? Brad shared this is a huge research opportunity. Brad shared that his experience is that LGU's have not been overly engaged in urban issues as others have. Other entities have filled that space. This NRSP could allow for great opportunities for collaboration between extension and research.

Is there an opportunity to build a model where researcher and extension can both be at the table? Brad shared that he was trying to navigate the bounds for NRSP. There is an opportunity for workforce development in the community. Is there a way to incorporate placed based jobs? There are two approaches, the government side and non-profit side. There is an opportunity to use this model in an underserved community. How many jobs can you create? How can 4-H get involved? Brad is trying to evolve this concept over time.

Has water been a consideration. Diverting water away from agriculture in rural areas to urban areas is a contentious issue. Brad shared that this has been a continued issue and this NRSP could be a great opportunity to change this from a critical issue to an organized activity with leadership that can drive outcomes. This structure can allow faculty to draw from the data, not replicate but contribute.

VIII. **Discussion and recommendations for intent NRSP-** This project assumes if one could evoke the interest of researchers then the researchers will come, which is a flawed model. If a model cannot get started at a regional level, how is it going to work on a national level?

This is an opportunity to engage with a group of constituents that has a huge impact. They can easily be mobilized. Researchers respond to opportunities. A lot of these decisions are made on an urban level. There is support for the recommendation to engage researchers to help develop some hypotheses for the initial NRSP. It was agreed that the proposal needs input from research.

This is a virtuous concept. Whatever we can do to socialize, the concept will be beneficial. There should be some coordination with research, extension, and academic programs. Would those other programs be willing to contribute funding?

The social science aspect needs to be reviewed so that expectations are met, and we gain urban constituents.

We need to find ways to get engaged in urban problems. This could be a great opportunity. How engagement is going to happen needs to be addressed. This is a great extension project.

Some research questions could be addressed now instead of waiting. This includes insect and pest management.

The research aspects in urban projects have not always been successful. The proposal should be narrowed and identify a few research objectives on a national level. A few areas could be targeted that have similarities. This could be a pilot program. Is the lack of desirable research the inability to fund research? Municipalities are not as interested in research as they want action now. There is a great opportunity. Are there lessons that that can be learned from? Pittsburgh and Philadelphia are great examples.

The presentation was delivered with more of a psychological lens instead of a data driven perspective. Admittedly, Brad had less than a month to put this concept into writing. We should encourage drafting a proposal that involved more research and includes how extension can be leveraged to support research activities.

Who are the scientists that could provide the data that can be translated by extension in the urban areas?

There is only one LGU campus that is located in an urban area. Does Brad need to look outside of land grant universities?

DEIA is an opportunity that could be addressed with a research project.

The Committee agreed to have Bret continue the conversations. The project needs to include research focus and needs to be national in scope. Connections can be made with other institutions to show the partnerships.

The committee agrees that this proposal should be developed further. The January 2025 submission deadline should provide ample time to address NRSP RC comments.

Steve moved to respond to this presentation with encouragement to submit a proposal by January 2025. Gary seconded the motion. Motion approved unanimously.

- IX. Midterm Review of NRSP4-** Steve shared that the project moved from Rutgers to NC State. There was staff turnover and now they are in a permanent space and fully staffed again. They did a great job of changing the funding from NIFA to a grant. Very effective in advocating. The biggest issue currently is a lot of companies will not be able to license for minor use due to regulatory concerns. The amount of money provided from NRSP is small but critical. This project just celebrated 60 years. The committee is completing work with Hemp, and they had a contingency plan in place to respond to the EPA regulations. The mid-term review was very solid.

Gary moved to approve the project and continue funding at budgeted amounts. Carolyn seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

- X. Midterm Review of NRSP9-** Bret shared that the request at the midterm was to conduct an impact analysis to illustrate what the project has been providing. An evaluator was hired and provided a very comprehensive evaluation of the project's accomplishments. The modeling committee published a paper with basic guidelines that has been cited extensively. The project's impact is still difficult to determine. In addition to the impact analysis there was a suggestion by NRSP RC to explore an alternative business model. NRSP9 efforts explored an alternative business model and decreasing reliance on OTT funding. A 501 C (3) was created in hopes of receiving sponsorship for some of NRSP9's activities. NRSP9 is entering into a contract with NRCS for three years for \$1.5 million dollars, which will help develop the guidelines for animal feeding systems.

Gary moved to approve the project and continue funding at budgeted amounts. Mike seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

XI. Revisions to NRSP Guidelines- The only suggestion was to include requirements to conduct an impact analysis for midterm review, which is included in the attached revisions.

See file for guidelines.

XII. Preliminary discussion of NRSP4's transition plan- For the midterm review, NRSP4 was asked to develop a plan to transition off of NRSP funding. The impact analysis done showed that the economic impact of the project was \$8.9 billion dollars. The plan essentially stated that they do great work and NRSP RC should continue funding. They are a fairly lean operation and are trying to re-establish international component. NRSP RC should recommend continuation of funding at a decreased level because they don't need to run as many field trials. In addition, IR-4 receives \$15 million, which includes a recent increase of \$4 million dollars. The question becomes with the substantial increase in funds, do you still need the financial support from NRSP? There is a significant investment with the additional money to become more modern by transitioning data to an electronic format. Rental fees are now required at the new location. There has also been a transition to contract labor that is more expensive. NRSP RC should be consistent with the requirements placed on all programs and NRSP4 should be held to the same standards. NRSP4 needs to build a budget that shows a reduction in reliance on OTT. The NRSP RC agreed to ask NRSP4 to have a business plan that starts with a 15% reduction in funds. Steve agreed to relay this message to NRSP4.

XIII. Adjourn