



## North Central Regional Association of State Agricultural Experiment Station Directors

### 201<sup>th</sup> Meeting

Jekyll Island Club, Jekyll Island, GA (room TBD)

8-10:30 am, October 1, 2014

### AGENDA

(Click here for meeting [MINUTES](#))

<i>Time</i>	<i>Item #</i>	<i>Topic</i>	<i>Presenter</i>
8:00 am	1.0	Welcome and Call to Order	Ernie Minton, NCRA Chair 2014/15
	2.0	Approval of Summer 2014 Minutes, see: <a href="http://ncra.info/docs/Historical/Minutes/July2014.pdf">http://ncra.info/docs/Historical/Minutes/July2014.pdf</a>	
	3.0	Adoption of the Agenda	
	4.0	Interim Actions of the Chair	
8:10 am	5.0	NCRA Office Report <a href="#">5.1</a> ED Activities <a href="#">5.2</a> NCRA Budget Update 5.3 USDA Climate Hub Update <a href="#">5.4</a> NCRA Comments on NIFA Policy Guide 5.5 NIMSS/NRSP1 Update (see 7.1, NRSP-RC)	Jeff Jacobsen and Chris Hamilton
8:35 am	6.0	MRC Report <a href="#">6.1</a> NRSP-RC	Deb Hamernik, Chris Hamilton, Doug Buhler
8:45 am	<a href="#">7.0</a>	Nominations Committee Update	Ernie Minton
8:55 am	8.0	ESCOPE Committee Reports (brief updates only, will be covered in more detail during ESS business meeting later in the day) <a href="#">8.1</a> Budget and Legislative Committee <a href="#">8.2</a> Communications and Marketing <a href="#">8.3</a> Water Security Working Group <a href="#">8.4</a> National Integrated Pest Management Coordinating Committee (NIPMCC) <a href="#">8.5</a> Futuring Task Force <a href="#">8.6</a> Capital Infrastructure Task Force 8.7 Science and Technology Committee	Steve Slack, Jeff Jacobsen, Ernie Minton (B&L), Karen Plaut (B&L), Daniel Scholl (CMC)  Deb Hamernik (S&T), Joe Colletti (S&T)
9:10 am	9.0	NIFA Plan of Work Needs/Input	Marshall Martin, All
9:30 am	10.0	Spring Meeting 2015 11.1 Planning Update 11.2 Preliminary Ideas for Special Topics (Danforth AgTech Report, local options, NCRA Plan, etc.)	Ernie Minton, Jeff Jacobsen, Chris Hamilton, All

9:40 am	<a href="#">11.0</a>	Resolutions	Marc Linit
9:45 am	12.0	Other Business 12.1 Feedback on reducing meeting costs and travel time 12.2 Joint summer meeting with W region in 2016, instead of 2015? 12.3 NRC Report on NIFA programs ( <a href="http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=18652">http://www.nap.edu/catalog.php?record_id=18652</a> )	Ernie Minton, All
		Future Meetings: <a href="http://ncra.info/Organization_UpcomingMeetings.php">http://ncra.info/Organization_UpcomingMeetings.php</a> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Annual APLU Meeting, November 2-4, 2014, Bonnet Creek Resort, Orlando, FL</li> <li>• Joint CARET/AHS, March 2-5, 2015, Omni Shoreham Hotel, Washington, DC</li> <li>• NCRA Spring Meeting 2015, Embassy Suites San Antonio Riverwalk, March 30-April 1, 2015</li> </ul>	
10:30 am	<b><i>Adjourn</i></b>		

## MEETING MINUTES

**Attendees:** Ernie Minton, NCRA Chair; Dave Benfield, NCRA Past-Chair; Steve Slack, OH; Connie Pelton-Kays, Kansas and CARET Liaison to ESCOP; C.Y. Wang, SD; Marc Linit, MO; Doug Buhler, MI; Jane Schuh, SD; Rick Lindroth, WI; Marshall Martin, Purdue; Karen Plaut, Purdue; Mike Schmitt, MN; Jeff Jacobsen, NCRA ED; Chris Hamilton, NCRA AD and recorder.

<i>Item #</i>	<i>Notes</i>	<i>Action Taken</i>
2.0	Approval of Summer 2014 Minutes, see: <a href="http://ncra.info/docs/Historical/Minutes/July2014.pdf">http://ncra.info/docs/Historical/Minutes/July2014.pdf</a>	Approved
3.0	Adoption of the Agenda	Approved
<a href="#">5.0</a>	<p>Jeff Jacobsen introduced Jane Schuh as the new NDSU Associate Director and newest NCRA member. Jane is a ND native, her field of study is respiratory immunology, and she is also serving NDSU as the Interim Dean of the College of Business.</p> <p>NC Organics Forum: Discussion ensued regarding the NC Organics forum, held last February 2014. It was noted that members of the NC organics forum may communicate in ways different from what AES/LGUs are used to, such as via blogs, Twitter, other online social media. Sentiment on GMOs between the two groups was also considered an important difference.</p> <p>Value of Capacity Funds and OMB: Jeff Jacobsen discussed a recent OMB request via APLU for illustrating the value of capacity funds. The regional EDs created a response document and sent it to APLU to forward to OMB. EDs will work to post this document and make it available for future, similar inquiries.</p> <p>NC USDA Climate Hubs: Each Hub appears to be engaging with LGUs differently. Hub directors are creating a work plan and will share with regional EDs soon. NCRA and NCCEA are collecting contact names to forward on to Jerry Hatfield in the Midwest Hub. Daniel Scholl agreed to be SDSU's main climate contact.</p>	<p>Daniel Scholl added as AES SDSU Climate Hub contact. Chris Hamilton will add his name to the master list.</p>
<a href="#">7.0</a>	<p>Nominations Committee Update</p> <p>Steve Slack indicated that the ESCOP CLP (Committee on Legislation and Policy; formerly the Farm Bill Committee) will be ramping up activities after the November 2014 APLU meeting. More information to come.</p>	For information only
8.0	<p><a href="#">8.2</a> Communications and Marketing: Daniel Scholl will be requesting input via email soon on the CMC operating guidelines.</p>	Send Daniel Scholl any comments on the CMC

		guidelines once you receive his email message.
9.0	NIFA Plan of Work Needs/Input: Due to a schedule conflict, Marshall Martin is unable to serve on the panel this year. David Jackson of UNL has volunteered to serve in his place. Chris Hamilton is collecting NIFA POW input from your stations; please send any comments, improvements, etc. to her. We will allow for further discussion on the 2015 POW during our spring NCRA meeting. NIFA plans to host the POW panel meeting in May/June 2015 and will send more information on this meeting, as well as other questions, to the panelists as it becomes available.	Continue to send NIFA POW comments and improvements to Chris Hamilton.
10.0	Spring Meeting 2015 11.1 Planning Update: Hotel site secured, Chris has sent preliminary registration information. Hotel room reservations: <a href="http://www.embassysuitesriverwalk.com/">http://www.embassysuitesriverwalk.com/</a> , use code "NCR". 11.2 Preliminary Ideas for Special Topics <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Danforth AgTech Report, plant science programs, breeding: How to build/enhance these investments</li> <li>• NCRA plan discussion: build on NCRA Executive Committee input</li> <li>• Professional development for graduate students – What can we do regionally?</li> </ul>	Continue to send special topic suggestions to Jeff and Chris.
<a href="#">11.0</a>	Resolutions	Read and approved. Chris will send John Baker's signed resolution to him.
12.0	Other Business 12.1 Feedback on reducing meeting costs and travel time: Discussion ensued about time and money spent to travel to various meetings. Some prefer easy fly-in locations, near major airports, quick cab ride, etc. Jeff Jacobsen will mention this to the other regional EDs as future meetings are planned.  12.2 2015 meeting will be hosted by SDSU and will not be joint with the W region. Should we decide to go forward with a joint meeting with the W region in 2016, we should focus on possible collaborative work, common themes, joint work products, etc. Also, ECOP/ESCOP joint fall meeting will also take place that year.	

***Adjourn – Chair Minton Adjourned the NCRA meeting. See you in San Antonio!***

## AGENDA BRIEFS:

---

### Item 5.2: ED Current and Future Activities (September 2014)

Presenter: Jeff Jacobsen

**Jeff Jacobsen**  
**Current and Future Activities (September 2014)**

#### General

Six months into Executive Director position

#### NCRA

- Acclimation and Establishment
- Review Minutes, Reports, Planning Documents
- NCRA Fall Meetings/Agenda
- State Visits (see status below)
- NCCEA Executive Director (Robin Shepard) and research ED Interactions
- USDA Panel Manager (A1701 CARE – Critical Ag Research and Extension), Fall-Winter
- NRSP1 (NCRA representative; NIMSS RFP, lead subcommittee for the review and recommendations; Redesign Team lead with Chris Hamilton)
- NCRA Executive Committee (periodic emails, phone calls, correspondence; establishment and refinement of DRAFT NCRA plan)

#### ESCOP

- Support Chair Steve Slack (with Chris Hamilton)
- ED Support for Core Committees and Functions (Science and Technology Exec Vice Chair; ESS Leadership Award; provide leadership to agenda and activities; linkage to NIPMCC)
- ESS Fall Meeting Agenda
- B&L conference calls (ad hoc)

#### Existing Collaborations

- Climate Hubs (Summer and Follow-up Meeting and Collaborations)
- Dairy Research Institute (email, and phone communications, on-hold)
- 2014 Organic Forum (email and conference calls, survey, identify future activities, review of summary report)
- Sun Grant Annual Meeting and Advisory Board (proposals)
- Climate and Corn-based Cropping System CAP (videoconferenced with the Resilient Agriculture-Adapting to a Changing Climate August 5-7)
- Canada Partnerships (Jamshed Merchant I29-I35 H75 Agri-Innovation Corridor discussions)
- Cornerstone Government Affairs and USDA (Fall 2014 and Winter 2015)

#### State Visits

- Kansas State University (March 12-13)
  - \*Arlen Leholm (March 14) and Chris Hamilton (March 15) informal visits
- University of Nebraska and South Dakota State University (May 18-23)
- The Ohio State University (June 25-27)
- Iowa State University and USDA ARS (October 6-9)
- Michigan State University **tbd**, periodic
- North Dakota State University (with NCCEA Fall Conference September 8-12)
- Purdue University (July 1-3)
- University of Illinois (September 2-5)

-University of Minnesota (June 16-18)

-University of Missouri (July 7-10)

-University of Wisconsin (and Chris Hamilton, Robin Shepard) **tbd**

### **Selected Summary of State Visits**

- Thank you for the opportunity for the view into your world. The time and energy put into these state visits has been outstanding.
- Faculties are appreciative of your efforts and are very optimistic about the future.
- Connected with research leadership and others at NCRA institutions.
- Obtained perspectives on NCRA functions, operations and past practices.
- Major investments (people, facilities, programs) are being made across the region to enhance the strategic core strengths.
- The institutional investment and future directions with commercialization of technologies, creation of unique discovery/research parks (and more) is large. Public-private partnerships are being explored with emphasis on workforce development and economic diversification and growth.
- Institutions have unique facilities and service centers that might be strategically linked in to fully capture value through leveraging across the Region.
- State challenges with office/lab and greenhouse (availability); field centers/stations issues with O&M and replacement.
- Opportunities potentially exist for future strategic effort(s) with NCRA and NCEA.
- Opportunities exist to explore enhanced linkages with graduate programs, international programs/experiences and CVM/Med School.
- Optimization of function with multistate committees without increasing transaction costs.
- Institutional initiatives may also provide opportunities to enhance collaborations across the region (global food systems, climate, plant sciences, water quality/quantity, Great Lakes Initiative, Scientists without Borders, Plant Science programs, big data, open data access and so on).
- Identified feedback to USDA competitive and capacity funds processes and procedures that can be improved from both faculty and staff perspectives.
- The local knowledge of multistate programs is variable. Nevertheless, the impact on faculties and programs has been very strong over time.

### **Recent Travel**

2014 Joint COPS, July 21-24, San Diego, CA [**Action:** National network and support]

NCCEA Fall Conference, September 8-12, Fargo, ND [**Action:** NC CES Network and NDSU state visit]

Healthy Soils for Healthy Waters Workshop, September 14-15, Columbus, OH [**Action:** Regional network, Hypoxia SERA project development]

National Integrated Pest Management Coordinating Committee (NIPMCC), September 23-25, Washington, DC [**Action:** Initiate the ESCOP/ECOP concept with the IPM community]

Fall ESS/AES/ARD Meeting, September 30-October 2, Jekyll Island, GA [**Action:** National support; Fall NCRA meeting]

2014 APLU, November 2-4, Orlando, FL [**Action:** National support]

Fall/Winter 2014, CARE Panel Manager, numerous timeframes, Washington, DC [**Action:** Secure insights and perspectives with a new competitive grant program; connect with USDA]

Fall 2014, State Visits: Michigan State University, University of Wisconsin [**Action:** Complete orientation in region]

[Back to Top](#)

**Item 5.2: NCRA Office Budgets Update**  
**Presenters: Jeff Jacobsen, Chris Hamilton**

**For information only.**

**UW-Madison, Assistant Director Budget**

<b>FY2015 Budget Summary, as of 9/18/2014</b>					
<b>Item</b>	<b>Budgeted</b>		<b>Actual</b>		<b>Difference</b>
Salaries	\$	61,141	\$	5,095	\$ 56,046
Fringe	\$	21,399	\$	1,783	\$ 19,616
Consulting					\$ -
Travel and Reg fees	\$	8,000	\$	2,881	\$ 5,119
Telephone/Internet	\$	2,000	\$	449	\$ 1,551
Publications	\$	1,000	\$	40	\$ 960
Supplies/Web fees/Postage	\$	2,000	\$	214	\$ 1,786
Training	\$	1,600	\$	1,599	\$ 1
Collaborations/Meetings	\$	2,000	\$	-	\$ 2,000
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>99,140</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>12,062</b>	<b>\$ 87,078.29</b>
		2014 Carry-over		\$157,704.00	
		Remaining		\$145,642.29	

**Michigan State, Executive Director Budget**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Budgeted (3/2014 to 6/2015)</b>		<b>Actual (as of 9/1/2014)</b>		<b>Difference</b>
Salaries	\$	246,667	\$	77,084	\$ 169,583
Fringe	\$	59,200	\$	20,045	\$ 39,155
Moving Costs	\$	10,000	\$	9,406	\$ 594
Travel and Reg fees	\$	35,000	\$	11,520	\$ 23,480
ED Office Expenses	\$	20,000	\$	3,918	\$ 16,082
MSU Admin Fees	\$	-	\$	1,555	\$ (1,555)
<b>Totals</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>370,867</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>123,528</b>	<b>\$ 247,339</b>

\*\*All state assessments have been paid.

## Item 5.4: NCRA Comments on NIFA Policy Guide

Presenter: Jeff Jacobsen



**Dr. Jeff Jacobsen**

446 West Circle, Room 408  
Justin S. Morrill Hall of Agriculture  
Michigan State University  
East Lansing, MI 48824-1039

August 8, 2014

TO: Dr. Robert Holland, Deputy Director

FR: Jeff Jacobsen, NCRA Executive Director

RE: NIFA Federal Assistance Policy Guide

On behalf of the 12 Agricultural Experiment Station (AES) Directors who lead the research enterprise in the North Central Region, I provide additional comments to the *NIFA Federal Assistance Policy Guide (July 2014)* during this extended comment period. We believe that additional language will provide the desired clarity from NIFA, which partner states will be able to consistently use within the varied administrative configurations that exist across our region that are responsible and accountable for the critical use of grant funds.

For example, South Dakota State University has a Dean and CES Director as one individual with a separate AES Director; while Kansas State University has a Dean and AES/CES Director and two Associate Directors for each (AES and CES) of the mission areas; while Michigan State University has a separate Dean, AES (AgBioResearch) Director and Senior Associate Dean, and CES Director. More administrative configurations could certainly be articulated. Regardless of these unique administrative structures, the *Guide* should provide singular clarity to ensure transparent interpretation and the highest level of accountability in each state respecting the different configurations. Without this focus and the breadth of potential interpretations that could occur as written, the *Guide* unnecessarily introduces ambiguity, creates problems and undermines accountability. The Director(s) should be the sole entity designated with the desired roles, responsibilities and financial authority for grant funds. Lastly, should not 'Grant Funds' be 'Formula Grant Funds' which would align with signatory authority SF-425 reports, POW and so on?

The language below addresses AES Directorship, which is the focus of NCRA. Please consider this language for insertion. Please contact me if you need clarification or have questions.

The Directors of Agricultural Experiment Stations (AES Directors) are the chief administrative officers for AES at the 1862 Land Grant Institutions (LGI). In certain integrated states, the AES Director and CES Director hold a single, consolidated position (AES/CES Director). Per the Hatch Act, federal law assigns to the AES Directors ultimate control and authority over the allocation and use of AES funds within the LGIs (the federal delegation). AES Directors may designate other representatives or roles to assist with administering grant monies within the LGI or organization. Such secondary administrative designation of additional positions notwithstanding, the AES Directors remain the exclusive chief administrative officers authorized to receive and allocate federal AES grant funds and to certify compliance with all corresponding AES obligations.

---

### North Central Regional Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors

Jeff Jacobsen, Executive Director  
jjacobsen@msu.edu

Christina Hamilton, Assistant Director  
chamilton@cala.wisc.edu



## Agenda Item 6.1: NRSP Review Committee Update

**Presenter:** Doug Buhler, Chris Hamilton

**Action Requested:** For action/vote

### NRSP Review Committee Members

<p><a href="#">Bret Hess</a>, Chair (WAAESD)</p> <p><u>Delegates:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Shirley Hymon-Parker (ARD)</li><li>• Doug Buhler (NCRA)</li><li>• Tom Bewick (NIFA)</li><li>• <a href="#">Clarence Watson</a> (SAAESD)</li><li>• <a href="#">L. Washington Lyons</a> (Cooperative Extension)</li></ul>	<p>Executive Directors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <a href="#">Eric Young</a> (SAAESD)</li><li>• <a href="#">Mike Harrington</a>, Executive Vice-Chair (WAAESD)</li></ul> <p>Interim Delegate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <a href="#">Tim Phipps</a> (NERA)</li></ul> <p>Stakeholder Representative:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <a href="#">Don Latham</a> (CARET)</li></ul>
--	---

### Background:

The NRSP Review Committee (NRSP-RC) met in Denver, CO on June 17, 2014 for its annual meeting and held a follow up conference call on August 18<sup>th</sup> to discuss resources needed for the NRSP-1/NIMSS revision (see attached proposal and update) and remaining questions on the NRSP\_temp321 proposal.

### The following actions were taken by the NRSP-RC:

*(Note: These actions are seconded motions that require a majority vote of the Directors to overturn. If this occurs there will be an alternative motion put forward for consideration.)*

- **Guidelines Changes:**

Motion and second and unanimous approval of the following recommendation for substantive changes to the NRSP Guidelines:

- **Section III. A. General:** Change bullet four under delegated authority to “delegate authority to the NRSP-RC to invest up to 1% of total Hatch Funding in NRSPs.”
- **Section IV. B Management and Business Plan:** Add the following “For the multistate program, including NRSPs; leveraging shall mean funding brought to bear on the project objectives regardless of source, not including in-kind support from host institution(s).”

- **Funding recommendations:**

A summary of the NRSP portfolio, including NRSP-RC actions, is below.

**NRSP 2014-2015**

**Requests for Off-the-Top Funding**

<b>Project</b>	<b>Request FY2012</b>	<b>Authorized FY2012</b>	<b>Request FY2013</b>	<b>Authorized FY2013</b>	<b>Request FY2014</b>	<b>Approved FY2014</b>	<b>†Request FY2015</b>	<b>NRSP Review Committee Recommendation</b>
NRSP1 <sup>1</sup>	50,000	50,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000		
NRSP3	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	<i>see below</i>	
NRSP4	481,182	481,182	481,182	481,182	481,182	481,182	481,182	
NRSP6	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000	
NRSP7	325,000	325,000	325,000	325,000	325,000	325,000	<i>see below</i>	
NRSP8	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	
NRSP9	175,000	175,000	175,000	175,000	175,000	175,000	175,000	
NRSP_TEMP001 (NRSP1)							300,000	Approve 3-year budget <sup>1</sup>
NRSP_TEMP003 (NRSP3)							50,000	Approve 5-year budget
NRSP_TEMP301 (NRSP7)							325,000	Approve 1-year budget <sup>2</sup>
NRSP_TEMP321							398,631	Approve 5-year budget <sup>3</sup>

†Assuming an acceptable midterm review, all NRSP budgets were approved during 2012 Fall ESS Meeting for the duration of their current, five-year cycles.

<sup>1</sup>NRSP-1 plans to terminate on September 30, 2014. NRSP\_TEMP001 is requesting approval of a new 3-year proposal and budget to facilitate an overhaul of the NIMSS and maintenance of the new system through a 3-year contract with Clemson University; the impact communications component of the project is ongoing. The 3-year budget is:

	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 2</b>	<b>Year 3</b>
<b>MRF Funding</b>	300,000	183,500	183,500

<sup>2</sup>NRSP7 must demonstrate that they have secured new (not in-kind) funds that are equal to or more than 2x the off-the-top funding requested prior to submitting a renewal proposal.

<sup>3</sup>Unlike other NRSPs, the NRSP\_temp321 MRF budget varies. The 5-year budget is as follows (please reference NIMSS for complete budget details):

	<b>Year 1</b>	<b>Year 2</b>	<b>Year 3</b>	<b>Year 4</b>	<b>Year 5</b>
<b>MRF Funding</b>	398,631	370,165	381,834	433,969	406,591
<b>Other Funding</b>	597,354	732,278	359,245	239,837	238,238
<b><i>Total Project Budget</i></b>	<b><i>995,985</i></b>	<b><i>1,102,443</i></b>	<b><i>741,079</i></b>	<b><i>673,806</i></b>	<b><i>644,829</i></b>

## Summary of NRSPs

<b>Project Number</b>	<b>Project Name</b>	<b>Project Period</b>	<b>Midterm Review Year</b>
<b>NRSP-1</b>	National Information Management and Support System (NIMSS)	2011-2014	2014
<b>NRSP-1 (NRSP_TEMP001)</b>	National Information Management and Support System (NIMSS)	2014-2017	2016
<b>NRSP-3 (NRSP_TEMP003)</b>	The National Atmospheric Deposition Program (NADP)	2014-2019	2017
<b>NRSP-4</b>	Enabling Pesticide Registrations for Specialty Crops and Minor Uses	2010-2015	2013
<b>NRSP-6</b>	The US Potato Genebank: Acquisition, Classification, Preservation, Evaluation and Distribution of Potato (Solanum) Germplasm	2010-2015	2013
<b>NRSP-7 (NRSP_TEMP301)</b>	A National Agricultural Program for Minor Use Animal Drugs	2014-2015	-
<b>NRSP-8</b>	National Animal Genome Research Program	2013-2018	2016
<b>NRSP-9</b>	National Animal Nutrition Program	2010-2015	2013
<b>NRSP_temp321</b>	Database Resources for Crop Genomics, Genetics and Breeding Research	2014-2019	2017

**Project Number: NRSP-1**

**Project Title:** Multistate Research Information Management and Impact Communications Program

**Requested Duration:** October 1, 2014 through September 30, 2017

**Administrative Advisors:** William Brown, Jeff Jacobsen, Steve Loring, Adel Shirmohammadi

**NIFA Representative:** Bart Hewitt

## **STATEMENT OF ISSUES AND JUSTIFICATION**

NRSP-1 serves two critical functions for the State Agricultural Experiment Station (SAES) System. First, it supports the National Information Management and Support System (NIMSS). NIMSS was designed to facilitate the management of multistate research and Extension activities supported by the Hatch Multistate Research Fund (MRF), from conception of the proposal to project termination. NIMSS is a web-based application allowing: (1) online submission of proposals, peer reviews and progress reports, and (2) ready access to this information. An automated e-mail notification function prompts users to take action and sends out notifications for meetings and report deadlines. Researchers, Extension educators, stakeholders and other cooperators can search NIMSS for relevant and timely information related to multistate research projects. In addition, the public has access to research project outlines and impacts. NIMSS is now serving all of the 1862 and 1890 Land-grant institutions, allowing them to manage, in a totally paperless system, their multistate research portfolios. The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) National Institute for Food and Agriculture (NIFA) also uses NIMSS to download and integrate data into its management dashboard and pre-populate federal forms.

The second important function that NRSP-1 serves is the communication of impacts of multistate research and Extension activities. The impact communications component of NRSP-1 enhances the visibility of Land-grant institutions and the success of the multistate research projects. Impact statements are prepared by a communications specialist at the termination of every project (approximately 60 per year) and are sent to: Administrative Advisors, Regional Executive Directors and their assistants, NIFA representatives and the ESCOP marketing agency kglobal. Administrative Advisors share the statements with project participants, partner trade associations, regulatory organizations, and other stakeholders. The impact statements are posted on the Regional Association websites and are also entered into the National Land-grants Impact Database (<http://www.landgrantimpacts.org>). They are used by NIFA staff in the preparation of reports and responses to Congressional and other inquiries. kglobal features the impact statements on the Ag Is America website (<http://agisamerica.org/>), and on the Ag Is America Twitter feed (reaching over 26,000 users) and Facebook page with about 4,000 followers. This

relatively new component of NRSP-1 has been extremely effective and very well received within the Land-grant University system, its public and private partners, its stakeholders and the public in general. Collectively, the NIMSS database system and the impact communications program provide for open and transparent systems that enhance compliance and accountability for SAES.

The Experiment Station Section is entering into a three-year contract with Clemson University to redesign, host and maintain NIMSS. The first year will be focused on the redesign of NIMSS, while the following two years will provide ongoing maintenance and the opportunity to further enhance NIMSS. The NIMSS redesign will provide substantial direct benefits to administrators and staff of SAES, participating scientists, federal agencies, and many others utilizing this system. There will also be indirect benefits to the public through increased access to current activities and outcomes from the Multistate Research portfolio.

The contract with Clemson will be for the period October 1, 2014 to September 30, 2017. The NRSP-1 Management Committee requests that the current NRSP-1 be terminated effective September 30, 2014 and that this new project be approved for a three year period, October 1, 2014 to September 30, 2017, to correspond to the contract with Clemson. Approval of this request will allow the project to continue to provide critical research support services to the SAES system during the three year contract with Clemson. During the final year of this project, a new five year NRSP-1 project proposal will be developed to support the enhanced NIMSS and the impact communications programs.

## **IMPLEMENTATION**

### **Objectives and Projected Outcomes**

**Objective 1:** Maintain and enhance the effectiveness and functionality of NIMSS and access and utilization of the NIMSS database.

**Objective 2:** More effectively document and communicate impacts of the multistate research activities

### **Outcomes:**

At any given time, there are about 300 active multistate research projects and activities recorded in NIMSS. At its peak period, NIMSS gets 28,000 hits per day, and an average of 15,000 hits per day during normal operations. Data transferred varied from 2GB to 4GB per day, during slow to heavy periods. New users register daily and the number of registered active, frequent users are recorded at over 11,000. NIMSS will continue to serve this clientele and the public during the project period, allowing for timely submission of proposals and reports, conduct of peer reviews, meeting notifications, participation and access to information in real time.

In addition, new functionalities will be introduced in NIMSS to enhance access to and quality of information available to users. It is anticipated that participation will continue to be expanded to include those outside the Land-grant system, and will include additional federal and state partners, producers, commodity groups, foundations and foreign scientists. NIMSS will serve as an effective communication tool to share research data and hence, ease the application of new discoveries and technology transfer.

Since its inception in 2002, NIMSS has been used to collect and store information on hundreds of scientists working in multistate projects in specific Knowledge Areas (KAs), Subject of Investigation (SOI) and Field of Science (FOS). NIMSS serves as a national repository of experts and their specializations. This capability will be explored further to build programs to analyze where expertise can be tapped to address national and regional priorities and to solve emerging problems.

NIMSS will be transformed into an even more effective tool in reporting the accomplishments and impacts of agricultural research carried out by Land-grant institutions. This impact information will be used to prepare more effective impact statements from multistate research activities. The Impacts Communication Specialist will continue to refine and enhance the impact statements. More effective ways to communicate impacts will be developed to reach a broader audience. Timely and relevant impact stories will continue to be identified and targeted to popular press outlets such as newspapers (local and national), university publications, industry magazines, agriculture magazines and online news sites. These efforts will greatly enhance the visibility of the Land-grant universities and specifically demonstrate the return in public investment in the multistate research system.

### **Management Budget and Business Plan**

General oversight, policy development, proposal preparation and budget recommendation will be provided by a Management Committee composed of: four Administrative Advisors, representing each of the four SAES regions; an ARD Director; a Cooperative Extension Director; the NIMSS Manager; the four Regional System Administrators; two director's administrative assistants who use NIMSS routinely; and two communicators/writers to advise the impact reporting program. The Administrative Advisors will elect one of their representatives to be the Lead Advisor and Chair of the Committee. NIFA will assign one or more non-voting representatives to the Committee.

NIMSS is managed by each of the Regional Associations serving the SAES. The Regional System Administrators handle the day-to-day tasks related to maintaining the system and answer queries from their users.

The WAAESD Office (WDO) provides coordination, editorial oversight, and physical space to the impact communications component of NRSP-1. The WDO also provides coordination between this effort and the ongoing efforts of ESCOP and ECOP (i.e., with kglobal, Cornerstone,



the ESCOP/ECOP Communications and Marketing Committee, and the National Land-grant Impacts Database Project).

Funding for NRSP-1 will be provided through an off-the-top allocation from the Hatch Multistate Research Fund. NRSP-1 will provide important administrative support services to research administrators and staff, project participants and other users of NIMSS and the impact communication efforts. Funding for NRSP-1 is seen as an administrative expense and alternative sources of funding are not anticipated.

### **Integration and Documentation of Budget Support**

NRSP-1 was developed to facilitate the management and communication of the impacts of integrated research and Extension activities supported by the Hatch Multistate Research Fund. It supports all 1862 and 1890 Experiment Station and Cooperative Extension participants. The program can also accommodate integrated education activities as the need arises.

### **Outreach, Communications and Assessment**

Input from SAES administrators and scientists on issues of policy, planning, and management of NRSP-1 is essential element in sustaining it as an effective support system. The approval of this NRSP provides the mechanism to support the representation of user interests and provide a forum to assess the effectiveness of the outreach of the NRSP-1 programs.

The Regional System Administrators will serve as the primary contacts and source of information and training for university administrators, program managers, investigators, business officers, and station staff using NIMSS. The WDO will serve as the primary contact and source of information on the impact communications component. The NRSP-1 Management Committee will serve as stakeholder representatives in addressing assessment issues and to help evaluate the effectiveness of outreach efforts. The representatives will be responsible for collecting information from the institutions in their respective regions or associations to reflect the effectiveness of the NIMSS and the impact communications programs in meeting their needs and objectives. The Committee will provide an annual report outlining the accomplishments of the previous year in support of the objectives at the ESS fall meeting. A copy of the report will accompany the annual budget request.

**PROJECT PARTICIPATION:** All 1862 and 1890 Land-grant Institutions

**LITERATURE CITED:** N/A

<b>BUDGET:</b>	<u>2014-15</u>	<u>2015-16</u>	<u>2016-17</u>
NIMSS:	\$245,000 <sup>1</sup>	\$128,500 <sup>2</sup>	\$128,500 <sup>2</sup>
Impact Communications Project:	\$ 55,000	\$ 55,000	\$ 55,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$300,000</b>	<b>\$183,500</b>	<b>\$183,500</b>

---

<sup>1</sup> The 2014-15 NIMSS budget request of \$245,000 corresponds to the first redesign cost of \$265,000 proposed by Clemson minus \$20,000 in carry-over NRSP-1 funds residing at Rutgers.

<sup>2</sup> The 2015-16 and 2016-17 NIMSS budget requests of \$128,500 reflect the on-going operations and maintenance cost proposed by Clemson.

## **NIMSS Update (9/2014)**

**Presenters:** Jeff Jacobsen, Dan Rossi

Current NIMSS - NIMSS had undergone two transfers in 2014. The first involved moving the system from the Univ. of Maryland to an external server, and the second to a Rutgers' Amazon Web Service account. The transfer to the Rutgers' server account was completed on August 27. Coding adjustments are underway to correct glitches due to a software upgrade (to ColdFusion ver.11) related to the second migration. Data entry is working and upload to the NIFA REEport has been restored. Approval letters and meeting authorizations are not automatically sent yet, but can be copied and pasted to committees as needed. At this time, the current system will be maintained and used until the newly re-designed NIMSS is ready for rollout. Maintenance of the current system is planned for the remainder of CY2014 and CY2015.

Future "NIMSS"- A subcommittee of NRSP1 [Jeff Jacobsen (chair), Bill Brown, Steve Loring, Adel Shirmohammadi, Shirley Hyman-Parker, Chris Hamilton] reviewed the responses to a national solicitation for a redesign of NIMSS. Available members of this group and two IT professionals (Robert Ridenour UTIA; John Chamberlain NMSU) participated in a conference call with Clemson's Youth Learning Institute Information Technology Team (ITT) to respond to provided questions and offer additional insights. Several follow-on calls were made to clarify residual questions. In addition, two other IT professionals reviewed this proposal with favorable recommendations. These details were provided to NRSP1 electronically and discussed in conference calls.

NRSP1 recommends developing a contract with Clemson's ITT for the redesign, operations and maintenance of the new system. The one-time cost of the redesign is \$265,000 and the on-going cost of operations/maintenance is \$128,500. This would require: 1) termination of NRSP1 on September 30, 2014, and renewal with a 3-year proposal and budget and 2) a contract for service with ITT.

Our discussion has been to develop a 3-year contract. One year of redesign and two years of operations/maintenance with the new system. This would result in a redesign that is responsive, operational and optimally tested by the national system over the following two years.

### **Recommended ESS Actions for NIMSS:**

NRSP1 recommends that the new, 3-year NRSP1 budget for NIMSS be:

- \$245,000 one-time NIMSS redesign (\$265,000 - \$20,000 in carry-over funds) for FY2015
- \$128,500 on-going NIMSS operations/maintenance for FY2016
- \$128,500 on-going NIMSS operations/maintenance for FY2017

- The new 3-year budget would also include an increase the budget for the Impact Communications Specialist to \$55,000 (from \$53,410) for FY2015, FY2016, and FY2017 to accommodate variable fringe benefit rates.
- The total request for NRSP1 is \$300,000 [FY2015], \$183,500 [FY2016] and \$183,500 [FY2017] as presented in three-year NRSP1 proposal [FY2014-17].

A proposed NIMSS redesign team composed of: four regional NIMSS System Administrators (Chris Hamilton, Sarah Lupis, Rubie Mize, Donna Pearce), one Executive Director (Jeff Jacobsen), Director (Steve Loring), four State staff regional representatives (Shelley Whitworth [NC], Tammy Heil [S], Angie Dangerfield [W], Rachel Unger [NE]), NIFA representative (Katelyn Sellers). In addition, ITT recommends that 1-2 people become the day-to-day contacts for their programmers. Chris and Sarah have volunteered to be these contacts.

[Back to Top](#)

## **Item 7.0: Nominations Committee Update**

**Presenter: Ernie Minton**

### **Action requested:**

- Review officers list below and inform Chris of any changes.
- AA volunteer/suggestions needed for NC1177: Agricultural and Rural Finance Markets in Transition.

### **NORTH CENTRAL REGIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION DIRECTORS**

2015 Officers and Committee Members  
(Fiscal Year 2015 begins **October 1, 2014**)  
Last Updated: 7/17/2014

#### **Officers:**

E. Minton, KS, NCRA Chair (14 and 15) ([eminton@ksu.edu](mailto:eminton@ksu.edu))  
D. Benfield, OH, Past Chair (14 and 15) ([benfield.2@osu.edu](mailto:benfield.2@osu.edu))

#### **Executive Committee:**

D. Benfield, OH, Past Chair (13) ([benfield.2@osu.edu](mailto:benfield.2@osu.edu))  
E. Minton, KS, NCRA Chair (14 and 15) ([eminton@ksu.edu](mailto:eminton@ksu.edu))  
D. Hamernik, NE, Chair-Elect (14) ([dhamernik2@unl.edu](mailto:dhamernik2@unl.edu))  
J. Jacobsen, NCRA, Exec. Vice Chair (Perm) ([jjacobsn@msu.edu](mailto:jjacobsn@msu.edu))

#### **Multistate Research Committee (3-year term):**

Archie Clutter, NE, MRC Chair (15) ([aclutter2@unl.edu](mailto:aclutter2@unl.edu))  
J. Colletti, IA, (13-16) ([colletti@iastate.edu](mailto:colletti@iastate.edu))  
R. Lindroth, WI, (14-17) ([lindroth@wisc.edu](mailto:lindroth@wisc.edu))  
N. Merchen, IL, (15-18) ([nmerchen@illinois.edu](mailto:nmerchen@illinois.edu))  
J. Jacobsen, Ex-Officio ([jjacobsn@msu.edu](mailto:jjacobsn@msu.edu))

#### **Resolutions Committee (3-year term):**

M. Linit, MO, (15-18) ([linit@missouri.edu](mailto:linit@missouri.edu))

#### **Nominating Committee (2-year term):**

Ernie Minton, KS (15-17) ([eminton@ksu.edu](mailto:eminton@ksu.edu))

#### **Committee on Legislation and Policy**

S. Slack, OH (Effective 7/2013) ([Oardc@osu.edu](mailto:Oardc@osu.edu))  
J. Jacobsen, Ex-Officio ([jjacobsn@msu.edu](mailto:jjacobsn@msu.edu))

#### **NRSP Review Committee Representative (4-year term):**

Doug Buhler, MI (14-18) ([buhler@msu.edu](mailto:buhler@msu.edu))

#### **ESCOP (3-year term):**

E. Minton, KS, NCRA Chair ([eminton@ksu.edu](mailto:eminton@ksu.edu))  
D. Benfield, OH, NCRA Past Chair ([benfield.2@osu.edu](mailto:benfield.2@osu.edu))  
Jeff Jacobsen, NCRA (Perm Alt) ([jjacobsn@msu.edu](mailto:jjacobsn@msu.edu))

**ESCOP Executive Committee:**

E. Minton, KS, NCRA Chair ([eminton@ksu.edu](mailto:eminton@ksu.edu))  
Jeff Jacobsen, NCRA (Perm Alt) ([jjacobsn@msu.edu](mailto:jjacobsn@msu.edu))

**ESCOP Chair's Advisory Committee:**

Jeff Jacobsen, NCRA (Perm Alt) ([jjacobsn@msu.edu](mailto:jjacobsn@msu.edu))

**ESCOP Budget and Legislative Committee:**

J. E. Minton, KS ([eminton@ksu.edu](mailto:eminton@ksu.edu))  
Karen Plaut, IN ([kplaut@purdue.edu](mailto:kplaut@purdue.edu))

**ESCOP Communications and Marketing Committee:**

W. Wintersteen, IA ([agdean@iastate.edu](mailto:agdean@iastate.edu))  
D. Scholl, SD, ([daniel.scholl@sdstate.edu](mailto:daniel.scholl@sdstate.edu))

**ESCOP Science and Technology Committee:**

J. Colletti, IA, ([colletti@iastate.edu](mailto:colletti@iastate.edu))  
D. Hamernik, NE, (14) ([dhamernik2@unl.edu](mailto:dhamernik2@unl.edu))  
Jeff Jacobsen, NCRA (Perm Alt) ([jjacobsn@msu.edu](mailto:jjacobsn@msu.edu))

**ESCOP Science and Technology Committee Social Science Sub-Committee (3-year term):**

Abigail Borron, IN (13) ([aborron@purdue.edu](mailto:aborron@purdue.edu)) - Ag Communications  
Scott Loveridge, MI (13) ([loverid2@anr.msu.edu](mailto:loverid2@anr.msu.edu)) – Ag Econ (Joe Colletti will replace when Scott steps down)  
Mike Retallick, IA (13) ([msr@iastate.edu](mailto:msr@iastate.edu)) – Ag Education  
Soyeon Shim, WI (13) ([sshim7@wisc.edu](mailto:sshim7@wisc.edu)) – Human Sciences  
Linda Lobao, OH (14) ([lobao.1@osu.edu](mailto:lobao.1@osu.edu))– Rural Sociology

**ESCOP NIMSS Oversight Committee/NRSP1:**

J. Colletti, IA ([colletti@iastate.edu](mailto:colletti@iastate.edu))  
Jeff Jacobsen, NCRA ([jjacobsn@msu.edu](mailto:jjacobsn@msu.edu))

**Other Appointments**

**North Central Rural Development Center Board (4-year term):**

D. Buhler, MI (perm, MSU rep), ([buhler@msu.edu](mailto:buhler@msu.edu))  
N. Merchen, IL, (14-16) ([nmerchen@illinois.edu](mailto:nmerchen@illinois.edu))  
CY Wang, SD, (14-16) ([cy.wang@sdstate.edu](mailto:cy.wang@sdstate.edu))

**North Central Bioeconomy Consortium**

NCBEC Vice President, J. Colletti, IA ([colletti@iastate.edu](mailto:colletti@iastate.edu))

**North Central Regional Aquaculture Center**  
NCRA Representative, J.E. Minton, KS ([eminton@ksu.edu](mailto:eminton@ksu.edu))

[Back to Top](#)

**Item 8.1: Budget and Legislative Committee**  
**NCRA Presenters: Ernie Minton and Karen Plaut**

For information only

The committee holds regular conference calls on the last Tuesday of each month that have generally been well attended. The current B&L Committee membership is shown below. Gary Thompson will assume chair at the ESS meeting.

Chair: Bret Hess (WAAESD)  Delegates: Barry Bequette (ARD) Carolyn Brooks (ED-ARD) Karen Plaut (NCRA) Ernie Minton NCRA Tim Phipps (NERA) Gary Thompson (NERA)* Bill Brown (SAAESD) Bob Shulstad (SAAESD) Jim Moyer (WAAESD) Jeff Steiner (WAAESD)  Executive Vice-Chair Mike Harrington (WAAESD)	Liaisons Rick Klemme Chair ECOP BLC Paula Geiger (NIFA) Emir Albores (NIFA) Glen Hoffsis (APLU Vet Med) Eddie Gouge (APLU) Ian Maw (APLU) Dina Chacon-Reitzel (CARET) Cheryl Achterberg (APLU - BoHS)  Jim Richards (Cornerstone) Hunt Shipman (Cornerstone) Vernie Hubert (Cornerstone)  *Chair elect
--	--

**Water Working Group:** The B&L Committee endorsed the program description and supports bringing forward a “Big Audacious Ask” on Water Security based on the Water Working Group efforts. This effort is in conjunction with our Extension colleagues, in consultation with Cornerstone and endorsed by ESCOP and ECOP, the BAC and the Policy Board. The Initiative is for \$100m/yr. for 5 yrs. The Committee recognizes that it may take a year or two to accomplish.

**Status of NRSP-7 Minor use Animal Drug Program:** The project has requested a one year budget (NRSP-RC approved \$325,000) which does not provide for program sustainability and is insufficient to cover a single drug approval. This may be a terminal year for the project unless they are successful in obtaining additional funds.

The NRSP-7 Committee has developed a request for approximately \$6 m which would provide realistic support for the project. Unfortunately, it is difficult to rally support from the diverse stakeholder groups e.g. sheep goats, llamas, catfish, deer etc. There is language in the 2014 Farm Bill that authorizes this type of program. The NRSP-7 Committee intends to spend the year exploring alternative funding options and bolstering stakeholder support for a proposal that would provide realistic funding.



**Survey in Science Roadmap Implementation:** The B&L Committee is conducting a survey to determine the impact of the Science Roadmap has had on decision making in the SAES system. As of this writing, there have been 50 responses. The results indicate the following:

- 68% of respondents report that the Science Roadmap has guided programmatic decisions.
- Of those reporting no change
  - 47% reported the priorities were already aligned with the Roadmap
  - 26% indicated a lack of resources
  - 20% of responses indicated lack of awareness

**Challenges 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 were most influential in programmatic decisions:**

Challenge 1: We must enhance the sustainability, competitiveness, and profitability of U.S. food and agricultural systems.	87.18% n=34
Challenge 2: We must adapt to and mitigate the impacts of climate change on food, feed, fiber, and fuel systems in the United States.	82.05% N=32
Challenge 3: We must support energy security and the development of the Bioeconomy from renewable natural resources in the United States.	74.36% N=29
Challenge 4: We must play a global leadership role to ensure a safe, secure, and abundant food supply for the United States and the world.	82.05% N=32
Challenge 5: We must improve human health, nutrition, and wellness of the U.S. population.	84.62% 33
Challenge 6: We must heighten environmental stewardship through the development of sustainable management practices.	82.05% N=32
Challenge 7: We must strengthen individual, family, and community development and resilience.	61.54% N=24
— The Grand Challenges have had little to no impact on programmatic decisions for my unit.	7.69% n-3

**Among the highest priority action items from within the Challenge areas:**

Improving agricultural productivity by sustainable means, considering climate, energy, water, and land use challenges	82.05% n=32
Developing new plant and animal production systems, products, and uses to increase economic return to producers	82.05% n=32
Improving existing and developing new models for use in climate variability and change studies; addressing carbon, nitrogen, and water changes in response to climate; assessing resource needs and efficiencies; identifying where investments in adaptive capacity will be most beneficial; and addressing both spatial and temporal scale requirements for agricultural decision making	58.97% n-23
Developing economic assessments to provide more accurate estimates of climate change impacts and the potential costs and benefits of adaptation, and to validate and calibrate models	33.33% n=13
Developing technologies to improve production-processing efficiency of regionally-appropriate biomass into bioproducts (including biofuels)	61.54% n-24

Assessing the environmental, sociological, and economic impacts of the production of biofuels and coproducts at local and regional levels to ensure sustainability	46.15% n=18
Developing technologies and breeding programs to maximize the genomic potential of plants and animals for enhanced productivity and nutritional value	79.49% n=31
Developing effective methods to prevent, detect, monitor, control, trace the origin of, and respond to potential food safety hazards, including bioterrorism agents, invasive species, pathogens (foodborne and other), and chemical and physical contaminants throughout production, processing, distribution, and service of food crops and animals grown under all production systems	61.54% n=24
Investigating the potential of nutritional genomics in personalized prevention or delay of onset of disease and in maintenance and improvement of health	43.59% n=17
Developing community-based participatory methods that identify priority areas within communities, including built environments, that encourage social interaction, physical activity, and access to healthy foods— especially fruits and vegetables—and that can best prevent obesity in children and weight gain in adults	58.97% n=23
Reducing the level of inputs and improving the resource use efficiency of agricultural	64.10% 25
Developing ecologically-sound livestock and waste management production systems and	69.23% n=27
Understanding how local food systems actually work, particularly for small producers and low-income consumers, and how local food production contributes to the local economy, to social and civic life, and to the natural environment	64.10% n=25
Understanding the relative merits of people-, sector-, and place-based strategies and policies in regional economic development and improving the likelihood that rural communities can provide supportive environments for strengthening rural families and spurring a civic renewal among people, organizations, and institutions	46.15% n=18
The action items have had little to no impact on programmatic decisions for my unit.	12.82% n=5

### Types of Programmatic Decisions Influenced:

Created new faculty/staff positions that were better aligned with Roadmap priorities	32.35% n=11
Allocated funds to new programs/projects that were better aligned with Roadmap priorities	58.82% n=20
Redirected funds to existing programs/projects that were better aligned with Roadmap priorities	67.65% n=23

### Responses by Region:

ARD	12.50% n=5
NCRA	27.50% n=11
NERA	12.50% n=5
SAAESD	27.50% n=11

WAAESD	20.00% n=8
--------	---------------

[Back to Top](#)

## Item 8.2: ESCOP Communications and Marketing Committee

Presenter: Daniel Scholl

### Background Information:

#### 1. Committee Membership:

Wendy	Wintersteen	AHS
Ian	Maw	APLU Representative to CMC
Hunt	Shipman	Cornerstone Government Affairs
Nancy	Cox	ESCOP CMC Representative to NC-FAR; CMC ESCOP Co-Chair
Steve	Slack	ESCOP Chair, FY2014
Michael	Harrington	ESCOP ED
Mary	Duryea	Southern Region ESCOP
Ronald	Pardini	Western Region ESCOP
Jenny	Nuber	kglobal
Daniel	Scholl	North Central Region ESCOP
Robin	Shepard	ECOP ED
Jane	Schuchardt	ECOP ED&A Point Person
Carolyn	Brooks	1890s Region ESCOP; ESCOP ED
Kirk	Pomper	1890s Region ARD
William	Hare	Northeast Region ECOP
Tom	Coon	North Central Region ECOP
Gina	Eubanks	1890s Region ECOP
Darren	Katz	kglobal
Tony	Windham	Southern Region ECOP
Daniel	Rossi	ESCOP ED&A Point Person
Connie	Pelton Kays	CARET
Jimmy	Henning	ECOP Chair, FY2014
Richard	Rhodes	Northeast Region ESCOP
Scott	Reed	CMC ECOP Co-Chair
Faith	Peppers	ACE Representative to CMC
Linda	Martin	ACOP Representative to CMC

2. Meetings – The CMC met by conference call on September 25, 2014. Its next conference call is scheduled for November 20, 2014.

#### 3. Update:

- The CMC works closely with kglobal and Cornerstone on a targeted educational effort to increase awareness and support for basic and applied research and transformational education provided by Land Grant Universities through Agricultural Experiment Stations and Cooperative Extension.

- We are into the second year of a partnership with ECOP to support the Project. ECOP has funding to support one additional year (2015).
- The AHS had indicated an interest in joining the effort and suggested the possible expansion the effort. An expansion proposal was prepared by kglobal in response to a request from the CMC. It included three potential alternatives for expanding the initiative:
  - Being Smarter: Messaging – includes regional focus groups and national survey for message validation, \$80,000 – 100,000
  - Being Broader: Targeting More Districts – adding 10 additional target districts, \$120,000
  - More Integrated: Leveraging the Power of the Communicators – working with all communicators from system rather than only those in target districts, \$75,000
- The PBD requested that the CMC prepare a set of recommendations concerning the expansion alternatives. A report with recommendations was submitted to the PBD at their July meeting. The AHS supported the report and overall initiative but decided to continue the initiative at the current level of \$400,000 with funding evenly split between ESS and CES. The AHS is also interested in supporting a workshop for ag communications to interact with kglobal and learn how to better support the effort.
- The CMC has focused its messages during the past year on nutrition and health. It is now considering adding a second focus – water security.
- The CMC will also be working on updating its operational guidelines and developing a plan of work for the coming year.

**Action Requested:** For information only.

[Back to Top](#)

### **Item 8.3: Water Security Working Group**

**Presenters:** Jeff Jacobsen, Steve Slack

#### **National Initiative on the Improvement of U.S. Water Security**

**Presenter:** H M Harrington

**For information only**

Recommendations of the Water Working Group representing the nation's Land Grant Institutions have been endorsed by ESCOP and ECOP, the respective Budget and Legislative Committees, the BAC, and the Policy Board of Directors. The recommendations have been shared with NIFA.

#### **Background and Specific Recommendations:**

Water availability and quality are essential to U.S. security interests. While it is vital to human health, water is a finite natural resource upon which our economy depends. Many important challenges exist for managing and protecting our water resources that can, and must, be addressed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) through the vast expertise and capacity of the nation's Land Grant Institutions (LGIs).

Examples of these challenges include: agricultural systems threatened by drought, fire, and flood; concerns over water reallocation and its impact on agricultural production and natural resources; the vitality of communities; impacts from agricultural and rural activities on fresh water systems, drinking water, and recreation; toxic algal blooms and nutrient rich dead zones in surface waters and coastal estuaries; lost diversity in our terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems; expanding needs for energy production; uncertainties due to climate variability; a range of human health and disease problems exacerbated by lack of water, too much water, or excess loading of nonpoint contaminants; and the long-term implications to local, regional and national economic conditions. Such problems often are framed and aggregated as national issues; however, a robust program to mitigate and solve them requires a response that reflects the unique local attributes (e.g., the interaction of people, land and water) that influence decisions about water management and protection. The tripartite mission of research, teaching, and community-based extension uniquely positions Land Grant Institutions to apply site-specific, science-based solutions that will protect, sustain, and improve U.S. water security. The challenges associated with protecting U.S. water security are among the most pressing issues of our present and future generations. Addressing future U.S. water needs will require USDA to reinvigorate its partnership with the nation's Land Grant Institutions. There is tremendous capacity in the Land Grant Institutions to conduct agricultural research, develop adequate water resource management strategies, train future generations of scientists, educators and water professionals, and to work directly with citizens on their problems through the community-based Cooperative Extension Service. The following recommendations call for bold steps in research and program funding that should be taken by USDA and the National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA). **This report outlines a \$100 million (annual) initiative by the nation's Land Grant Institutions (LGIs) to address the nation's water security challenges.**

#### **The National Water Resources Working Group**

Land Grant Institutions are central in USDA's response to protecting the nation's water resources. To develop a strategy for enhancing how Land Grant Institutions can help USDA, the Board on Agriculture Assembly [by way of the Policy Board of Director's Budget and Advocacy Committee (BAC)] created an *ad hoc* national Working Group on Water Resources in Fall 2013. The 23 member Working Group was charged with developing recommendations for how Land Grant Institutions can best address U.S. Water

Security (e.g., water quantity and quality issues) following their tripartite mission of research, education and Extension. Members were selected based on experience with previous programs, their expertise, and regional representation.

The Working Group focused on two phases of activities leading to a final set of recommendations.

1. The identification and prioritization of **The Grand Challenges in Protecting and Improving U.S. Water Security**. These are the issues and problems that the nation's Land Grant Institutions have a critical role in addressing – ranging from problem identification and needs assessment, problem solving, resource protection and management, and remediation.

2. The prioritization of **The Essential Elements to an Integrated Response by The National Network of Land Grant Institutions** to address the highest area of need – this included programmatic priorities and institutional structures/mechanisms/expertise/etc...

### **Guiding Principles Behind the Working Group's Recommendations**

In developing recommendations the working group started with several important side-boards to its discussions. These principles provided valuable guidance in keeping the group focused on the most critical water issues, and on the strategic role of the nation's Land Grant Institutions in dealing with those issues. These principles included:

- Focusing on water resources issues that include both water quality and quantity;
- Identifying opportunities for enhancing integrated responses to water challenges with research, education and extension functions of the nation's Land Grant Institutions;
- Applying Land Grant University expertise to water problems that span agricultural, rural and urbanizing landscapes;
- Linking to, and leveraging the broader expertise within our universities (e.g., state water resource centers);
- Addressing local and multistate problem solving and program implementation (and where appropriate geographic and watershed-based problem approaches);
- Fostering effective localized responses and implementation to solving water problems and reducing threats (especially by strengthening community-based extension, academic teaching programs, and applied research and demonstration);
- Stressing how multistate and interdisciplinary approaches (and/or expertise teams) will employ natural sciences, engineering and social sciences;
- Ensuring regional/multistate collaboration among Land Grant Institutions and NIFA;
- Building upon the recommendations from the Section 406/Integrated Activities Task Force – a Task Force formed jointly by the Extension Committee on Organization and Policy (ECOP) and Experiment Station Committee on Organization and Policy (ESCOP). [The Task Force authored two reports, June 2011 and April 2013.] Strong consideration was given to maintaining the intent (functional equivalency) of programs already prioritized by the Task Force;
- Identifying opportunities for partnerships and leveraging both expertise and fiscal resources within USDA (e.g., NIFA, ARS, USFS, and NRCS), as well as other agencies (e.g., Department of Interior, Environmental Protection Agency); and
- When identifying fiscal elements, a consolidated budget proposal (as few lines as possible) shall be considered.

### **The Grand Challenges - Protecting and Improving U.S. Water Security**

The Working Group's first phase of actions focused on the identification and subsequent prioritization of the water issues and problems that the nation's Land Grant Institutions have a critical role in addressing.

This broad array of problems is the basis for what the Working Group identified as “National Issues of Significance” (See Figure 1). These issues represent both current and emerging threats to U.S. water security and are thus primary drivers for future Land Grant University research, teaching programs and extension-outreach to communities. Addressing U.S. water security interests will require substantial investment in new/additional funding.

In its effort to categorize the dominant national issues associated with U.S. water security, the Water Working Group conducted a review of more than two-dozen recent priority identification efforts. This review included: academic papers; reports on priority setting processes by USDA, Land Grant Institutions and other partner agencies; and previous work by Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities (APLU), ESCOP and ECOP.

This comprehensive approach to issue identification resulted in the emergence of five National Issues of Significance: (1) Food and Agricultural Production, (2) Environment and Ecosystem Services, (3) Energy Production, (4) Human Health and Safety, and (5) Community Vitality [See Figure 1, next page].

These five issues represent themes, or categories of challenges, that Land Grant Institutions are well equipped to make a difference in solving through efforts that are science-based, targeted, and integrated across Agricultural Experiment Stations (AES) and Cooperative Extension Service (CES).

The titles and descriptions for the Issues of National Significance were carefully chosen to reflect how citizens understand problems. Under each of the five issues, the Working Group offers a few specific examples of problems that can be generally grouped under a respective issue. This list of examples is not intended to be comprehensive or exhaustive, rather an illustration of the issues that will be addressed by Land Grant Institutions.

**Figure 1. National Issues of Significance**



**Grand Challenge**

# The Improvement of U.S. Water Security

*Water Security is important for the vitality and resiliency of U.S. Agriculture and Rural Communities*

**(Keystones)  
Issues of National  
Significance**

Food and Agricultural Production	Environment And Ecosystem Services	Energy Production	Human Health and Safety	Community Vitality
----------------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------	-------------------------	--------------------

**Examples**  
*\*We recognize that many of these examples overlap across themes.  
\*\*Issues listed also reflect prevalence in CRIS data.*

- |  |  |  |   |  |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Crop and Animal Production</li><li>• Conservation</li><li>• Groundwater</li><li>• Irrigation</li><li>• Reuse</li></ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Endangered species</li><li>• Groundwater recharge</li><li>• In stream flows</li><li>• Nutrients</li><li>• Pesticides</li></ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Bio-fuel production</li><li>• Fracking</li><li>• Dams and hydropower</li></ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Bacteria</li><li>• Drinking water</li><li>• Food safety</li><li>• Personal care</li><li>• Pharmaceuticals</li></ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Community planning</li><li>• Economic/business development</li><li>• Land use changes</li><li>• Extreme events</li></ul> |
|--|--|--|---|--|

**Approaches**

**Issues of National Significance (stated above) are compelling examples in which Land Grant Institutions are well positioned to have a strong role in understanding, analyzing and documenting the nature of the problem. Equally important are the applied problem solving responses and programs from our Land Grant Institutions which will be based upon the following principles:**

- Holistic water management solutions (e.g., especially when addressing water quantity);
- Interagency coordination with government and non-governmental entities;
- Integration of science-based information and science-evaluated solutions into policy development and public decision making;
- Objectivity in community-based education, and fostering inclusive dialog and in citizen-based responses;
- Addressing trans-boundary issues involving receiving waters;
- Understanding risk and uncertainty; and
- Solutions (where appropriate) will be deployed at the watershed and landscape scales.

### Essential Elements of the Integrated Response from the Land Grant Institutions

The Issues of National Significance should greatly influence how Land Grant Institutions organize their expertise and infrastructure. These national issues are targets for the research programs, teaching and instruction that occur on campuses, and the extension work that happens in our communities.

To ensure research, teaching and extension, are used to the fullest extent, the Working Group identified five **Essential Elements** of a Land Grant University-led national water security initiative. These Essential Elements reflect:

- How Land Grant Institutions mobilize expertise (faculty, staff, and students);
- How that human-capacity is integrated with the institution’s infrastructure (campuses, classrooms, laboratories, research stations, field stations and county Extension offices); and
- How intramural and extramural funding can support a national water security initiative.

These Essential Elements connect universities with each other, connect universities to stakeholders and other partners, and clarify the linkages with NIFA.

### The Level of Funding for a USDA/NIFA – Land Grant University Response to U.S. Water Security

The Working Group’s approach to prioritizing funding for the Essential Elements was driven by the Issues of National Significance. After first considering the issues that Land Grant Institutions are best positioned to address, the Working Group then defined the five Essential Elements to meet those issue-challenges, and then finally what is required for each element to succeed. **To effectively address water security challenges we must “enhance” Land Grant Institutions through a major financial commitment to new and expanded initiatives. Therefore, the Working Group strongly recommends \$100M (annually) in new/additional funding. That funding would be allocated across the five Essential Elements.**

#1. State/Institution-based Coordination	\$4M	Fixed costs
#2. Regional Water Centers	\$6M	Fixed costs
#3. Integrated Regional Water Grants	\$45M	50% of competitive funds
#4. AFRI National Grants	\$36M	40% of competitive funds
#5. Instructional Grants	\$9M	10% of competitive funds
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$100M</b>	Annually - for a minimum of five years.

[Back to Top](#)

**Item 8.4: Pest Management Working Group Update**  
**NCRA Presenters: Jeff Jacobsen, Steve Slack**

**For information**

Currently there exists a National IPM Committee (NIPMC) consisting of IPM Center Directors, Regional IPM Committees, State IPM Coordinators, and Community IPM practitioners, the IPM Voice as well as others. This group has been meeting annually for a number of years and makes recommendations on programs; however, this group has limited official ties to ESCOP and none with ECOP. This group was asked to respond to the recommendations contained in the Pest Management Working Group White paper that was developed last year. Many participants in the Working Group are also members of the NIPMC.

With the approval of ECOP and ESCOP steps have been taken to form a Joint ESCOP-ECOP Pest Management Coordinating Committee that will function as a subcommittee under the ESCOP Science and Technology Committee. A draft set of Rules of Operation have been drafted and circulated widely among the current NIPMC and others for comment. The draft rules include committee charge, structure, size, roles, responsibilities and reporting lines, etc. (see attached). Any minor changes to the rules will be finalized at the larger group will be meeting in Washington DC, September 23-24, then submitted for approval by ECOP and ESCOP. An oral report on this meeting will be provided.

The year will be viewed as a transition from the old group to a more formalized structure.

## **National IPM Coordinating Committee (NIPMCC) Rules of Operation**

The National IPM Coordinating Committee is a committee of the Extension Committee on Organization and Policy (ECOP) and the Experiment Station Committee on Organization and Policy (ESCOP), and shall function as a subcommittee of the ESCOP Science and Technology Committee.

### **Organization of the NIPMCC**

#### **General**

The genesis of the National Integrated Pest Management (IPM) Coordinating Committee (NIPMCC) began in 1985 when the Pest Management Strategies Subcommittee of the Experiment Station Committee on Policy (ESCOP) Science and Technology Committee was charged with providing coordination among the Regional IPM Competitive Grants Programs and USDA, the sponsoring agency. The Subcommittee was expanded to include Extension representation in 1986 to better integrate regional research with activities occurring through Smith Lever 3d IPM funds. At that time, the group began to refer to itself as the National IPM Coordinating Committee, later shortened to simply the National IPM Committee. Over the years, the NIPMCC has functioned to provide advice and communications regarding Integrated Pest Management programs supported by USDA-NIFA (and its predecessors) and land-grant universities from across the US and its protectorates and territories. Core membership was originally comprised of officers of the four ESCOP regional technical committees for IPM (now NCERA 222, NEERA 1004, SERA 3, and WERA 1017), administrative advisors to those committees, and managers of the four regional IPM competitive grants programs (NC-RIPM, NE-RIPM, S-RIPM and W-RIPM), with USDA-NIFA IPM-related National Program Leaders serving as *ex officio* members. Representatives from USDA-ARS-OPMP (1996) and Regional IPM Centers (2000) were added to the committee after these groups were established. Key partner organizations, including US EPA and USDA-IR-4/NRSP-4, have also participated. Committee leadership is composed of liaisons to the Extension Committee on Policy (ECOP) (currently Ed Rajotte, PSU) and ESCOP (currently Frank Zalom, UC-Davis), with facilitation by the National IPM Center Directors.

The 2013 President's Budget proposed to combine budget lines for several research and extension programs related to pest management into a new Integrated Crop Protection Program; however, the proposal was met with some resistance because highly successful programs were terminated and imposition of indirect charges were applied to all of the component programs. A formal IPM Working Group comprised of more than 40 IPM scientists representing universities, the private sector and government was appointed by the Budget and Advocacy (BAA) Committee. The Committee charge: "The Working Group is asked to develop a report that provides operational guidelines for fulfilling the goals of the Integrated Crop Protection Program." The working group held a number of conference calls and developed a report that was accepted by the BAC and Policy Board (July 2013). The report was sent to the NIPMCC for review and comment. While no formal recommendations were received from the NIPMCC, there was informal endorsement of the Work Group recommendations.

**Charge:** Make recommendations to ESCOP and ECOP on programs, policies and reports that affect pest management implementation, and make recommendations on budget matters relating to pest management. Assist in development of reports and strategic plans on pest management issues. Pursue activities that facilitate coordination and collaboration nationally among and between IPM research and extension at the Land Grant universities, and between the Land Grants and Federal agencies involved in IPM.

**Composition:** Membership will be selected to ensure that IPM input from all US regions and relevant groups is well represented on the committee, and should include:

- Three members as selected from each of the regional technical committees for IPM (NCERA 222, NEERA 1004, SERA 3, and WERA 1017) serving staggered 3 yr. terms. N=12
- Directors of the four Regional IPM Centers, N=4
- Chair of the ESCOP Science and Technology Committee and one Extension Director, N=2
- One ESCOP and one ECOP regional executive director, N=2 (Non-voting)\*
- One representative each from 1890 and 1994 institutions, N=2
- Non-voting *Ex officio* members, liaisons, N=variable
  - IR-4
  - Other land-grant programs related to pest management
  - Agencies and programs within USDA including NIFA, APHIS, ARS, and SARE.
  - Other Departments of the Federal government including EPA, HUD, GSA and DOD.
  - Private-sector organizations including IPM Voice, IPM Institute of North America, and the National Alliance of Independent Crop Consultants (NAICC).
  - At least one representative from the National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA), preferably a National Program Leader, recommended by the NIFA Director and appointed by the ESCOP/ECOP Chairs.
  - Representation from other agencies and organizations as deemed important to be involved in discussions on national IPM programs and policy.

\*One of the Executive Directors from the same region as the chair of the committee and will serve as the Executive Vice Chair, by providing administrative support to the committee. These two appointed Executive Directors will be non-voting members of the committee.

## **Officers**

Officers will include a Past Chair, Chair and Chair-elect chosen by the committee from the four regional technical committee and 1890 institution members. The officer positions will rotate among the five groups in the following order: North Central, Western, Southern, Northeast, 1890. Terms shall be for one year, with orderly movement from the Chair-elect position to Past Chair.

Terms of appointment to the committee will be three years. Where appropriate, terms will be staggered so as to provide continuity to deliberations.

An Executive Committee composed of the Past Chair, Chair, Chair-elect, ESCOP and ECOP reps, and a rotating regional center director will be formed to facilitate communication with the committee, prepare the meeting agenda, and take charge of any other committee organizational needs.

### **Committee Operations**

The committee may meet face-to-face at least once per year typically, in the fall. Other business of the committee will be conducted electronically through conference calls and e-mails. All expenses will be borne by member's respective institutions.

The committee shall annually provide a "State of IPM" report to ESCOP and ECOP.

The committee shall provide updates and reports on its activities and programmatic recommendations to ECOP and ESCOP as requested and deemed appropriate.

Any budget recommendations shall be made via the Chairs of ECOP and ESCOP for consideration by the respective Budget and Legislative Committees.

[Back to Top](#)

## Item 8.5: BAA Futuring Initiative

NCRA Presenters: Jeff Jacobsen, Steve Slack

### For information only

#### Background Information:

1. BAA Futuring Task Force Membership:

Josef Broder	APS
Tim Burcham	Non-Land-grants
John Ferrick	IAS
Mike Hoffmann	ESS (Chair)
Govind Kannan	1890s
Doug Lantagne	CES
John Phillips	1994s
Dan Rossi	ED support
Lou Swanson	AHS

2. Background – ESCOP proposed to the BAA PBD and the Board approved embarking on a system-wide futuring initiative to help position the Land-grant System to address the grand challenges facing society, now and as they intensify in the future. This futuring initiative will not duplicate the roadmapping and strategic planning efforts made by the various BAA sections in recent years, but rather use those and other relevant plans as a starting point to develop a long-range integrated vision for the system 20 - 25 years in the future.

3. Update

- The first step was the appointment of a steering committee consisting of representation from the various BAA sections. The charge to the Steering Committee was to determine the charge, goals, outputs, timeline and composition of a Futuring Task Force that would guide the initiative.
- The Task Force has prepared a draft report, “Land Grant University Futuring Task Force Plan,” which included an estimated budget of \$50,000.
- The Plan and budget was approved by the PBD at their July meeting. The PBD suggested that the Steering committee transition into the BAA Futuring Task Force with the addition of a representative from the Non-Land-grants.
- The following representatives have been added to the Task Force: Timothy Burcham (Non-Land-grants), Govind Kannan (1890s) and John Phillips (1994s). Several of the original Steering committee members have also been replaced.
- The initial conference call for the Task Force is being scheduled as well as a face-to-face meeting for members attending the APLU meeting in Orlando.

[Back to Top](#)

**Item 8.6: Capital Infrastructure Task Force**  
**Presenters: Jeff Jacobsen, Steve Slack**

**For information only**

**Background Information:**

4. Committee Membership:

Michael Hoffmann (Chair)	Experiment Station Committee on Organization & Policy (ESCOP)
Jim Kadamus Dale Gallenberg	Sightlines Non-land-grant Agricultural & Renewable Resources Universities (NARRU/NLCGA)
Pamela J. White Tim White	Board on Human Sciences National Association of University Forest Resources Programs (NAUFRP)
Eleanor M. Green	Association of American Veterinary Medical Colleges (AAVMC)
Carolyn Brooks Dan Rossi	1890 Land Grant Institutions ED Support

5. Background – Sonny Ramaswamy has requested an estimate of the backlog of capital infrastructure needs among APLU institutions. ESCOP was asked to coordinate a process to develop such an estimate. A Capital Infrastructure Task Force with representation from all elements of our system was appointed with the charge to work with Sightlines to design a survey to collect information to allow Sightlines to extrapolate capital infrastructure needs on our campuses.

6. Update

- The Task Force worked with Sightlines in the development of a survey proposal. The proposal with a price tag of \$100,000 was presented to the Policy Board of Directors (PBD) at their March 2014 meeting.
- The PBD asked the Committee to prepare a plan for funding this project through assessments from the participating institutions. A funding plan was presented to the PBD at their July meeting and was approved.
- Further review of the potential lists of invited institutions has resulted in a smaller population of invited institutions. Ian Maw and Dan Rossi are working with Sightlines to finalize a price for the shortened list.

[Back to Top](#)



**Item 11.0: Resolutions**

**Presenter: Marc Linit**

**A Resolution of Appreciation to Dr. John Baker  
Michigan State University**

**WHEREAS**, John Baker has recently left his position as Associate Director at Michigan State University, AgBioResearch; and

**WHEREAS**, John has distinguished himself as an administrator at AgBioResearch as Associate Director and Acting Director and as a Professor of Large Animal Clinical Sciences, Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Studies and Director of the University Research Containment Facility and College of Veterinary Medicine's Vivarium; and

**WHEREAS**, Dr. Baker is a recognized expert in bovine respiratory disease; secured over \$2.5M in external funds as PI and co-PI including funding for a modular BL-3 laboratory and \$1M for graduate student training and; mentored five M.S. and three Doctoral students and served on eight graduate committees; published more than 60 scientific articles, 11 book chapters; numerous proceedings papers and invited presentations; taught several graduate-professional courses; and

**WHEREAS**, John's career has enhanced research endeavors at AgBioResearch, advanced scientific discoveries with impacts on the veterinary profession, provided leadership now and in the past to the College of Veterinary Medicine; provided leadership of professional organizations such as the American Veterinary Medical Association's Council on Research; provided guidance and teaching as a professor of large animal clinical sciences; facilitated and partnered with other research agencies to benefit people in Michigan and across the United States; and

**WHEREAS**, Dr. Baker was a dedicated and active member of NCRA from 2004 to 2014, served on the North Central Rural Development Center Board, was the NCRA representative to the ESCOP Science and Technology Committee, was Administrative Advisor for NCAC2, NC1192, NCERA57, and served on and was a tireless advocate for The Minor Use Animal Drug Program (NRSP7); and

**WHEREAS**, John will continue to contribute to academic, research, and Extension activities in the North Central Region as the Dean of the College of Veterinary Medicine at Michigan State University; and

**FURTHER**, John has a very thoughtful and direct, if somewhat loquacious, approach that enriches and enlivens all interactions and impacts the outcomes of activities in which he is involved; and

**THEREFORE**, the NCRA hereby expresses its appreciation, respect and sincere thanks to John Baker for his long service to the Association, his dedication to the importance of large

**animal research, his leadership and impact on advancing research important to stakeholders throughout the Region, Nation and globe.**