

NCAC -1 Meeting

Meeting – San Diego, CA January 11-12, 2017

Carl Rosen and Nancy Ehlke co-chaired and co-hosted the meeting. The meeting was called to order at 8:30 am.

Members in attendance are:

Anderson, Stephen	Missouri - University of Missouri
Barker, David	Ohio - Ohio State University
Ehlke, Nancy J	Minnesota - University of Minnesota
Gaussoin, Roch E	Nebraska - University of Nebraska
Horsley, Richard	North Dakota - North Dakota State University
Jacobsen, Jeff	Administrative Advisor
Kells, James	Michigan - Michigan State University
Lamkey, Kendall	Iowa - Iowa State University
Pierzynski, Gary	Kansas - Kansas State University
Rosen, Carl	Minnesota - University of Minnesota
Slater, Brian K.	Ohio - Ohio State University
Wright, David	South Dakota State University

Members that cancelled due to weather and /or health concerns

Bollero, German	Illinois - University of Illinois
Casey, Frank	North Dakota - North Dakota State University
English, James	Missouri - University of Missouri

Members that were not able to attend:

Hartenmink, Alfred	Wisconsin - University of Wisconsin
Tracy, William	Wisconsin - University of Wisconsin
Anderson, Joseph M	Indiana - Purdue University
Ferguson, Richard B.	Nebraska - University of Nebraska

Members that did not respond to Committee Communications:

Brawn, Jeffrey D	Illinois - University of Illinois
Jones, Karen	Southern Illinois University
Midden, Karen	Southern Illinois University

The meeting started with introductions of members attending the meeting. The committee welcomed our new Administrative Advisor Jeff Jacobsen, MSU. Brian Slater and David Barker (Ohio State) agreed to chair the 2018 NCAC-1 meeting. There was a long discussion about the concerns raised by William Tracy about the review process for NC regional projects. The discussion was in-depth and the consensus was that the process was working well. The primary recommendations are to continue the project reviews as currently handled with the expectation that is technical expertise is a limiting factor then seek additional input from other faculty.

NC-7: Kendell Lamkey (lead): About \$500,000 funding off the top goes to the NC Plant Introduction Station. Generally a very good project, some collaborative research projects.

Recommendation: Vote to Approve (12-0)

NC-1200: Jim Kells (lead): The new project has 4 major research objectives related to photosynthesis. 22 participants from 12 Institutions (from in and out of the region). Extensive project write up, 143 publications, last 5 year project had about 250 publications and 1 patent. The project has some collaborative research, but the basic scientists seem to get together to share their research ideas and generate new research ideas. There is a lot of collaboration that happens because of this meeting after the discussions at the meeting. The committee serves a great role in developing collaborations among scientists working in basic photosynthesis.

Recommendation: Vote to Approve with Minor Revision (12-0)

NCERA 184: Participation is excellent, members have excellent outreach activities and they do excellent outreach activities, members are from in and outside the region. Lamkey is AA and thinks the group functions excellently, occasionally have industry participation. This committee deserves a gold star and should be the poster child for these types of committees.

Recommendation: Approve/continue with normal revision (12-0):

NCERA 103: The committee is functioning well, have very good extension/outreach activities. The committee specializes in assessing nontraditional fertilizers, they have a very good website which is accessed by a substantial number of people. Good participation by NC and other region scientists. Website could be improved for ease of use, but it is getting significant traffic. Annual meetings are held and have broad participation. Committee is providing very good information. They meet in conjunction with NC Fertility meeting and discuss/research the products available in the market. Committee members have been targeted by industries that make these types of products but the group provides valuable, unbiased information to growers about new products. ISU hosts the regional website and they are actively working on improving the current website to have their excellent work made available to state agencies and other extension/outreach activities.

Recommendation: Approve/continue with normal revision (12-0)

NCCC 215: Potato diseases, project is focused on 4 states but the participation list is more extensive. Objectives are to exchange topics and materials among participants usually at meetings in Chicago (Obj. 1), discuss variety trials and coordinate among regions (Obj. 2), and they want industry input but attendance is rare at this meeting (Obj. 3). Previous reviews also indicate little industry input at this meeting. The major sharing is germplasm among the breeders. There is very broad participation including graduate students from the four institutions but little industry participation.

Recommendation: Approve and continue with revision provide specific recommendations (12-0)

NC 1178: Focused project on agricultural interventions and soil quality on practices that improve soils such as cover crops and also on detrimental practices to soil health such as crop residue removal. Meetings well attended and broad participation in NC region. Title is misleading, not an emphasis on biofuels, focused more on cover crops and crop residue removal. Linkages are primarily through the annual meeting, there are joint projects with participants. Recommend they include grants/research projects with project participants to document participation.

Recommendation: Approve/continue with normal revision (12-0)

NC 1179: Some incomplete information, notes from 2014. Missed numerous deadlines. Objectives are diverse and include modeling, measuring and may to be narrowed in scope.

Recommendation: Approve and continue with revision provide specific recommendations (12-0)

NC 1181: Looks like individual states do their own research and they get together (Nebraska-Kansas states projects). Recommend they expand regional participation and collaborative research if possible.

Recommendation: Approve and continue with revision provide specific recommendations (12-0)

NC 1182: Project has more limited participation, list 11 states but not every state participates. Project deals with N management in forage systems. Meetings are relatively small with 4 -6 states activity participating in the project (NB, WA, UT, TN, MI most active). 4 objectives: Legume N management and cycling, efficacy of secondary metabolites in grazing systems, pasture efficiency and N cycling, disseminate research results. They have good research productivity but obj. 2 didn't get funding so they haven't been able to accomplish the objective (MSU) which is a very specific and defined objective. Low participation may be related to timing of the meeting during the academic year. The group has relatively new faculty hires now, great forum for young faculty to get together and participate but probably still trying to find their way and develop leadership. Good project may want to consider merging with NC 1181? (Works in beef systems more focused on the forage side). Lots of research but appears to be somewhat independent with minimal interstate research collaborations. Significant extension activities with some of the participating states. The participants tend to work well, but research tends to be conducted independently. Recommend working at getting funding for project research activities, funding should try to be more collaborative.

Recommendation: Approve/continue with normal revision (12-0)

NCERA 137: Soybean disease monitoring which supplies information to producers, scientists, etc. rapidly. Big membership (27), meetings well attended with 30 participants. Current on their reporting. Committee has valuable activities and contributes to soybean productivity. Very good committee that is meeting its objectives. The committee is active and engaged.

Recommendation: Approve and Continue (12-0)

NCERA 217: Excellent committee focused on tile drainage and expanding drainage effects on soil health. Very active group and have excellent participation in meetings. High membership, definitely doing their job proposed by the project. Wide participation including outside the NC region. Over 40 pubs, over 50 extension presentations, excellent activities, impactful research and significant activities and impacts. Excellent committee for an NCERA committee, long standing committee but has evolved and adapted to changes in issues. Really solid committee with balance between research, extension, etc.

Recommendation: Approve and Continue (12-0)

NCERA 3: Committee is small, didn't meet in 2014 but met in 2015 and 2016. Committee meets with national and regional meetings of soil surveys. Small but very active committee, received the NC award last year. It's the land grant liaison with the cooperative soil survey. Good exchange with NRCS folks and good linkages with national groups. Sponsored symposium every year related to soil classifications, etc. Attendance is good with the small number of participants.

Recommendation: Approve and Continue (12-0) Contingent upon Frank Casey agreeing with recommendation.

Jeff Jacobsen, AA: Discussion with committee about the NC region and the multi-state project process. Directors also spend 40 – 50% of their time on national issues. One of the big issues is improving facilities for crops, soils, animals, etc., estimate it is a \$9 B problem. The committee appreciates Jeff's attendance at the meeting, it has been a number of years since the AA has attended the meeting. Chris Hamilton is a great resource for addressing any issues with NIMSS. We all recognize her strengths and expertise!

The meeting continued with State reports.

We had a brief discussion about the data collected each year. The consensus of the committee members was the information was useful and we should continue to collect the data. Changes to the data collected are: 1) for Graduate Students, other funding sources should be added to the table (Fellowships, industry funding, etc.) and include columns for total numbers of students (Include funded and non-funded students); 2) Add a page for new hires, set up package, position description, and appointment split; and 3) remove the comparative budget information.

On January 13, 2017 we had a conversation with NIFA (Karelyn Cruz, NPL in Agriculture, Food and Nat'l Resources; Eric Norland – NPL forestry and liaison for AFNR; Ali Mohamed, Interim Director for Climate, Division director for bioenergy; Dionne Toombs, Director of Nutrition

1. Introductions
2. Process of administration transition. No idea what the plans are at present time.
3. Impact on federal grant program

Nothing will change unless there are changes in farm bill. New farm bill will be 2018-19

Grants will continue as last year. Changes will occur with the new farm bill.

4. How is NIFA preparing for the new admin.?

Reporting what they do

Sonny Ramiswamy will continue serving (unless he takes on another job) – 2 years to go

No clue about Secretary of Ag.

Transition – landing team is having initial conversations

Ag committee has 13 new members

Farm bill is 2018 – no sense of rush at this time

5. Ag committees need to know what is being done by NIFA. It is important to let the committee know about the work you do. Need to know what the impacts are. There is a need to educate senate and house members about what's going on.

6. Programs

Bioenergy with DOE

NSF – food, energy, water nexus – RFA soon - 5 million

EPA for water RFA – will be soon (weeks)

see website – for details

7. IPA – Inter agency personnel agreement – not sure what impact of freeze will be. A number of positions are open

8. Project review question – quality of impact statements. How does NIFA mine impact statements?

Biggest problem – need to know what actually happened. What is the problem and what did you find out? They need a 90 second elevator pitch. Majority of reports are too lengthy with too much science. Needs to be more concise. Also need a clear and concise impact statement and what the anticipated impacts are as well.

For example, there was a question on landscape conservation. They did a key words search for landscape conservation and came up with 600 page. There was little they could use for a report to Undersecretary. NIFA gets requests from congress on what researchers are doing – they need to report up. NIFA would like reports that state what the potential impact could be even if you don't have the impact yet. Include things like potential cost savings. Why is this work useful?

Example - Soil biology – need to link with productivity and plant health. Need more soil science impacts.

Need to share success stories. Send pictures as well. Share with liaison for the state – contact NIFA for who the liaison is if you do not know.

9. How can Dept. Heads help NIFA do their job more successfully?

Update websites and provide potential impacts!

Karelyn Cruz will join us next year.

10. Other

Keep websites up to date – what does NIFA search for? 1. Publications, 2. Conferences
3. Diversity,

Need panel reviewers. Go to RFA and volunteer to be on a panel, send resume; they will update database

Other things about reviewers – looking for younger faculty; want broad range not just full professors; this is good experience to see how to write a good proposal.

Have new faculty members and diverse faculty serve on panel reviews

How does NIFA select panel? – Division Director - looks at composition. Want balance. Need assistant, associate, and full professors, different regions; diverse faculty

Small business innovation program – need ad hoc experts.

Innovations in Food and Agriculture – new program – It is for faculty that have idea for a patent – Training for how to do this - lab to market. Will send information to Jeff about the details.

If in DC – open invitation to visit NIFA

