

**2016 ESS-CES/NEDA Joint Meeting  
Jackson Lake Lodge, Grand Teton National Park, WY**

**Joint Session III  
New Ideas and Key Changes for Federal Authorization: Farm Bill Work Session**

**REPORT**

Through an interactive, facilitated process, participants in this session considered ideas for new and changed authorizations for the 2018 Farm Bill.

Starting with a list of 73 ideas (*numbered for reference only and not to indicate priority in any way*), participants went through two rounds of voting to narrow this list to six ideas for discussion in breakout sessions. In the second round, participants agreed to combine ideas 1-5 into one breakout session and vote for ideas that would be discussed in the other breakout sessions.

All participants contributed to each breakout session discussion where they were asked to provide specific details about the program/idea in question and any arguments supporting the idea/program.

**Starting List of Ideas (\* indicates ideas that were selected for breakout discussion)**

1. \*Smith-Lever 3(b)&(c) change such sums to \$700M authorized amount
2. \*Hatch increase to at least \$500M
3. \*McIntire Stennis increase to at least \$100M
4. \*Evans Allen 1890 Research increase to at least \$100M
5. \*AFRI increase to authorized amount, increase authorization to \$1.5B
6. Sustainable Agriculture Research and Education increase to \$50M or authorized level
7. New Program - Home Visits in Remote Areas - Include as part of SL capacity funds
8. \* Increase EFNEP authorization from \$90 to \$120 million
9. \*Create major integrated (research, academic, and Extension) program on water resource management and security as proposed by the Water Working Group
10. Create integrated block grants administered through existing Extension and Experiment Station associations targeted to relevant regional economic, environmental or social issues
11. Support new integrated (research, academic, and Extension) initiative to address the effect of extreme events on agricultural production, water resources, air quality, and rural health
12. \*Create funding program for new facilities, repair and maintenance but not at the expense of other programs
13. Create programs to increase the number of students preparing for agricultural careers

14. Develop an initiative to increase research on the effect of policies on individuals and communities
15. Create an initiative to build the big data infrastructure
16. Repeat and expand producer education provided by Extension in partnership with USDA Farm Service Agency
17. Authorize an Extension, research and academic integrated, multi-disciplinary focus on antibiotic resistance
18. Create graduate-level and young scholars (aimed at high school students) grants programs
19. Initiate a review program for USDA-NIFA modeled after the NSF five-year cycle for external review of programs
20. Assure indirect cost recovery is restricted in some programs and is applied at a percentage more in line charges to land-grant universities
21. \*Create both authorizing and appropriations language ensuring capacity funds are neither diverted nor diluted from land-grant universities
22. Reduce reporting and compliance burden required by USDA-NIFA for land-grant university recipients of capacity and competitive funding
23. Change language in the Grants for Insular Areas to state that only the Land Grant institutions in the Insular Areas can apply for the funds from any program under SEC. 7127 titled "Distance education and resident instruction grants program ..."
24. Change carryover provision for 1890 Extension Capacity Funding from 20% of appropriations for one year to be consistent with Smith-Lever 3(b)&(c).
25. Include language establishing Extension as the educational arm of USDA
26. Expand capacity funds specifically dedicated to youth development through 4-H. Increase support to the 1890s for the same purpose.
27. Involve Extension in USDA Strike Force and provide funding
28. Integrate a culture of health and wellness into capacity fund expectations and relevant RFAs; align production with a safe and affordable food supply
29. Allow biomass/biofuels feedstock production on CRP acreage
30. Increase collaboration on urban conservation measures (e.g. forests horticulture, wildlife management)
31. Increase technical assistance funding within NRCS to allow better planning processes, including collaborations with AES scientists and CES faculty and educators
32. Create a mechanism for AES and CES collaboration on NRCS decisions related to natural resource management beyond public input

33. Specify 2-5% of total NRCS incentive program cost for to systematic monitoring and evaluation of environmental benefits
34. Support the allocation of NRCS funds directly to specific areas of need
35. Clarify roles for NRCS and Extension; specifically, NRCS provides technical assistance and government program benefits and Extension provides education using research results.
36. Specify NRCS funding specifically for land-grant universities to conduct research and provide Extension education including validation by research before a practice is compensated
37. Clarify or roles and responsibilities between NRCS and LGU Extension and Agriculture Experiment Stations. NRCS provides technical assistance and government payments for conservation practices. LGUs provide conservation education and research related to best practices.
38. Require Rural Development to collaborate with Extension partners to clarify roles.
39. Specify funding for Extension's work in rural development, specifically for the Stronger Economies Together (SET) program
40. Invest in the Regional Rural Development Centers for research and Extension education, and establish a coordinating entity
41. Create programs where Extension provides training, leadership development, grant writing assistance, strategic planning, and program evaluation for communities to access RD funds
42. Create programs for RD funds flow to land-grant universities for applied research and Extension education.
43. Create a program for community development similar to Beginning Farmers and Ranchers
44. Support investments in alternative energy through improvement of production technology for biorenewables should be highly supported.
45. Develop micro hydropower technologies for use by farmers
46. Place emphasis on applications of advanced energy technologies in agriculture
47. Strengthen connections with Extension energy programs, specifically for funds to flow to land-grant universities for applied research and education
48. Continue research into functional foods to continue to provide a source of nutrition that is beneficial to health
49. Include microbiome in relation to nutrition and health
50. SNAP-Ed funding should either be restricted to land-grant universities or administered through departments of agriculture in each state (rather than through another state agency)
51. Broaden the concept of "forestry" to extend beyond primarily tree production to include forest ecology, water, soils, and animals

52. Create a program to examine the impact forest policy changes have on the economic well-being of communities
53. Provide research and assistance on management practices (e.g. harvest and conservation) for private, small forest landowners
54. Develop a program on urban forests (e.g. what are they, what species should they contain, how should they be managed)
55. Involve Extension in forestry program planning and educational program implementation, advance use and funding for Regional Forestry Centers, and increase collaboration with 1890s
56. Increase the Sun Grant Program from \$10M to \$20M, move it into AFRI or combine it with Biomass R&D
57. Move Alfalfa and Forage Research Program into AFRI
58. Merge small grant programs into other lines (e.g. Sun Grant Program, Alfalfa and Forage Research Program, Global Change UV Monitoring, Potato Research, Aquaculture Research, Farm Safety and Youth Farm Safety, Methyl Bromide Transition Program, and Organic Transition Program)
59. Increase Global Change UV Monitoring to \$100,000 and move into AFRI
60. Move Potato Research into AFRI.
61. Increase Aquaculture Research funding to \$5M and move into AFRI or aquaculture centers
62. Roll Farm Safety and Youth Farm Safety into a 4-H initiative
63. Combine the Methyl Bromide Transition Program into IR-4 or pest management line
64. Eliminate the Organic Transition Program or merge with SARE
65. Move the Organic Agriculture Research and Extension Initiative (mandatory program) into AFRI or merge with SARE
66. Move Biomass Research and Development (mandatory program) into AFRI or combine with Sun Grant program
67. Focus on a “culture of health” by authorizing funding for Extension through relevant departments and agencies.
68. Authorize capacity funding for Extension to expand urban programming
69. Authorize funding for Extension to provide decision-making tools for farmers with pending financial crises caused by low commodity prices
70. Establish Centers of Excellence to address family violence, disability, civil engagement, obesity, and poverty
71. Add a new competitive awards program to support the three identified centers of the 1890 Capacity Coordination Initiative

72. Provide funding for workforce development for dairies, swine confinement operations, immigrants, and crop laborers
73. \*Reauthorize 1890 Extension at such sums necessary but not less than 20 percent of Smith Lever 3(b)&(c) and change the carryover provision for 1890 Extension capacity funding from 20% of appropriations for one-year to be consistent with the carryover provision for Smith-Lever 3(b)&(c).

**Breakout Session 1: Item 73**  
**1890 Extension Reauthorization**

The main statement from this session was to reauthorize 1890 Extension at such sums necessary but not less than 20 percent of Smith Lever 3(b)&(c) and change the carryover provision for 1890 Extension capacity funding from 20 percent of appropriations for one-year to be consistent with the carryover provision for Smith-Lever 3(b)&(c).

**NOTES**

- **Specific Details**
  - Reauthorize the 1890 funding
  - Consider increasing the authorization amount-
  - Should think big
  - Change the carryover amount to be consistent with Smith-Lever
- **Supporting Argument**
  - Provides a level playing field
  - Changing the carry-over is a fiscal benefit
  - Promotes collaboration and leveraging of funds
  - Provide examples to justify the change
  - Increases funding
  - Joint planning in the state
  - Will support additional underserved and limited resource audiences
  - Will serve new audiences such as new/beginning farmers
  - Increases stability and strategic directions
  - Will avoid staff layoffs

## Breakout Session 2: Idea 2

### Create funding program for new facilities, repair and maintenance but not at the expense of other programs

There is a recognized need for facilities for Land-grant programs, but also significant concern that any request be designed in a way that assures it will not hamper high priority program funding requests. This concern leads to a key question. Should any facilities funding effort be a part of the Farm Bill or part of a larger "stimulus-type" effort?

#### NOTES

- Build on the sight-line report
- 8 million – move now (next year)
- Facilities are old
- No funds to fix
- Use matching program (state, industry, commodity group, private)
- Off-campus R&E centers
  - Meeting space
  - Labs
  - Greenhouse
  - Growth chamber
  - Outreach space
- Improve image
- Get to cutting edge
- Will by definition be at expense of other programs
- Allocation??
  - Differing ability
  - Regional
- Partners
  - Industry
  - USFS
  - ARS
  - NRCS
  - NASS
  - USGS
  - Other Universities
- New facilities to maintain
  - Allocation
    - Regional
    - National
    - State
  - Support quality faculty
  - Separate/new allocation
  - New line
  - Multi-year funding
- Problem: university decreases support (threat)
- Not in Farm Bill
  - Better elsewhere

- Mandatory FB from CCC
- Bonding approach-federal
- Private provided facility with payout/lease
- Underfunded for years
- Stimulus package
  - None in last round
  - World food problem
- Available until spent wording
- Food security – NIST
- Homeland security
- Grounds for capacity funds
  - Add to existing lines



### Breakout Session 3: Idea 21

**Create both authorizing and appropriations language ensuring capacity funds are neither diverted nor diluted from land-grant universities.**

Instead of defensiveness and paranoia about loss of capacity funds, focus on a strong justification for our land-grant system institutions to use and leverage capacity funds to uniquely address emerging issues with applied and evidence based research and Extension education.

#### NOTES

- McStennis funds go to forestry programs (e.g., University of Montana)
- Define importance and uniqueness of research and extension capacity funds (different from competitive funds)
- What would Congressional district lose of lose capacity, or gain if capacity funds are diverted
- Are we justified in being this paranoid?
- Go back to mission. Created to serve the public. Must expand beyond agriculture. No other group has this capacity
- Are HSIs a threat?
- Some operating a LG College under a public institution
- Why OMB & Congress always focus on competitive
- Commodity programs maintain famers; is Extension the only “farmers” in town?
- Capacity funds assure needs are met
- Capacity funds support not primed for competitive
- Keep number of land-grants consistent
- Retain capacity dollars at or above current levels
- Do not allow capacity money to go to non LG, other agencies, or organizations
- Applies to funding other LGs from other agencies (e.g., NRCS)
- Constructed rational for LG investment
- Cannot put forward a proposal to tie hands of future congress
- Rationale founded in our mission
- Build case around extension and experiment stations
- What is the authorizing language?
- NIFA (agency) formula restricts diversion of funds
- Concern of access to LG status by other universities
- 1994s numbers changes with every Farm Bill
- In 1890s, new president not connected to LG mission
- Write-in opportunity for Extension only and then not divert to other organizations
- Support the non-LG line
- Is this implied (already have formula)?
- Why worried if others want to compete?
- Avoid definition of LG
- Cap the number of LGs at current level (exception for 1994s)
- Is this protectionism (e.g., block grant entitlement)?
- Any indication offering new language?
- Offering language without danger could create danger (e.g., Hispanic populations)
- LG mission is broader than research and Extension

- Partner with rest of LGs (other colleges, departments); build rationale for stronger voice w/in LG mission

#### Breakout Session 4: Ideas 1-5

**Smith-Lever 3(b)&(c) change such sums to \$700M authorized amount, Hatch increase to at least \$500M, McIntire Stennis increase to at least \$100M, Evans Allen 1890 Research increase to at least \$100M, AFRI increase to authorized amount, increase authorization to \$1.5B**

Capacity and competitive funds are both critically important and are intimately connected (need capacity to compete) with successful outcomes and progress against societal problems.

#### NOTES

- AFRI increase should be clearly justified with issues (e.g., water)
- Have to figure out a way to get beyond only us justifying capacity funds as it is self-serving recognizing that there are some differences across large and small institutions
- AFRI need flexibility (?)
- Megagrants NOT working (CAPS), does not help LGUs across the board so parity is not possible
- Look at parity in capacity funds distribution
- Items 1-5 solve issues, items 6-73 are additional/future issues/problems to address
- In the future as the details are flushed out, many of the 6-73 items could/should be rolled into justifications for increases
- Grow AFRI by capitalizing on the success that it has experienced with new dollars and stories of outcomes
- Both and notion (capacity and competitive)
- How this is all done will be critically important
- Support growth with these programs and encourage continued BIG thinking
- Need capacity funds to get competitive funds, if decrease capacity then fail with AFRI
- Lofty goal to increase by x2 the budgets
- With AFRI conduct a program review every 5 years
- Increase the allowable IDC to help justify increases and improve dynamics on campus
- All capacity lines into one line and the competitive as is with language that describes distribution
- Items 6-73 are the rationale for all increases
- Do no harm with cap and comp increases
- Include 1890 Extension into these capacity discussions (1-4)
- Further define “capacity” to separate from AFRI and further elaborate on the relationships with both
- We do a better job describing outcomes with competitive and what is done with the funds; important to do better with descriptions with capacity and the need for more
- Provide more content on issues and stories for capacity and competitive by thematic areas (water, animal health, etc) to justify the need for more money
- Capacity needed for immediate issues (it allow work on) with state and regional impacts; competitive broader and more national in scope and longer-term
- Want infographic on capacity fund survey
- We still need to learn from the NIH messages and evidence on competitive funding as to growth and emulate
- Single line that contains competitive and capacity would be an easier sell
- Keep 5 lines as is; could move McS into AFRI and add language for management purposes
- Need distinct lines to go to right place/function
- Keep SL and Hatch separate

- Documenting impacts and outputs key both from past efforts to support future needs and investments
- In order to justify more money, we should identify 3 things and the dollars needed to accomplish those things with regular reporting back to NIFA and Congress, etc; then the funds get added to base and then we can repeat with a new 3; All capacity funds related
- Modernize the definitions of capacity and competitive funds
- Include ROI with capacity and then project more ROI with future additional investment
- Ibid with competitive
- Plus up the capacity funds, do the work and then add to base
- Build dollar justification with 6-73 and consolidate lines
- Need better education as to what we could do with more funds
- Investments create actions and leverage state resources (and maybe add state resources)
- Huge increases proposed so need good descriptions as to what would be done
- Targeted dollars good with authorization AND appropriation
- BIG system wide ideas with societal impact needed (add more urban)
- Have SL and Hatch with similar dollar targets
- The next generation of scientists need to be supported and enticed with more funds, both competitive and capacity
- Harmonize the stakeholders into carrying a broader message rather than a specific one (e.g. commodity, specific industry)
- Communication efforts are critically important on all
- Be issue-oriented for future increases in capacity funds (e.g. 4H, urban)
- Issues need to be identified first, then determine what the dollar amount needs to be
- Capacity funds provide the structure of the organization
- Create a competitive line and a capacity line.... So consolidate lines and increase the two
- Locus of control with the agency and/or with Congress...in the earmark era the funds were used for stakeholder interests
- With identification of issues of need we also need visionary ideas/approaches for justification
- Need a reevaluation of the distribution of capacity funds
- Quick discussion regarding the increase of allowable IDCs identified that not all institutions share those, what could be considered capacity funds, with the units that generated them.
- Need to change the language with McS funds to be broader such that they can be used for programs that are allied with forestry
- There could be match issues with some 1890 and 1862 institutions if the increases in capacity funds occur
- Look at the actual formula and terms of farms, rural, etc. Impact of HSIs too
- Need to expand and/or improve the partnering abilities of LGUs with others to work on big issues
- With capacity and competitive funds is there a need to revisit CREATE21?
- Capacity funds are used to get to competitive capacity of the programs
- Describe what are we going to get with increasing capacity and, in addition, articulate what would happen if capacity funds were lost
- Smaller institutions need capacity funds just to survive and deliver programs
- With more capacity funds, some states would actually provide more state funds
- CES is the only entity that has county extension offices at the local level with capacity; other entities do not have that capacity

- Do not increase AFRI at the expense of capacity
- 1890 research and extension funds allows the presence of a college of ag and provides opportunities for students to do research
- If capacity funds were lost programs would be shut down particularly in certain geographies
- If capacity funds for SL and Hatch were decreased the impact would lead many colleges of ag looking and acting like a college of arts and sciences and NO to little applied work would get done
- Problems that need to get solved are BIG, so we need BIG dollars; capacity funds help to ensure continuity and start ups
- Need to go beyond just talking about research
- Capacity funds accelerate competitive programs and help to ensure continuity (crops, breeding programs)
- Do not divert dollars to create increases in certain lines; Capacity funds are a highly unique feature of LGUs that have made them successful
- Do not increase lines at the expense of others
- Capacity funds leverage funds (county, state), if they were to be eliminated then there would be a collapse of county offices and research/academic programs would suffer
- 1890 Extension capacity funds should have been in this group
- Articulate the value of integrated research and Extension efforts
- Many joint appointment faculty are the ones that bring in competitive funds
- Society needs global issues addressed, food security etc. without LGUs this can not be accomplished
- In certain institutions capacity funded faculty with split appointments are the major body that secures grants

**Breakout Session 5: Idea 8**  
**Increase EFNEP authorization from \$90 to \$120 million**

Justification for increasing EFNEP's authorization level includes not only expanding the number of educators and clients served, but, more importantly, could allow for a more holistic contemporary approach to nutrition education that would encompass living environment, food purchasing management, food choices, and an overall culture of health.

**NOTES**

- Why increase authorization when appropriation is \$23M under
- Distinguish between EFNEP and SNAP
- Impact of program with data
- Aimed at youth obesity
- What can be done with more to target
- Increase all institutions to minimum
- Enhance work on food security and culture of health
- Staff intensive which helps community economy
- Opportunity to expand base
- Program about environment in which family lives – health and safety
- Density of population effects costs [of implementation]
- Already below authorization level
- Tie in with human health colleges
- Opportunity to tie the EFNEP to SNAP-One Health concept
- Work more on food side rather than nutrition
- Better food choices, cost, and convenience
- Food deserts, distribution, waste
- Can always expand program with more educators
- New technologies for program delivery
- Currently program is restrictive. Increased funding may allow more flexibility and tie into SNAP-ED
- EFNEP is directed at Extension and has good accountability
- SNAP-ED can go to other organizations
- What is un-met need?
- Broader approach to program beyond typical focus
- EFNEP is all direct delivery. Expanding program may bring in a policy dimension
- Equity issue with pay for educators.
- Need common measures of success
- Opportunity to expand EFNEP subject areas
- Work to have SNAP-ED to just to Extension
- Merge with other #50 (SNAP-ED distribution)
- Enhance “ground up” aspects, coming from communities
- EFNEP is more traditional than SNAP-ED
- Educate decision-maker about impact, ROI, and difference between SNAP and SNAP-ED
- Savings of dollars going to EFNEP
- Sound, evidence-based delivery and evaluation of impacts
- EFNEP delivery is more efficient than SNAP-ED

- Tie it into other health initiatives
- Financial management aspects

### Breakout Session 6: Idea 9

#### Create major integrated (research, academic, and Extension) program on water resource management and security as proposed by the Water Working Group

Capacity and competitive funds are both critically important and are intimately connected (need capacity to compete) with successful outcomes and progress against societal problems.

#### NOTES

- USGS
- Limited funding
- Dept. of Interior – collaborate
- Ubiquitous (regional /national)-site specific solutions
- Urban issues
- International partners
- DOD – Collaboration, strong partner, national defense issue
- Water security like food security and policy
- Health issues
- Capacity funding for water initiative as base for competitive
- Regionalization (watershed)
- End product – coming soon! (working group – water security)
- Protecting water sources
- EPA partner (rural programs)
- AFRI program in water
- Resource conservation water district
- Following the conservation lines of funding
- Private wells and water system
- Need to get water high on the national agenda
- Extension needs money
- Own ag contribution – proactive not reactive
- Provide skill set [in] water management policy (faculty/ag professionals) USGS, Dept of Interior, DOD, EPA
- Flexibility
- Lead Agency (i.e., like Homeland Security)
- Go beyond the water document; document is too specific
- Connecting water with food productivity and health
- Water use management moves across states and regions (policy)
- Water excess/water waste
- Recovering what we lost (i.e., restructuring of AFRI)
- Climate change linkage and support
- Excess water/flood management
- Ag and other use competitors
- Small, rural communities
- Ag-largest usage of fresh water
- Human health and other health agencies
- State water plans and linkages to these plans



- Water related to economic development
- Funding for educational programs for water
- Re-use of water
- Urban communities- water parks and water for recreation
- 406 Water Quality Program
  - Capacity
  - History of success
  - Quantity issue
- Need for research on best management practices to meet targets and why
- Climate change
- Aquifer management
- Water security = food security
- Urban-rural interface with water
- Legal issues
- Driving farmers out of production
- Hatch, Hatch multistate, Hatch integrated (not totally new)
- System engineering on water
- New potential sources
  - Desalinization
- Water migration
- Water runoff and storm water management
- Large scale modeling based on climate change, etc.
- Snow management
- Beach erosion