

**WAAESD Summer Meeting Agenda  
July 9-11, 2019  
Hotel Chaco  
Albuquerque, New Mexico**

<b>Wednesday, July 10 8:00 AM – 12:00 PM Potters Room, Hotel Albuquerque</b>				
<b>Agenda Item</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Presenter</b>	<b>Page(s)</b>	<b>Minutes</b>
2	Call to Order, Welcome, Introductions	Chris Pritsos	--	Attendees: Chris Pritsos (UNR), Steve Loring (NMSU), Natalie Goldberg (NMSU), Troy Bauder (CSU), Glenda Humiston (UC), John Ritten (UW), Walter Bowen (UHM), Dillon Feuz (USU), Scot Hulbert (WSU), Adrian Aves (UG), Mark McGuire (UI), Bret Hess (WAAESD), Saige Zespy (WAAESD)
3	Joint Session Recap/Action Steps	Chris Pritsos	4-6	Chris reviewed the W-APS Session and overviewed each speaker, noting that priorities for WAAESD match well with Western Governors' Association (WGA). He noted active discussions involved initiating a symposium to bring together all projects dealing with water to see where there are opportunities to work together or interface. Mark said he hopes to invite a summit of water projects to the spring meeting, and he would move forward on the priority. Steve encouraged Mark to thoughtfully develop the list to include all projects with peripheral connections to water.  For next summer, Glenda noted because of the Fourth of July holiday, California (the host state) and WEDA have suggested a meeting the week of June 22, which is earlier. The meeting will likely be held at Contra Costa, for a more cost-effective meeting, rather than holding it in San Francisco. WAAESD agreed unanimously.
4	Approval of Business Meeting Agenda and Minutes of 2019 Spring Meeting	Chris Pritsos	1-2 7-61	Steve moved to approve the business meeting agenda (Agenda Briefs (AB) p. 1-2). Scot seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.  Mark moved to approve the minutes from the spring meeting (AB p. 7-61). Glenda seconded the motion, which passed unanimously.

5	Chair's Report, Interim Actions, Executive Committee Report	Chris Pritsos	62	<p>In a handful of highlights from the Chair, Chris mentioned a shortage of Administrative Advisors, so Mark and Bret worked to identify states that were short, as well as replacement advisors. To date, one advisor is left to identify, with one in a temporary capacity.</p> <p>A special meeting was hosted in May to discuss budget modifications, accounting for Mike Harrington's vacation buy-out. A budget increase was approved to compensate for the increase.</p> <p>A list of nominees for both regional and national committee vacancies was developed by Bret, who identified interested parties.</p> <p>Chris also charged Bret with developing a list of work to prepare for a discussion about WAAESD's structure and function.</p>
6	FY19 Budget Report	Bret Hess	63-64	<p>Expenses through April 2019 were listed in the budget agenda brief (AB p. 63-64). Bret noted that, because CSU's Business Office is being re-located, the financial report has not been reconciled through June. The report also includes projections through June.</p> <p>The approved budget was \$412,488, with expenses through April at \$229,359. The projected expenses included Mike's salary for the remainder of the year, Mike's vacation buy-out and Harriet's salary.</p> <p>Harriet worked to develop an archiving system, in cooperation with Mike, Bret and the CSU Libraries Archivist, to keep records for WAAESD. The records will be digitized, archived and made available to the public. To date, minutes are available online, with the rest to be completed soon.</p> <p>Bret also noted that projected expenses put WAAESD in the red by \$42,523. Additionally, Bret added he has not yet received salary compensation for his time, but the \$45,000 will be pushed to the next fiscal year. Delaying the compensation to FY20 will allow the association to stay in the black.</p>

				<p>Fiscal Year 2019 assessments have been paid in full, and a number of states have indicated they are sending their Fiscal Year 2020 assessments. Bret cautioned that, with the Business Office in transition, the updated reports will be made as soon as possible. At the fall meeting, an updated financial report will be made.</p> <p>Walter moved to approve the budget as presented. Mark seconded the motion, which was approved unanimously.</p>
7	<p>By-Laws Revisions/Vote</p>	<p>Chris Pritsos</p>	<p>65-71</p>	<p>Chris explained that the by-laws have been undergoing revisions over the last several months to clarify and make them more workable. The Executive Committee approved the by-laws on July 8, and now WAAESD must approve them (AB p. 65-71).</p> <p>Scot suggested a minor edit (removal of the extraneous “and”), and Bret clarified that the Executive Committee also approved several minor changes (to include the “and” and the correction of on cross-reference).</p> <p>Scot moved to approve the by-laws. Glenda seconded the motion. The by-laws were approved unanimously.</p>
8	<p>Nominations and Committee Service</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WAAESD Officers</li>   <li>• WAAESD At-Large Representative</li> </ul>	<p>Bret Hess</p>	<p>72-73</p>	<p>Officers must be ratified by membership. The Executive Committee approved the slate of officers, who all agreed to assume the positions. The Executive Committee thought it would be appropriate to continue in their current roles to ensure continuity. Gene Kelly will serve his second year of a three-year term.</p> <p>Because Laura Lavine is stepping out of her role as at-large representative, Patty Coleman has agreed to step in and represent the Pacific Islands.</p> <p>There was a large change-over in the MRC, and Adrian, Walter and David have all agreed to serve</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• WAAESD MRC</li>   <li>• ESCOP Executive Committee</li>   <li>• ESCOP Representatives</li>   <li>• ESCOP NRSP-RC</li>   <li>• ESCOP Budget &amp; Legislative Committee</li>   <li>• ESCOP Diversity Catalyst Committee</li>   <li>• ESCOP Science &amp; Technology Committee</li> </ul>		<p>on the MRC, with their terms to stagger to avoid a large turnover in the future.</p> <p>For the ESCOP Executive Committee, WAAESD officers provide national representation. The Past-Chair of every region serves on the Executive Committee.</p> <p>The Chair (Chris), Past-Chair (Glenda) and Chair-Elect (Mark) are also on the board, in addition to Steve Loring, who serves as a standing Communications and Marketing Committee chair.</p> <p>Mark has agreed to serve to a four-year term on ESCOP NRSP-RC.</p> <p>Current members of the ESCOP BLC include Chris and Glenda. Glenda is willing to continue with an additional term. The chairmanship of the committee will return to the West in 2021, and because the chair is not a voting member, another person must be elected at that point.</p> <p>Adrian has agreed to serve on the ESCOP Diversity Catalyst Committee. Additionally, WAAESD may have a second member. No nominations for the committee were received from the floor.</p> <p>After asking three times for additional nominations, Steve moved to cease nominations. The nominations were unanimously approved.</p> <p>As part of his position as Interim Executive Director, Bret must serve as Executive Vice Chair for a national committee. Mike Harrington served as Budget and Legislative Committee Chair, and in his absence, Jeff Jacobsen from the Northcentral Region has stepped in. Bret has been assigned to serve on the ESCOP Science and Technology Committee, which also includes two subcommittees. Each subcommittee has a quarterly conference call, and the committee holds months conference call. Gene Kelly and Chris Davies serve on the committee currently.</p>
--	---	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communications and Marketing Committee</li> <li>• National Impact Database Committee</li> <li>• NRSP1</li> <li>• ESCOP National Plant Germplasm Coordinating Committee</li> </ul>			<p>Steve currently serves as Communications and Marketing Committee Chair.</p> <p>Steve serves as Co-Chair of the National Impact Database Committee.</p> <p>Steve is the lead AA and Chair of the Management Committee of NRSP1</p> <p>Scot has agreed to represent WAAESD on the National Plant Germplasm Coordinating Committee, which was voted on at the spring meeting.</p> <p>No formal approval was necessary for the participation on ESCOP, the item was for information only.</p> <p>(See AB p. 72-73 for complete list of nominations)</p>
9	Multistate Project/Activity Administrative Advisors	Mark McGuire	74	<p>With Bret's assistance, Mark identified new Administrative Advisors (AA) for multi-state projects, since a few are in the midst of retiring or departing. One last AA must be identified. Mark noted that John has agreed to serve at least temporarily in that vacancy, which deals with elderly financial exploitation. Bret added that Steve has agreed to serve in temporary capacity for the project in the event it becomes too burdensome.</p> <p>Mark also noted, in assigning new AAs, he worked to spread out responsibilities among states. Scot and Washington State University held a majority of the projects, and the new AAs have been designated to spread out some of the load.</p>

				<p>Mark also noted that department heads can be designated to serve in those roles, an option that should be considered to further spread responsibility among the states. Bret explained department heads or department chairs can serve as AAs, but generally, they serve in WERA or CC projects, rather than research projects.</p> <p>Bret noted he is working on a training program to provide some direction on what AAs do, what their responsibilities are and how to carry out their duties. The training course will be held via zoom and also serve as a refresher for existing AAs.</p>
10	Budget & Legislative Committee Report	Glenda Humiston	--	<p>Glenda reported she didn't have too much to add after the Cornerstone report from the joint meeting. The Budget and Legislative Committee had a number of conference calls about line consolidation, which is still up in the air. Whether budget consolidation will be three, 12, 15 lines, etc., the only clear answer is it will have less than 40 lines. She reported most of her report was covered during the Joint meeting earlier.</p>
11	Science & Technology Committee Report	Bret Hess	75-77	<p>Bret overviewed the activities of the Science and Technology Committee (STC), and the Chair is responsible for coordinating the selection of the Multi-State Research Committee of Excellence. This year, STC recommended and the ESCOP Executive Committee confirmed S1056 Enhancing Microbial Food Safety by Risk Analysis as the winner of the 2019 Excellence in Multistate Research Award. S1056 will be honored at the 2019 "A Community of Scholars Honoring Excellence" session at the APLU annual meeting in San Diego, CA. Bret encouraged AAs to submit nominations for those committees that are worthy of the honor next year. The project will also be honored at APLU's meeting.</p> <p>Also at the APLU meeting, Bret will accept the Excellence Award on behalf of WAAESD.</p> <p>The Chair of the committee rotates each year, and this year, it will be the Northeast Region.</p>

				<p>There are also two subcommittees: The National Integrated Pest Management (IPM) Subcommittee and the Social Science Subcommittee. The IPM subcommittee talks about emerging issues regarding pest management and will hold an in-person meeting Oct. 22 in APLU headquarters. The Social Science Subcommittee is working on preparing a set of one-pagers similar to the ESCOP roadmap, which allows a leave-behind after discussions on what social science provide. The committee holds an annual meeting in conjunction with USDA's Agriculture Outlook Forum Feb. 19-20.</p> <p>The bigger functions of the Science and Technology Committee include the Teconomy Report. The report showed a concern with a relatively low level of matching funds that were reported. Bret noted the approach is often to report minimums because overmatching makes it difficult to advocate for increases in federal dollars in the future.</p> <p>Additionally, the STC will review the National Academy of Sciences' report Breakthroughs 2030 and analyzed how the report aligns with ESCOP priorities to determine what might be done to better align the committee with national actions.</p>
12	Diversity Catalyst Committee Report	Bret Hess	--	Bret noted the Diversity Catalyst Committee has selected an award winner, but they have not yet provided a public statement on who that winner is. Additional information is pending.
13	NRCS Working Group	Bret Hess	78-84	<p>On behalf of Gene Kelly, Bret provided context for the NRCS Working Group's formation, noting that prior to the most recent Farm Bill, there was mission creep occurring with NRCS. Certain Executive Directors were asked if they would be willing to work with NRCS and NIFA to iron out what was happening. At the same time, discussions were occurring about how to change farm bill language to prevent the extreme mission creep.</p> <p>As an example, Bret noted that in a seed-producing region of Wyoming, NRCS was recommending cover crop mixes that would have</p>

			<p>included crops like rye, which would have influenced the ability to produce clean native seed. Jeff Jacobsen pulled together leadership of NRCS, NIFA and Executive Directors of AES to see how NRCS and land-grant universities can work together, providing a first step in a collaborative relationship.</p> <p>There are also discussions in certain states where a state agronomist is hired to find experts that could work together between the two institution, which could be of interest to land-grant universities and NRCS both.</p> <p>Final recommendations were made, although Bret is unsure of where they stand currently.</p> <p>Glenda noted she has also not heard much. She also noted that UC is deeply engaged with NRCS and Cooperative Extension, saying that some states have complementary roles, while others do not. She added that a good working relationship is important, and UC currently jointly funds two agronomists with NRCS who are overseen by AES.</p> <p>Glenda further commented AES is working to ensure new science from Extension, AES and land-grant universities is included in the official NRCS Field Office Technical Guide (FOTG), which is what NRCS uses when recommending best practices for EQIP and other programs. Until the science is incorporated into FOTG, landowners can't use them to access cost-share funds. Troy agreed, noting both a formal process and personal relationships between NRCS and land-grant universities are important. Troy further noted that the recommendations made following the summit are an excellent set of items.</p> <p>Glenda added NRCS Conservation Innovation Grants are a great source of funding for AES projects, allowing cooperative agreements for projects. These projects can also be performed jointly with conservation districts, and Glenda suggested developing those relationships would be a great avenue to talk about opportunities. She also noted that California's very strict</p>
--	--	--	---

				environmental laws necessitate cooperation, as well.
14	NRSP-RC Report	Mark McGuire	85-87	<p>Mark reported that, while he was unable to make the last NRSP-RC meeting, Bret attended. The NRSP-RC recommends National Research Support Projects worthy of off-the-top funds, which have a maximum of one percent for multi-state research dollars (a max of \$2 million). He reviewed a list of projects, explaining the impact writing project provided a portion of Sara's salary. The funds are still active and Sara Delheimer is still working on the impact statements, which have been used by Sonny Ramaswamy quite a bit. Mark is unaware if the new NIFA director is aware of the impact statements. He noted it would be good to make sure the new NIFA director is aware of the statements.</p> <p>Additionally, he said this year was a mid-year review of NRSP 3, 6 and a renewal of NRSP 10.</p> <p>NRSP 3 is the National Atmospheric Deposition program, which moved to Wisconsin recently. The program is tied to climate change, but not necessarily to agriculture. Mark noted there was very poor coverage in the West, which is the result of financial constraints. To serve the West, Mark didn't think it was good, but the East and Midwest are very happy.</p> <p>He continued that they did not act on NRSP 4, the IR-4 Program Support, which was their renewal last year.</p> <p>NRSP 6 is the potato gene bank, which is tied to the facility in Wisconsin. Mark noted it has been an ongoing support for the program, and it was asked that they figure out a plan to end the support. Mark explained that NRSP is not designed for continual support, but rather projects are asked to find alternative funding. He added that the committee was unsure if due diligence was done to find additional funding. Further, he said the use of the facility was by states that have no potato program or production, which was interesting. Mark said</p>

			<p>they sent a message that the mid-term review suggested funding would be terminated in two years at the end of their contract.</p> <p>NRSP 8 is the National Animal Genome Research Program which was renewed last year. They are heavily funded at \$500,000 per year. Noelle Cockett at Utah State is the leader, and the project is in its third renewal, which causes concern. However, the tools in the project are heavily used around the world and across the U.S., so the committee felt it was too valuable to give up on. They suggested the \$500,000 is leveraged into something like \$90 million over the history of the project. Mark said this is likely the last iteration of NRSP 8, or it may go to a lower funding level to maintenance.</p> <p>NRSP 9 is the National Animal Nutrition Program. Again, it's been renewed and providing a national database, and Bret's one of the AAs for that, as well. Bret reported the project arose because the National Academies eliminated the National Review Committee that develops the nutrient requirement handbooks for animal nutritionists, which essentially serve as the bible for working nutritionists. This committee covers all livestock species that are fundable through NIFA funds, and they have an extensive and high-profile individuals that are part of the team. They have two subcommittees. One is on feed composition, which helps maintain a database to avoid duplicative work on new nutrient requirements bulletins. The group has been able to gather data from private companies, which has been productive in terms of leveraging funds. The modeling group also works to drive the decisions that work for nutritionists. They have published papers on adjustments that can be made for the next iteration of nutrient requirements. Bret reported the group has been very productive.</p> <p>Mark reported the last project was NRSP 10, the Database resources for Crop Genomics and Breeding. Scot is the lead AA. The database is mostly specialty crops, and Washington State is putting about four times what the industry is in terms of effort. There is some concern from the</p>
--	--	--	--

				<p>review committee that the support is centered around Washington State, but the commitment is there to find a broader approach and look at alternative funding in the future. The research is to look at the genome of a variety of plants, including cotton, apples and tree fruits. The project also looks at quality standards and more, serving an important function. Bret noted that much of the discussion focused on the relevance, how often it is accessed and is it needed, as well as the business plan for weaning themselves off the support. The project is in its first renewal.</p> <p>Mark added that, during the fall meeting, NRSP will review the by-laws, with a main point to talk about terms, the number of renewals and moving projects away from use of the funds so if new projects come along, funds are available.</p> <p>Mark also noted they are currently not spending all funds, and no new projects were proposed. Glenda said, after looking at water in the mini-summit, NRSP may be a place to get started and recruit the right kind of investigators to a new proposal.</p> <p>Scot inquired as to how projects originally start. Bret explained that projects are typically emerging topics of interest that require some level of support. For example, the Animal Nutrition Project came from a hole in research that needed to be filled. Essentially, the projects come from identification of a need, driven by AES directors. The funds are not administered by USDA, and Walter noted it is difficult to find a compilation of the projects. The programs are found in NIMSS.</p> <p>Bret mentioned that the section meetings are very important because decisions are made about NRSP funding at the national level, which requires all input and votes. ESCOP Rules of Operation will also be considered, and currently, there is no mechanism for a proxy.</p>
15	Communications & Marketing Committee	Steve Loring	--	The Communications and Marketing Committee has had a fair amount of activity in the last few months, Steve reported, including how effective

	<p>National Impacts Database</p>		<p>information was and how K-global was using information and representing the system. The contract with K-global was terminated because it wasn't being effective and serving the committee as desired, creating tension. As a result of the contract termination, the committee has begun to discuss other options to best use their remaining funds to further their goals.</p> <p>As an option, one suggestion, which will be moved forward to BAA, is to hire an expert communications and marketing company to develop a strategic plan, based on the needs of the committee. If the BAA agrees, the committee will work to get strategic planning complete to create a brand value for the land-grant university system at the national level, instead of just talking about specific universities. Steve noted that someone working at APLU at the national level might be helpful in moving the activity forward.</p> <p>Steve further noted that reconfiguring the Communication and Marketing Committee to involve more experts from land-grant universities across the country. Faith Peppers from the University of George and Karla Trautman from South Dakota State University are involved and instrumental in the committee's work, so Steve hopes to see more coordination between committees and universities in terms of communications and marketing activities to make advocacy efforts more unified and effective. He hopes to dovetail these efforts in the near future.</p> <p>The National Impacts Database has been undergoing changes to make it easier to use and more relevant, with the goal of encouraging people to submit high-quality impact statements. Varying quality has been seen over the years, and now, review procedures have been instituted. However, the varying engagement levels of reviewers led to inconsistency. To date, nine people have agreed to serve on staggered, two-year terms and will promptly review and turn-around impact statements for NIMSS, which can be accessed by everyone else.</p>
--	----------------------------------	--	---

	NRSP1 Report		<p>Steve reported that NRSP1 oversees the NIMSS system and appreciates hearing that it is at least a little bit easier to work on. He noted things are going smoothly and the program is considerably improved over the last few years. Clemson is responsible for overseeing the IT, and this year marks the mid-term review for the project. He encouraged members to send him comments and recommendations, noting that, on the whole, things are going smoothly. Sara Delheimer is still being used to write impact statements, and a question remains around how much training should be conducted to help people write good impact statements.</p> <p>Bret noted Steve has done a yeoman's job in working on these three committees, particularly in increasing the consistency and high-quality of the National Impacts Database to make the system more robust.</p> <p>Natalie inquired how many universities and Colleges of Ag across the West have a designated communications person. At NMSU, the communications are consolidated in one university-wide communications system, which makes it difficult to get messaging out. Glenda said there was an attempt to do the same at UC, but effectively persuaded them not to. Troy noted CSU shares communications with external programs. Natalie noted they are finding new ways to pay for help to assist faculty members in communications efforts. Specifically, she said research faculty struggle with bringing the information down to an understandable level for the average adult.</p> <p>Steve noted that Sarah Lupis and Sara Delheimer both have done a variety of workshops for individual projects and universities to help provide training on workshops, but the training has not solved all the problems. Sara D. is still doing some training. Discussions are in place on how much activity and how much of it is on Sara D. to conduct because there is a need in all regions.</p>
--	--------------	--	--

				<p>Glenda reported that UC has been working to create and agree on public value statements, then training employees to write impact statements that fit those value statements. She noted that many people are stepping up their game in writing statements. Glenda encouraged AES Directors to visit with Wendy Powers about how she accomplished the training and what she did to make the training effective. Glenda said it is important to help people understand they are not being asked to do additional jobs or to lobby, but they are simply being asked to share their story better.</p> <p>The National Impacts Database is not connected with NIFA. Similarly, the Communications and Marketing Database is not connected with NIFA. Currently, there is frustration with the necessity of inputting the same information into multiple places. Steve noted that NIFA and REEport are out of his control, but said the National Impact Database and the NIMSS system can be streamlined.</p>
16	Housekeeping Items and Preview of Remaining Topics on the Agenda	Chris Pritsos	--	<p>Prior to break, Mark provided an update on the spring meeting for 2020, which will be jointly hosted by Idaho and Washington State. The meeting is slated to be the week of March 23, and Sarah Lupis is working with WAAESD to identify a site (likely to be in Spokane, Coeur D'Alene or Boise). Sarah is providing cost estimates and they will have more information at September's meeting.</p> <p>Bret added that WAAESD would be willing to assist in terms of program development and more for the meeting.</p> <p>As a final note, Bret said there was a lot of discussion about liaison's, and Lyla noted that, in working with other organizations, it is important to have a point of contact. Many times, the liaison may not know everything they need to know. While this isn't always the case, it is fairly common. Many times, appointed liaisons don't have a lot of extra time to perform more duties, and often, offices end up being the point of contact. The point of having a liaison has come</p>

				<p>up often, and if there is a desire to pursue a liaison, Bret encouraged members to think about what a liaison looks like, who would represent and what association makes best sense to represent as a liaison.</p> <p>Chris also mentioned CARET and AHS members visited with him about being more engaged in developing the agenda, having action items and more. Moving forward, Chris noted that some consideration should be taken to engage other groups in planning meetings. Steve noted frustration in the lack of a point person in AHS and CARETs to determine their priorities. Chris noted that even within the organization, there is no leader. Bret said the issue has re-occurred over many years, posing the question as to whether the root issue was a general lack of communication within themselves. It standard for the institution hosting the meeting to become the chair of AHS. Additionally, high turnover in deans creates a loss of institutional knowledge, which is challenging. Chris encouraged meeting organizers to be sensitive to the concern.</p>
17	Networking Break			Coffee and donuts were enjoyed.
18	<p>Review and Discussion of Strategic Visioning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2012 values, principals, and expectations</li> <li>• 2016 facilitated discussion</li> <li>• 2018 staff roles and responsibilities</li> </ul>	Bret Hess Glenda Humiston	<p>88-91</p> <p>92-94</p> <p>95-100</p>	<p>In a strategic visioning discussion, Chris noted that the group should review past strategic visioning discussions to determine where WAAESD will move forward.</p> <p>Bret explained, in the agenda briefs, a review of 2012, 2016 and 2018 strategic visioning conversations. In the spring of 2012, WAAESD began discussions related to a disconnect with NIFA, but the conversation also provided an opportunity to explore its key values, as well as the values and expectations of its partners (AB p. 88-91). Bret said early conversations led to the development of the Western Agenda and an understanding that Extension should also be a partner of WAAESD. Bret noted values of honesty, trust, integrity, openness, transparency, mutual respect, etc. are core to the activities of WAAESD. The principals (or who will take on responsibilities) were identified as partners, cooperators and more. At that time the</p>

			<p>relationship with NIFA was also broken after a restructuring. Bret noted it would be important to revisit those early discussions as a result of the transformation of WAAESD, as well as the changes in NIFA on their transition. He said it might be important to consider their role in a partnership with NIFA. Ultimately, the expectations resulting from the discussion was a mutual partnership, including understanding and benefits for both parties, while also anticipating follow-through and trust from all sides. Further, Bret said many of the ideas from the 2012 discussion are still relevant (including a unified voice with Congress). Part of the responsibility of the WAAESD office is to liaise with different organizations, and Bret asked whether those are still relevant for the expectations of the office moving forward.</p> <p>In 2016, a vision session was held, with the idea of developing a strategic plan (AB p. 92-94). The highlights of the work and discussions in the association were reported, including questions about what would happen if WAAESD dissolved and more. Essentially, all of the work done by the office would fall back to states and coordination would decrease. While possible budget savings may be seen, Bret noted indirect time costs would likely offset those savings. Further, discussions about a “perfect” WAAESD office were discussions, to include connections regionally and nationally, a powerful voice in policy development and more. Bret emphasized that progress has been made on these actions, including being a voice in policy development nationally, citing a request from Sen. John Barrasso’s office on endangered species following work done by WAAESD. Further the alignment of state programs with the Western Agenda is a great, new idea, as well as strong and effective impacts (where progress is also being made). Team building and strong collaborations between western organizations and across state lines are also continuing forward. Finally, with the acknowledgement that the office is limited in what it can do by time and personnel, the top priorities were determined a snowball activity.</p>
--	--	--	---

				<p>Bret asked if these same activities are still important today for what WAAESD should look like going forward.</p> <p>In 2018, Glenda led a discussion about the roles of staff members and the Executive Director (AB p. 95-100). Bret summarized that the Executive Director and Assistant Director were both asked to do a crosswalk of information on their activities and allocation of time.</p>
19	<p>WDA of the Future</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What do you want the association to be?</li> <li>• How should the association be structured to achieve what we want?</li> </ul>	Bret Hess	--	<p>Glenda noted that the 2018 discussion was a good one, but she also noted that the new faces in WAAESD, as well as the clean slate for the association mean the discussion should be had again, noting staffing will depend on what the association will look like. She suggested allowing newer members of the organization a larger opportunity to review the reports and provide their input, along with additional input from longer-term WAAESD members, at the fall meeting. She hoped that, by the spring meeting, WAAESD would be able to nail down what the association should look like and what it's priorities should be, as well as what kind of staffing supports that.</p> <p>Further, Glenda said the need for an Executive Director is clear, but the question of what that person should be doing day to day and what support staff is needed should be determined. Chris asked how a new Executive Director could be on-boarded by July 1 if the discussion isn't held until spring 2020. Glenda noted that the final document should be produced by the spring meeting, which would allow advertising and recruitment for the Executive Director immediately following that time.</p> <p>Discussion on the benefits and drawbacks of the organization's current structure, as well as other possible structure options were held, involving all WAAESD members. Factors like how money is moved within institutions, how the off-the-top funds are handled and more.</p> <p>Glenda mentioned that the structure of the organization must be solved because that</p>

			<p>impacts how and what kind of Executive Director WAAESD moves forward with. She also mentioned that the crosswalk done in the past should be redone, but basic questions about the association should be handled first.</p> <p>Bret noted that the biggest question is to determine what the best model is.</p> <p>Glenda asked about the difference of a 501(c)4 compared to a campus-based association. She cited that the bureaucracy of being associated with a university can be challenging.</p> <p>Chris mentioned that accounts can be held within one university, but the association housed elsewhere, which may result in a hybrid.</p> <p>Glenda noted a contractual agreement to handle accounting and business operations with a university may be best, to ease the challenges of off-the-top funding. She also noted that other options, like a 501(c)4 or incorporating may be beneficial. She encouraged WAAESD members to explore the possible options before settling on one option.</p> <p>Chris asked whether the new Executive Director or structural decisions should be made first, but Glenda noted that it is important to decide what members want the association to look like before hiring an Executive Director. She suggested bringing in comments and feedback from a variety of sources (within WAAESD, other Executive Directors, Mike, etc.) to figure out what the association should look like. She noted, then, the Executive Director job will be easier to sort out.</p> <p>Dillon asked whether there is a consensus of discontent with the current association structure. Glenda explained that, on some levels, there was concern about the association, specifically due to a reduced focus on western-specific issues, rather than national issues. She also noted concern with lack of follow-up on big, strong proposals which require leadership and coordination.</p>
--	--	--	--

				<p>Glenda also noted an Executive Director should also focus on identifying funding solutions beyond just USDA grants.</p> <p>Chris agreed, but added there was also concern with prioritization of time on national issues.</p> <p>Bret recapped the structural organization of the association currently, explaining that 65 percent of the portfolio comes from multi-state research programs, which comes from off-the-top through W006. To receive those funds, the moneys must go to an experiment station. The rest of the funding for the association comes from state assessments, which includes five percent of the total office function is academic program and the rest is paid by experiment stations. The territories are given a flat-rate assessment each year. Bret also noted difficulties that arise from hosting on campus, adding that institutional policies must be followed by the association, as well. The association agreed (and thought it would be easier) to bring Bret on board through a contract as an association management service. CSU's contracting policies have provided some limitations. Bret's position is just one example of a challenge seen in working through an institution. Bret also noted that changes in leadership also impact activities on campus. Budgeting procedures also go through CSU, as well.</p> <p>Bret further noted other possible solutions, including considering a different model, such as a 501(c)4 or others, while also continuing to contract through an association management business. Determining whether CSU can pay into a 501(c)4 account with those funds or should those funds be eliminated in favor of higher assessments that individual institutions pay. The Northeast Extension Directors (NEED) hired an association management business to create a 501(c)4 and hire an Executive Director. The association management business bring in experts to provide additional support for the office, all of which is paid by the assessments. Further, if institutions experience budget cuts,</p>
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>there may be little flexibility in paying assessments, so off-the-top funding may be preferable.</p> <p>In discussion pros and cons, Steve questioned what would happen if associations aren't able to pay assessments, but Bret explained that a 501(c)4 might be more flexible.</p> <p>Troy noted CSU also had concerns about who the Executive Director is evaluated by and where they fit in the organizational structure.</p> <p>Bret also cautioned use of the off-the-top in a 501(c)4 because 501(c)4's do permit some lobbying.</p> <p>Glenda also suggested creating a benefit corporation.</p> <p>Walter also asked whether other regions have experienced similar challenges or if WAAESD is unique. Bret noted that lack of turn-over within other organizations meant that other organizations have not seen similar issues. A large part of the challenge has come in the change in Executive Director.</p> <p>Bret noted it is not important to have access to an office because so much of the work is done via Zoom meetings, so the Executive Director needs access to an airport and an internet connection. Others agreed.</p> <p>As other concerns, Bret noted institutions may mandate raises or furloughs, which could happen without WAAESD input.</p> <p>Mark asked how WAAESD should move forward in evaluating structure options. Glenda offered the expertise of Kathy Nolan from her contracts and grants office, who handles agreements, MOUs and more, to be part of a team to look into it. She also suggested, however, that multiple people should be involved in the conversation to do an analysis on the pros and cons, as well as the legalities of each structure option.</p>
--	--	--	--

				<p>Bret explained that Mark Amaral, the director of the association management business used by NEED, agreed to chat with WAAESD, if they are interested. NEED also agreed to provide insight, as well.</p> <p>Glenda added that questions about whether joint proposals, indirect proposals and moving money around should also be part of the conversation.</p> <p>Mark said retirement and interactions in the officer were also of concern in year's past, both of which were detrimental in office function, so activity evaluation is essential. He expressed a preference for a contract that is up for review every three years or so.</p> <p>Looking at timelines, members will be asked to research and put together a joint opinion prior to the September meeting. In addition to Kathy Nolan, Chris suggested UNR Associate. VP of Research Administration Charlene Hart to join the team. Bret suggested adding Jessi Fuentes, the CSU Ag Sciences Director of Finance, would be an important member of the team who could provide history of WAAESD's accounts, as well as institutional challenges.</p> <p>Walter also suggested that it may be possible to organize a strategy to take better advantage of university foundations. Bret noted he had the idea of creating a 501(c)3 to help fund seed grants that the association would like to start, but there may be conflict with universities if they are being asked to raise money for it. Bret suggested something like the Mountain States Lamb Cooperative Sheep efforts, in collaboration with University of Wyoming, may provide opportunity for the future. Walter added that Western Governors' Association may be a great partner in that.</p> <p>While the past has shown that WAAESD is always housed on campus, the by-laws do not require such housing. The only requirements are an Executive Director and recording secretary.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>Adrian inquired as to whether the agreement with CSU has been terminated, and Bret confirmed WAAESD is no longer officed at CSU, with important records in the library or in a storage unit. Accounts are still housed at CSU.</p> <p>Troy added that another disadvantage of being on a university campus is the requirement for service that often are expected by working on campus that can take time.</p> <p>Mark moved to set up an investigating committee to identify potential options in organizing structure of the association. Glenda seconded the motion.</p> <p>Mark clarified that participation would be hopeful from California, Nevada and Colorado State. Glenda, Chris and Troy will reach out to confirm participation.</p> <p>Bret and Saige will write up a formal committee charge (see attached WAAESD-Committee_to_Investigate_Structure_Directives). Bret will also reach out to Lighthouse and NEED to chat about benefits and drawbacks of their structure. The committee will report back prior to the fall meeting in September.</p> <p>Chris asked about holding a business meeting at the fall meeting in Nashville, September 23-26, to get the process moving. He suggested meeting the day before or day after to spend time working out details. Mark suggested making the topic the entirety of the business meeting. Bret also suggested a breakfast meeting. Looking further at the meeting schedule, Glenda noted that Monday is wide open because ECOP meetings are scheduled all day, with only a WAAESD Executive Committee meeting from 3-4. Chris encouraged folks to be flexible and look at their schedules. He also noted that the entire business meeting will be dedicated to the topic. Mark will follow up about people coming in on Monday for a meeting to determine these issues. Additional speakers can be conferenced in, if necessary.</p>
--	--	--	--	--

				<p>The motion to set up an investigating committee to identify potential options in organizing structure of the association passed unanimously.</p> <p>Chris noted the desired functions of the Executive Director will be more easily hashed out after decisions have been made about organization structure.</p> <p>With no other business to conduct on July 11, WAAESD opted to cancel the meeting set for the following day.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Thursday, July 11</b>  <b>8:00 AM – 12:00 PM</b>  <b>Potters Room, Hotel Albuquerque</b></p>				
Agenda Item	Description	Presenter	Page(s)	Minutes
				<p><i>**No business meeting was held on July 11. WAAESD members felt their conversations from the prior day adequately summarized the ED Position Description, Staffing and Search Timeline. Items added below are gleaned from conversations on July 10 from 10:30 a.m. to 12 p.m.**</i></p>
20	ED Position Description, Staffing and Search Timeline	Chris Pritsos	101	<p>Bret explained the WAAESD office is obligated to spend 65 percent of their time on multi-state projects and 25 percent on national programs. Additionally, five percent goes to academic programs because they work on the office's functions.</p> <p>Various WAAESD members expressed that the Executive Director should maintain focus on West over national priorities to spend adequate time on western issues, look beyond USDA grants to DOD, DOE, DOI, Foundations, private funding and coordinate large grant projects.</p>

				More discussion on the Executive Director for the office will be held in future meetings.
21	Adjournment	All		Safe travels to all.
22	Lunch on your own			

Action Items:

- Organize structure review committee to be working on pros and cons of WAAESD organization options, to report back prior to the fall meeting in September
- Mark McGuire, Mike Gaffney and Bret Hess will identify water project AAs to bring them together.
- Make new NIFA Director aware of impact statements
- Provide NIMSS comments and recommends to Steve Loring for the mid-term review in FY 2020
- Consider whether a liaison between WAAESD and other groups (WGA, CSG-West, NASDA) and what the role of the liaison would look like
- Coordinate with AHS and CARET in developing the agenda for the next summer meeting
- Review 2012, 2016 and 2018 strategic visioning discussions to determine if values of WAAESD and responsibilities of the office, Executive Director and others are still the same, examine what needs to be updated and provide input on how the association should move forward
- Identify large, multi-state grants (such as McArthur grants) to apply for and harness the power of the association.