

McIntire-Stennis (M-S) Cooperative Forestry Research Program

A Collaboration Between the USDA and the States

Background

* Signed into law by President John F. Kennedy on October 10, 1962

* First funding of \$2 M was appropriated in 1964

- Has current funding of \$34 M and the previous two years as well as for FY 2017
- Supports 79 programs (54 (1862 land grants) 14 (1890 land grants) and 11 non-land grant institutions)
- Currently supports 674 active projects implemented by a little over 1000 scientists
- 232 new projects were approved in 2015 with durations of 2 to 5 years
- The latest member of the M-S Program is Central State University of Ohio with a proposed funding of \$100,000 each year for the next 5 years. Proposes to do environmental restoration of coal mined sites
- Yearly funding to 1890 land grants is \$2 M.
- Majority of the funds have been going to Climate change and Bioenergy
- 90% compliance on the these two research areas = 71 institutions (programs) of the 79

Allocation Process (\$34 M)

NIFA collects 3% federal administration fees (\$1,047, 490)

Small Business set aside of 2.90% (\$926, 663)

Biotech Risk Assessment of \$33,724

Base Funding = \$25, 000 , X 54 = \$1,350,000. I like to see FRAC recommending the amount to \$50,000.

After taking out the fees and the base funding, the balance is subject to the formula.

The Formula:

A = Non-federal Commercial Forest Area + Volume of the timber cut + Matching

Non-federal Commercial forest area = 40%

Timber cut volume = 40%

Matching = 20%

-In cash or in-kind

- in kind includes nonfederal research expenditures on non-McIntire projects (this is questionable because it does not contribute to the goal achievement of active McIntire-Stennis project or projects. Matching requirement by law is 100%. This should be complied with. Its inclusion in the formula is problematic. It places others at a disadvantage especially the poorer institutions. This should be excluded from the formula. We need FRAC's recommendation on this. Total is \$2.7 M

- yearly matching ranges from \$140 M to \$187 M. it looks impressive but in reality , it is not.

4 Major Efforts this year:

1. Updating the 2007 Strategic Plan
2. Project Directors Meeting (as opposed to the Adm. Technical Representatives Meeting)

3. Collaborative Funding with the Forest Products Lab on Cross Laminated Timber research using McIntire-Stennis funds. We are working on the MOU and we are forming a consortium of institutions that have capacity to do research on CLT. I have rounded up 8 institutions thus far.
4. Experimenting on education proposal for McIntire-Stennis projects.

Reactions to the Nov. 2015 FRAC Recommendations. Thank you Council for the five recommendations relating to NIFA.

1. The recommendation on modifying NIFA and Forest Service policies so as to allow tuition remission using McIntire-Stennis funds..... This is not feasible. By law, formula funds could not be used for tuition remission. I wondered about it too.

2. The inclusion of the 1994 land grant institutions as eligible participants in the McIntire-Stennis Program is very much welcomed. The process has to be through legislation, specifically through the Farm Bill of 2018. FRAC must devise and recommend a more specific pathway.

3. Increased funding for the McIntire-Stennis to \$50 M is a "long shot". I put a request to increase the M-S fund by \$1 M in FY 2017, it was passed back by OMB last January and so it was not included in the 2017 budget request by the President.

4. Thank you Council for your recommendation to specifically direct M-S funds to domestic research priorities. There has been no submission nor request involving international research for the last five months.

5. The recommendation on the review of the formula for potential revision is taking place. The recommendation to revise the formula to reflect contemporary recognition of the broad range of benefits from forests is interesting and attractive. But we need those that are easily and readily measured or quantified. C.A. Blanche