

## AES Advisory Team Meeting

April 2, 2018

### Minutes

Present: Natalie Goldberg, Steve Loring, Dave Lowry, Jane Pierce, Jerry Sims, Shengrui Yao, Stephanie Walker, Clint Loest, Bruce Davis, Shad Cox, Steve Guldán, Craig Ogden, Aaron Scott, Blake Curtis

Absent: Dina Chacon-Reitzel, Roland Sanchez, Dino Cervantes,

Agenda:

1. Subcommittee Reports – We discussed the idea of having our final report begin with a statewide overview of agriculture in NM.
  - a. Southern Team (reviewing Tucumcari, Clovis, Artesia and Leyendecker, and Fabian Garcia). This team looked at:
    - i. Impacts of the stations
    - ii. Research Focus areas
    - iii. Commodities addressed
    - iv. Cash Receipts by County
    - v. Digital Measures Research Outputs – 5 years
  - b. Northern Team (reviewing Los Lunas, Alcalde, Farmington, Mora). This team discussed the following:
    - i. Are we asking the right questions? We should not be comparing ASCs to each other, but rather their relevance to the community (station stakeholders)
    - ii. Criteria – for assessment
      1. Who are the clientele? Researchers, public, ASC employees, others currently not being reached?
    - iii. Survey for researchers, stakeholders, employees
    - iv. Need for a Needs Assessment
    - v. ASCs should not be seen as competitive with NMSU – we are part of, not competitive with, NMSU.
    - vi. How can the ASC uniqueness be used to solicit support?
    - vii. Uniqueness can be used to compare and justify centers
    - viii. Develop strategies to develop uniqueness
      1. Mora – only unit that focuses on forestry, forested land, elevation, production of trees for the state
      2. Alcalde – Small scale farms, Natural resource in NM hydrology, etc., CES RAIPAP collaboration, organic certified land,
      3. Farmington – Agroforestry, agronomic resource, located on NAPI, and collaborative agreement with SJCC
      4. Los Lunas – Coop agreement with NRCs, Closest to population center, traditional farming to urban, wide diversity of soil types

- ix. There was a discussion of the need for the Advisory Committees to meet – help each other with how to work with the legislature, what works for their advisory committee. Maybe one person from each – a designee.
  - x. Collaboration matrix
    - 1. Grants?
    - 2. Research?
    - 3. Student training?
  - xi. Chancellor and Regents tour of ASCs would be a good idea.
    - 1. Virtual tour through videos?
  - xii. Funding formula fix to meet basic needs of the ASCs – what other sources of funding are out there, gifts, grants, endowments, sponsorships, etc.
- c. Animal Team [Corona, CDRRC (aka College Ranch, Clayton)] (handout provided)
- i. College Ranch had no manager at the time of this study
  - ii. They sent out a questionnaire asking the following:
    - 1. Mission statements
    - 2. Sustainability statement
    - 3. Advisory committees
    - 4. Stakeholders
    - 5. Intangible benefits
    - 6. Communication of work effort
    - 7. General perceptions
    - 8. Metrics for comparisons
    - 9. What resources are needed to meet stakeholder needs? Current strategies for obtaining resources
- d. Group Discussion including a review of the LFC report findings:
- i. General finding of the LFC report were discussed. The Advisory Team touched on:
    - 1. The value of all ASCs - All ASCs are unique and needed.
    - 2. ASCs should not lose track of the core mission of their centers.
    - 3. What happens if we don't take action on the recommendations and they decide to force the issue through budget cuts
    - 4. The need to look at things that are important nationally, not just in NM.
    - 5. The need to stakeholder support (the sentiment of the group is that the Board of Regents and the Legislature are only going to listen to the stakeholders).
  - ii. We have to figure out a way to put economic value on the work that we do.
    - 1. How do we put economic data on the impact on natural resources and wildlife (non-commodities)?
    - 2. Hard to assess economics of small farms as many are still involved in a barter system.
  - iii. What is the sociological impact of AES on communities?

- iv. What is the cost of fire to NM (carbon sequestration, total costs including the cost to fight)?
  - v. Small, diversified farmers and ranchers have a small margin on their operations – they cannot afford to fund the work. This is a sustainability issue – several generations on the same land.
  - vi. No justification for closing, but have to figure out a way to fund what we've got.
  - vii. Identify charter, restate it, and then state that we can't meet our charter without funding to adequately support.
  - viii. Research and Extension are partners and the Extension Service is the voice.
  - ix. Identify the future as a unit (one cohesive effort).
2. Survey – there was a discussion about the idea to survey users of the ASCs (handouts provided during meeting). However, in the end, it was determined that this instrument would not provide the information needed to develop the final report. Perhaps later we can refine the survey to address specific questions related to stakeholders and help ASCs conduct a needs assessment.
3. Action plan moving forward:
- a. Natalie will develop a questionnaire for the ASC superintendents that will incorporate the type of information discussed by the subcommittees (see-attached template).
    - i. She will fill in as many of the questions as she can for each center based on the material obtained to date. The ASC superintendents will be asked to edit and complete the documents.
  - b. Steve will work on developing a summary overview of Agriculture in NM with the idea that this can be used for the introductory material for the final report.
  - c. Next committee meeting we will discuss the materials provided in the questionnaire's and start to work on the report for the Dean.