

GREAT BASIN CESU ANNUAL MEETING
Hatch C Room, Student Union, Boise State University
January 14, 2013
10:00 AM to 12:00 PM

Agenda

- 1) Welcome/Introductions
- 2) Minutes from past meetings; review action items (Attachment #1)
- 3) Agency updates (federal partners)
- 4) University updates (university partners)
- 5) Review new national protocol for adding GB-CESU partners (Attachment #2)
- 6) Comments on draft criteria for CESU Projects (Attachment #3)
- 7) Discussion and endorsement of revised GB-CESU Strategic Plan (2011-2016) (Attachment #4)
- 8) Discussion of status of CESU project database (i.e., keeping project information up-to-date and available)
- 9) Great Basin Consortium program and future meetings (Attachment #5)
- 10) Other business
- 11) Adjourn

DRAFT GB-CESU Annual Meeting Minutes, January 14, 2013

The following are the minutes from the recent GB-CESU meeting, including recommended actions.

1. The GB-CESU Executive Committee met on January 14, 2013 from 10:00 am to 12:00 pm at Boise State University, just prior to the start of the second Great Basin Consortium conference.
2. The following GB-CESU representatives were in attendance: Mike Collopy (UNR), Bruce Roundy (BYU), Jeanne Chambers (RMRS-USFS), Paul Doescher (OSU), Chris Lauver (NPS), Sue Phillips (USGS), Kimberly Page (BSU), Paul Verburg (DRI), Eugene Schupp (USU), Keith Reinhardt (ISU). Other guests included: Tom Fish (CESU-National Network Office). Linda Kelly (GB-LCC; BLM), Karen Prentice (BLM), Todd Hopkins (GB-LCC; FWS), and Keirith Snyder (ARS, Reno).
3. Others in attendance by phone:
Cheri Yost (CESU-National Network Office), Penelope Morgan for Kurt Pregitzer (UI), Stan Smith (UNLV), Christina Clack (UNR)
4. After introductions, Mike Collopy welcomed the attendees and passed out meeting handouts (attached to these minutes). The committee reviewed action items from minutes from previous meetings. There were no corrections to the minutes.
5. Everyone present introduced themselves and spoke briefly about their respective roles in their organization and relationship to the GB-CESU. During introductions, the federal agency partners also updated the group on recent developments within their respective organizations.
6. The committee then discussed the recently implemented national protocol for adding new CESU partners. Most of the discussion involved the new process for adding federal partners. There continues to be concern among several of the university partners about the potential adverse budgetary consequences to their institutions of adding federal partners at the lower CESU F&A rate (17.5%). Several institutions currently have major research programs supported by federal agencies at their institution's federally-negotiated F&A rate and a shift to the lower CESU rate is expected to cause significant concern for their respective administrations. There was a strong feeling among the committee that it is time for the CESU National Council to review the current rate (which has been in place for nearly a decade) and consider an appropriate adjustment upwards.
7. The draft "Criteria for CESU projects," developed by a subcommittee of CESU Directors, was presented to the group and a short discussion ensued. Mike Collopy requested that committee members provide any comments they might have on the on draft criteria to him ASAP, so he can include it in his feedback to the Network Office by 31 January 2013.
8. Paul Doescher and Mike Collopy led a discussion of the revised GB-CESU Strategic Plan (2011-2016). A couple of minor editorial suggestions were incorporated, after which the plan was endorsed. A final version of the plan will be distributed with the minutes.
9. A discussion then took place regarding how to best track CESU projects. Mike Collopy described UNR's current method by including "CESU:" at the start of all project titles, as well as GB-CESU as a keyword in the sponsored projects database, and suggested that the other non-federal partners explore whether or not their respective SPO's would be willing to do the same.
 - a. Overall, the consensus was that there would likely be too much opposition by their sponsored projects offices and that they would not be open to changes in their database coding. The desire for a national method of tracking was voiced. Tom Fish discussed where they are at in this process and that this system has a ways to go before it can be implemented.
 - b. Mike Collopy reiterated that in the meantime, we need to do our best to keep track of our projects, so we don't fall behind waiting for a better system.

- c. A recommendation was made for the National Network Office to consider issuing a requirement that all projects be coded in such a way that they can be easily coalated (e.g., using keywords like UNR does). Some committee members indicated that if a request/requirement was issued by the national office, many of the non-federal partners might be more willing to comply.
- 10. Everyone was encouraged to participate in the Great Basin Consortium conference that started immediately after the lunch break.
- 11. The meeting adjourned at 12:00 pm.