

Board of Managers

New Jersey Agricultural Experiment Station
Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey
88 Lipman Drive, Suite 113
New Brunswick, NJ 08901-8525

www.njaes.edu

848-932-3775
Fax: 732-932-8955

NJAES Board of Managers

2013 Annual Report

**Assessment of and Recommendations for the
New Jersey Agricultural Experiment Station**

Table of Contents

Dedication.....	3
Introduction.....	4
Review of 2013 survey of county boards of agriculture.....	4
Review of the NJAES ARMA Strategic Plan.....	7
Recommendations of the NJAES Board of Managers.....	9
Recommendations of the NJAES Board of Managers from the 2014 NJ Agricultural Convention Delegates.....	10

Appendices:

Appendix A 2013 Annual Report Methodology

Appendix B Compilation of the 2013 survey responses from the county boards of agriculture

Appendix C 2012 Annual Assessment of Needs of Production Agriculture in New Jersey

Appendix D 2013 NJAES Specialist Ranking Results

Appendix E 2014 NJ Agricultural Convention Resolution #11, New Jersey Agricultural Experiment Station

Appendix F NJ State Horticultural Society letter, dated February 11, 2014

The Board of Managers
Celebrates the
100th Anniversary of the Smith Lever Act of 1914
Establishing the Cooperative Extension Service at our
Land Grant Institution
Rutgers University

The mission of the Cooperative Extension System is to disseminate research-based information on topics as varied as nutrition and health, youth development, agriculture, horticulture, animal husbandry, small business and personal finance through a central state Extension office at the land-grant university and county offices staffed by professionals in each of the U.S. states and territories.

We honor and thank the faculty and staff, past and present, of Rutgers Cooperative Extension for dedicated service to their constituents. We celebrate Extension's past accomplishments and we look forward to continued excellence in programming in the future.

Introduction

This annual report is an assessment of needs as identified by the constituents of the New Jersey Agricultural Experiment Station (NJAES) and compiled by the NJAES Board of Managers (the Board). This report includes a brief commentary on progress made by the NJAES in addressing the needs laid out in the 2012 annual assessment report (Appendix C), a review of the Department of Agricultural and Resource Management Agents Strategic Plan¹ (henceforth referred to as the ARMA Strategic Plan) and recommendations on how the ongoing needs of the constituents of the NJAES can be met.

The Board believes that these annual reports are an important tool for use as a reference of its opinions regarding the realization of the many important objectives of the NJAES and Rutgers Cooperative Extension (RCE).

Overall, the Board believes that some progress has been made in returning the NJAES to its expected role in serving production agriculture as its primary constituent group. However, communication problems persist and the board is not yet satisfied that it is being consulted sufficiently on matters regarding personnel, budget and program direction. It is expected that there will be further improvements made in 2014 that will re-establish the Board in its appropriate role as advisors to the administration of the NJAES.

Significant milestones for the Board during 2013:

- Board of Managers survey of county boards of agriculture
- Board review of the ARMA Strategic Plan
- Proposed a policy that allows for the Board to recommend candidates to sit on personnel search committees
- Met with Gerald Harvey, Rutgers Board of Governors
- The Budget and Advocacy Committee of the Board held several meetings with Dean Goodman, Director Hillman and Director Katz.

Review of 2013 Survey of County Boards of Agriculture

The 2012 Annual Assessment of the Needs of Production Agriculture in New Jersey (Appendix C) was prepared with substantial input from the county boards of agriculture through responses to a written survey. A similar methodology was implemented with the 2013 survey. However, where the 2012 survey and report was focused on the role and status of researchers and specialists, this year's efforts focus on county agricultural and resource management agents. It is important to note that several of the comments and recommendations regarding researchers and specialists remain open and are still pending. The 2013 annual report should be viewed together with the 2012 report.

The 2013 survey of county boards of agriculture was completed during the month of September. The survey results were collated and distributed at the December 5 meeting of the Board (Appendix B).

The survey questions were designed to elicit from the county boards of agriculture opinions on the current delivery of services by NJAES and RCE. The survey produced a strong and informed response from the constituents at the county boards of agriculture, one that reinforces

¹ Rutgers New Jersey Agricultural Experiment Station, Department of Agricultural Resource Management Agents Strategic Plan, Kluchinsky et. al., January 4, 2013 (revised May 1, 2013).

the ongoing sentiment about the importance of these services to production agriculture and associated NJAES interest groups.

The topics included in the survey dealt with:

- The value of an annual assessment of needs
- Further review of specialists priority ranking
- Assessment of county agent services, with specific issues mentioned (level of service, regional sharing, relationship with county freeholders, tenure track, value of environmental agents)
- The current allocation of resources to production ag and non-production ag purposes
- Adequacy of communications, including RCE publications
- Budget information availability/willingness to actively support public funding for NJAES
- Other issues submitted to the open-ended question

The following is a summary of the feed-back received:

Question 1: Value of an Annual Assessment of Needs

The consensus of the counties is that an annual assessment of needs report by the Board is a beneficial tool and should be continued.

Question 2: Specialist Ranking

The general consensus is that the process of filling identified priority positions is extremely slow, even after the decision has been made to hire. The ranking exercise also identified areas of need statewide.

Some counties identified local production agriculture needs not met in last year's list: Atlantic County (cranberry/blueberry physiologist and vegetable entomologist); Middlesex County (soil fertility specialist); Ocean County (water quality/natural resources/focus on Barnegat Bay-current search underway); Monmouth (no progress in development of IPM program in central New Jersey).

Question 3: County Agricultural Agents

There are two points of consensus that have emerged regarding county agricultural agents. First, the hiring process for new county agents is far too slow. Second, county agents are now "stretched too thin" with added responsibilities that may be partially due to retiring agents not being replaced.

Bergen, Atlantic, Mercer, Middlesex, Sussex, Union, and Cumberland counties are all satisfied or reasonably satisfied with their current level of services. Six counties identified significant needs: Gloucester County - 4-H agent, tree fruit/viticulture agent (current search underway); Hunterdon County - field crop expertise is lacking, vegetable agent - gap in expertise since the retirement of Ag Agent Bill Tietjen; Monmouth County - nursery and vegetable agent assistance - Rich Obal retirement has left a void in service; Ocean County - no ag agent (current search underway); Warren County - ag agent (current search underway for agricultural marketing agent); and Somerset County reports their ag agent's time allocation ratio is off balance with half of the ag agent's time spent working with the Master Gardener program.

The survey results show that the county boards of agriculture are open to the idea of regional county agents, however they want to see any proposed policy on this explained in writing. There needs to be a consideration of county freeholder concerns about accountability of their tax-payer's funds. It remains unclear whether there is a proper allocation of county agents in proportion to commodity sectors.

The county boards of agriculture are split on their relationship with their freeholder boards. Of those that say they have a good relationship with their freeholders, few have discussions related to funding. This is an area that needs to be explored.

On the issue of tenure, there seems to be a consensus that a mix of tenure and non-tenure positions are warranted, however balance is needed. The county boards of agriculture strongly urge that any plan continue to incorporate a balance of maintaining tenure-track agricultural agents that deliver educational programs, as well as conduct applied research benefiting the agricultural community, and sufficient extension specialists to meet the applied research needs of the ag community.

The county environmental agents were rated a low priority as they are currently being utilized. Generally speaking, most of the current environmental agents are not servicing production agriculture. Suggestions were made to give these agents production agriculture education or deny tenure and reallocate the positions and funds to priority areas. There were also suggestions of areas where the environmental agents could do work to benefit production agriculture including; irrigation management, water testing, soil and water conservation, manure management, aquaculture, invasive species in farm ponds, food safety issues related to production agriculture, storm water management on farms, erosion control, research into practices to minimize salt water flooding of crops during severe storms, greenhouse runoff, and water use advice.

Question 4: Allocation of Resources: Production Agriculture and Non-Production Agriculture

The overwhelming response from the counties about the current allocation of resources by the administration at the NJAES is that there has been a steady shifting away from production agriculture. Only the urban counties of Union and Bergen responded that this shift meets their needs based on their county demographics. Support for production agriculture must be at the very least, maintained and optimally, improved and if production efficiencies are to be achieved to feed our state and nation at the levels required to keep food affordable. The NJAES administration must make production agriculture its priority and meet the needs identified in the 2012 Annual Assessment of the Needs of Production Agriculture in New Jersey, the ARMA Strategic Plan, and this 2013 Annual Report.

Question 5: Communication

Communication at the county level through Board of Managers representatives is good. The NJAES publications are well received, especially the Plant & Pest Advisory, IPM maps, Vegetable & Fruit Production Manuals, Animal Health Advisories, and the Agriculture Issue Alert. The ag community is comfortable with online delivery. However, the county boards of agriculture would like to receive the Board of Manager meeting minutes in a more timely manner and communication from the NJAES administration is lacking and needs improvement.

Question 6: Funding/Budget

There is a genuine desire for more detailed and clearly explained budget information. The county boards of agriculture would like to see a full budget breakdown before dollars are spent as well as an accounting of how funds were spent to provide accountability to constituents.

Question 7: Other issues not covered

The following “other” needs were identified in the survey responses: 1. more education directed at the general public about GMOs and conventional crop production 2. more livestock assistance in the area of small animal expertise (sheep, goats, alpacas) 3. replacement of key agents in timely manner when they retire/ better succession planning.

Most counties are happy with their 4-H, Master Gardener and FCHS programs. The one exception is Gloucester County where they are in need of a 4-H Agent.

Review of the ARMA Strategic Plan

The Board recently completed a comprehensive review of the ARMA Strategic Plan. This culminated in a special meeting of the Board, county boards of agriculture, and the New Jersey State Board of Agriculture, at which ARMA department chair, Dan Kluchinski along with the NJAES administrators, were invited to present the ARMA Strategic Plan and take questions from the audience.

The Board’s review of the ARMA Strategic Plan revealed two questions immediately:

1. How can the working relationship between the Board and the leadership of the ARMA department be strengthened?
2. Will the ARMA Strategic Plan become the effective operating policy for decision-making regarding the agricultural and resource management agents by the NJAES?

The Board is largely in agreement with the findings and recommendations in the ARMA Strategic Plan. It commends the support of programs that endorse the traditional role of RCE in service to production agriculture. The Board also endorses the prioritization of clientele as specified in the ARMA Strategic Plan as, “1) those clientele who are making a living and gaining income and benefit from NJAES expertise; 2) those clientele who are not making a living from, but benefit from our expertise and 3) future audiences who could benefit from extension programming, funding should be reflected in prioritization.” In fact, should the NJAES administration make clear its intentions to follow the ARMA Strategic Plan as a blueprint for its decision-making with input from the Board, a solid gain will have been achieved toward developing a better confidence in the direction of the NJAES.

Nonetheless, the Board would like to be assured of an active role in providing stakeholder input in needs identification, program direction and service on faculty hiring search committees. This was commonplace in years past and ought to be reinstated on a routine basis.

Furthermore, there are some statements in the ARMA Strategic Plan² that raise concerns among the Board. These are outlined below:

1. The ARMA Strategic Plan states, "...the ARMA faculty and staff positions supporting these efforts have declined while our mission areas have broadened to meet changing needs and audiences." (3) and "...we must consider the various mandated services (regulation determined) and 'good will' service functions that we provide. We must determine how to more efficiently conduct these efforts, or if we have adequate resources to continue to do them at all." (9)

The Board takes the position that the NJAES should not be increasing its mission at a time when resources are shrinking. NJAES should wait until more funds become available and in the interim, it should stick to its primary mission. Priorities should drive budgeting.

2. Kluchinski, et.al. have placed the personnel need of a specialist in vegetable entomology under the base program, "Urban Agriculture and Community Gardening, School Gardens." (16, Table 4.)

The Board takes the position that the priority need for a specialist in vegetable entomology is in the area of production agriculture consultation, trouble shooting, and research.

3. Recommendation 7 of the ARMA Strategic Plan states, "The Department strongly supports, regardless of audience, some discussion of user fees. Fees for specific service or educational sessions should be determined, and the collected profits centralized once local expenses are recovered." (19)

The Board is concerned that user fees collected would go to a "centralized location" rather than going directly to the agent or program that provided the service for re-investment in the program or expansion of the program mission.

4. Recommendation 10 of the ARMA Strategic Plan states, "The Department expects that the process to determine faculty hiring needs and determine duties in consultation with clientele advisory groups be followed in order to comply with historic hiring protocols..."(21) However, when the Board met with Dan Kluchinski, he stated that he had not considered the Board to be a clientele advisory group.

It is the Board's expectation that going forward, all of the NJAES will consider the Board to be the primary representatives (through the county boards of agriculture) of their clientele advisory group.

5. The ARMA Strategic Plan states under "Engagement and Support" that "staffing needs are directly correlated with the presence of functional programmatic teams led by engaged and proactive subject matter experts, Extension Specialists; this role may be filled by County Agents or senior staff." (22)

The Board sees extension specialists as having an historic and unique role to play. They are responsible for carrying out applied research and acting as a backstop for extension agents. The Board sees extension agents as being responsible for developing and carrying out

² Rutgers New Jersey Agricultural Experiment Station, Department of Agricultural Resource Management Agents Strategic Plan, Kluchinsky et. al., January 4, 2013 (revised May 1, 2013).

educational programs for clientele with trouble shooting abilities. This statement by Kluchinski, et. al. leaves the Board wondering if the NJAES now sees these two positions as interchangeable. In some counties, it does appear that extension agents are now expected to do the work previously performed by extension specialists. Having extension agents take on the role of extension specialists short changes both the research program and the backstop role of the agent.

Recommendations of the NJAES Board of Managers

As advisors to the NJAES, the following are the recommendations of the Board:

Recommendation 1: The Board will establish a committee to review and make recommendations for amendments to its current by-laws. By-law amendments should include but not be limited to: a formal written protocol for the Board to make recommendations of persons to sit on personnel search committees; the addition of the immediate past president and current committee chairs to the Executive Committee; to consider changes in protocol for additional meetings.

Recommendation 2: The Board will continue to reinforce to the NJAES administration that it must recognize the Board of Managers as the primary advisory and advocacy group for the NJAES.

Recommendation 3: The Board will make a concerted effort to improve the communication and coordination with the ARMA Department, through its Chair, and the NJAES administration. The Board has a vested interest in seeing the ARMA Strategic Plan implemented effectively and in order to have a role in the implementation process, communication at all levels must be improved.

Recommendation 4: The Board will continue to seek clarification and more information on the multi-faceted NJAES budget process.

Recommendation 5: The Board will encourage the county boards of agriculture to strengthen their relationships with their county freeholder boards and local legislators.

Recommendation 6: The Board strongly recommends to the NJAES administration that it prioritize the hiring the following two positions: a nursery, vegetable and field crop agricultural agent as requested by the Hunterdon and Monmouth County Boards of Agriculture; a 4-H agent in Gloucester County as per their specific recommendation. At the time of the survey six counties identified significant needs not currently being met. Since the survey has been completed, two of those positions have had search committees announced (Ocean County Environmental Agent – water/Barnegat Bay, Warren County Agricultural Agent – agribusiness/marketing) and a third has been promised (Gloucester County Agricultural Agent – tree fruit/small fruit/nursery). The Board supports the fulfillment of all three of these positions.

The Board requests that the administration reflect upon the five Environmental Agent positions (initially hired with a grant from the NJ Department of Environmental Protection, but now largely funded by the NJAES budget). With funding limited, the administration must consider the overall needs of the NJAES constituents and consider re-assigning some of the dollars now dedicated to these five positions to other, higher priority program needs. The value of having five of these agents must be assessed and measured against the identified priority needs in this assessment and the ARMA Strategic Plan.

Recommendation 7: The Board recommends that the NJAES make an effort to improve the timeliness of its hiring process. Positions should not remain vacant for an extended period of time such that there is a negative impact on programs.

Recommendation 8: The Board recommends that the ARMA department establish a committee to assist in the implementation of the ARMA Strategic Plan, in order that the work of implementation does not fall solely on the department chairperson. This will help to maintain continuity of the implementation process.

Recommendation 9: The Board recommends a more timely publication of the New Jersey Tree Fruit Production Guide, and all production guides issued by the NJAES. The NJ Tree Fruit Production Guide, in particular, should be published and available for purchase in time for the Mid-Atlantic Fruit and Vegetable Meeting held the last week in January. This will allow for NJ growers, and regional, out-of-state growers the ability to purchase the guide ahead of the growing season. The NJ Tree Fruit Production Guide contains information that is vital to growers when planning their pest control and fertilization programs for the upcoming year. (See Appendix F for letters of support regarding this recommendation).

Recommendations of the Board from the 2014 NJ Agricultural Convention Delegates

The 2014 NJ Agriculture Convention was held in Atlantic City February 4-6, 2014. The delegates discussed and voted on 35 resolutions, several of which referenced the NJAES (Resolution numbers referenced below).

Recommendation 1: The Board recommends the entirety of Resolution #11 “The New Jersey Agricultural Experiment Station” (Appendix E) which was discussed and unanimously passed by the delegates to the Agricultural Convention, including Board president, Compton. The resolution asks the NJAES to be a partner in furthering production agriculture in New Jersey via research, delivery of programs, and providing scientific based information that effect policy decisions in addition to performing its other roles.

Recommendation 2: The NJAES/RCE should do more to educate producers in the agriculture industry on food safety and third party audit programs. (Resolution #1)

Recommendation 3: The NJAES/RCE should produce a white paper examining the science of the use of Genetically Modified Organism’s (GMO’s) in agricultural production, including a review of scientific literature. This should be done promptly as the issues surrounding public perception are being widely discussed and efforts are being made to require labeling of foods with bio-engineered ingredients. (Resolution #8)

Recommendation 4: The NJAES/RCE should investigate the feasibility of farmers and/or private enterprises establishing anaerobic digestion units. These utilize high volume moisture, animal farm agricultural and human food waste streams for the production of biogas for a locally produced energy source. Digestates could be used as managed soil nutrient for agricultural production to create an additional revenue stream. (Resolutions #9 & #21)

Recommendation 5: The NJAES/RCE should work to help facilitate the development of craft breweries and distilleries as called for in the legislation signed into law in 2013. (Resolution #32)

These are the Board’s assessments and recommendations. The Board looks forward to working with the NJAES to achieve continued excellence in programming in the future.

NJAES Board of Managers 2013 Annual Report - Methodology

In 2012, the Board utilized results from the first survey of the county boards of agriculture to produce the first "Annual Assessment of Needs of Production Agriculture in New Jersey." This was followed by a ranking exercise done by the NJAES /RCE exercise to prioritize the Specialists needs across the State. The Board of Managers committed to annual assessments.

As part of the annual assessment process, the Budget & Advocacy Committee of the Board was charged with producing the 2013 survey of county boards of agriculture and the Annual Assessment of Needs report. The Board of Managers Budget & Advocacy Committee is comprised of: Pat Butch, Chair; Lou Makrancy, Vice Chair; Ken Osterman; Jim Etsch; Allen Carter; and Bob VonThun.

The Committee invited the county board of agriculture presidents and representatives to the Board of Managers to a dinner meeting on June 10, 2013 at Mastoris Restaurant to assess 2013 accomplishments of NJAES/RCE and identify challenges. This input served as the basis of the 2013 county board of agriculture survey.

On August 15th 2013, the county board of agriculture survey was emailed/faxed to each county board of agriculture president and Board of Managers representative. The deadline for survey returns was set for September 30, 2013.

The Committee met on October 8, 2013 to review the results of the county surveys.

The Committee met again on October 29, 2013 to compile the survey data in preparation for distribution to the Board at its December 5, 2013 meeting.

The Committee requested that a copy of the ARMA Strategic Plan be mailed to all Board members for their review. Board members were asked to prepare comments and questions for ARMA Department chair, Dan Kluchinski. County representatives were asked to obtain feedback about the ARMA Strategic Plan from their county boards of agriculture.

The Board called a special meeting for January 6, 2014 in order to have ARMA Department chair, Dan Kluchinski and Dr. Larry Katz available to answer Board member questions about the ARMA Strategic Plan. An invitation to the special meeting was extended to all members of county boards of agriculture and the New Jersey State Board of Agriculture.

The Committee participated in a phone conference on January 3, 2014 to finalize plans for the special meeting on January 6, 2014.

The special meeting was held on January 6, 2014, 5:30 at Rutgers Campus, Food & Science Building. Dan Kluchinski and Dr. Katz were available to hear comments and answer questions regarding the ARMA Strategic Plan.

The Committee met on January 23, 2014 to compile the information obtained at the special meeting and to formulate a draft for this report.

The Board president represented the Board at the New Jersey Agriculture Convention, February 4-6, 2014 in Atlantic City.

The Committee held a phone conference call on February 10, 2014 to finalize the composition and outline of this report.

Appendix B

Compilation of the 2013 survey responses from the county boards of agriculture

QUESTIONS	Atlantic	Bergen	Burlington
Comments on the 2012 "Annual Needs of Production Ag assessment"	Some of our county's issues were included in the "white paper", and yes an annual report to the Administration by the BOM is supported	Yes. Annual report helpful	Issues are covered well.
Comments on the ranking exercise by RCENJAES this past year	The representatives from our Board that worked on the completion of the "white paper" agreed with the top ranking of a fertility specialist, however Atlantic county has a primarily blueberry and vegetable producing industry and would naturally prefer specialists that would enhance these industries. A. cranberry/blueberry physiologist, B. vegetable horticultural research and or vegetable entomologist.	#4 Ranking changes this year...in 2012 the #4 ranking was given to honey bee specialist, in 2013 it is changed to fertility specialist.	Not aware No Comment
Input on County Ag Agents			
Satisfied with current level of service?	Yes	Yes	We don't see the agents on the farm as much. It has been better for us to go directly to the specialist (weeds, disease, tree fruit ect.) Local agents seem busy with other administrative and master gardener issues.
Your position on "sharing" agents across county boundaries	Tentative yes but there needs to be sufficient, highly qualified staff within a reasonable geographic area that have expertise in that area's ag industries.	Ok for reasons of expertise	It will be necessary to do this and possibly improve the level of agents we could get.
Is the county board "in the loop" with county freeholder decisions on financial support?	Freeholder support is good	No	Yes but only in a reactive mode.
Your position on the use of "tenure track status" for county ag agents?	"Tenure track" county agents, our position is that the College should always be looking for the best candidates with the proper expertise for that county to fill those positions for the long term. Also realize tenure can be problematic if there are issues with personnel.	Needs balancing	We don't like tenure tracks for anything. However on the other side of the issue if an agent is tenured then the position is secure and can't be eliminated by budget issues.
How can the environmental and resource management agents better meet the needs of production ag? Do not include water use certifications with DEP	These agents should be required to enroll in production agriculture education and to integrate themselves within the ag industry.	N/A	Do we have one of these??

<p>Comments on the current allocation of resources between production ag and non-production ag purposes</p>	<p>Atl BOA feels the College is steadily shifting focus away from production ag towards a more consumer oriented audience using the premise that the College needs to serve all the residents. Production ag's position is that the College should work to ensure the public has access to an abundant and safe food supply and to that end should dedicate a stronger commitment to production agriculture.</p>	<p>Yes, role has shifted due to necessity but still inadequate for both production ag and non-production ag.</p>	<p>Terrible. Resources and attitudes are focused away from production ag. Someone at the University level needs to take up the cause of supporting conventionally produced crops. Research to prove that there is no nutritional or health difference between organic or conventional crops. Research and publications on GMO benefits and nutritional information.</p>
<p>Comments on communications regarding RCE/NJAES Is the county board sufficiently informed on RCE/NJAES activities at both the state and county levels?</p>	<p>Would like to see a budget with explanations that a lay person can follow.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>What is your opinion about the listening session held in February '13 at the State Ag Convention?</p>	<p>Limit the dean and the director of ext. to short, concise answers so as to allow for more questions</p>	<p>Good. But not of vital importance</p>	<p>Need action, not just listening</p>
<p>Which NJAES publications are useful to the growers/producers in your county? Identify.</p>	<p>Plant and Pest, IPM maps</p>	<p>All are useful, especially Pest Advisory and Vegetable and Fruit recommendations.</p>	<p>Plant/Pest advisories and production manuals</p>
<p>Comments on the funding for RCE/NJAES personnel and programs</p>			
<p>Would the county board be interested in receiving budget information from RCE/NJAES about its operations?</p>	<p>Yes. See answer above under communications.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Will the county board commit to a lobbying campaign with its local state legislators to seek supplemental state budget funding for RCE/NJAES?</p>	<p>Yes. Our county lobbied for additional funding at our annual legislators dinner.</p>	<p>Qualified yes, if details supplied.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>How would the county board allocate \$1 million...?</p>	<p>Everyone would benefit from an intensive, multi-disciplinary soil health and nutrition research and extension program.</p>	<p>N/A and not worthy of a response</p>	
<p>Other issues not covered - Ag or non-ag</p>			<p>Again the overall perception of conventional Farmers is not good. We need support from Rutgers to help educate the consumer and counter the general feeling that conventionally produced crops are BAD!</p>

QUESTIONS		Cape May	Cumberland
Comments on the 2012 "Annual Needs of Production Ag assessment"		The annual report is needed and should continue, it will prove to be a useful tool.	It was a culmination of a grass roots effort ... a first step in a process to bring RCE/NJAES back to a position where it is aware of the needs of production agriculture...RCE/NJAES has failed to adequately support and staff research and extension programs...The best approach for addressing the needs of production agric. with all its diversity is to annually evaluate where the industry is, what are the needs of the ag industry and what should RCE/NJAES do to address the needs.
Comments on the ranking exercise by RCE/NJAES this past year		Believe that there is now some animosity between the commodity groups. We agree with the results as we understand a ranking system that takes place among a group.	The CBOA is well aware of the rankings outlined by the BOM white paper and agrees with the findings in the white paper. The ranking exercise by RCE/NJAES was a duplicative effort that was poorly designed with little thought or effort. Members of our county BOA objected to having to repeat a process that we had already put a lot of time and effort into.
Input on County Ag Agents			
Satisfied with current level of service?		To say satisfied is a stretch, are we ever completely satisfied. Services can always be improved.	Reasonably satisfied with the level of service from our county extension agents although there is some discontent with the amount of time spent on administrative tasks that take away from agents' time to troubleshoot and visit production areas to know what problems are occurring...
Your position on "sharing" agents across county boundaries		Understand that this may be what needs to happen but should not be at the expense of service. If sharing can be done and services can be done in a timely matter, great. Let's get all areas of production Ag covered.	CBOA is not opposed to "sharing" agents across county boundaries as long as the needs of production ag within the county are met. "sharing" already occurs with our county agents, although it is not a formalized arrangement. An agent with "shared" responsibilities must not be given too broad a topic range nor such a large geographic range that the agent is unable to accomplish what is expected. Particularly concerned that here is only one extension agent with nursery responsibility in the entire state... our board feels very strongly that the nursery agent in Monmouth County must be replaced so that the nursery industry in the northern part of our state is covered. Also concern that stakeholders may not know how to contact the "shared" agent with responsibility for a commodity area...
Is the county board "in the loop" with county freeholder decisions on financial support?		We believe that we have a good working relationship with our freeholders, but new leadership has taken place and we are working on bonding again.	Not "in the loop" with county freeholders when decisions are made on financial support. Lost freeholder representative (in the last election) that attended county BOA meetings. Learn of proposed cuts to the Extension budget through the Extension agents. Essentially no communication with the Freeholders except when crises arise or are threatened.
Your position on the use of "tenure track status" for county ag agents?		We agree that tenure is an important tool for agents. We can also see where this can hurt, search committees, mentor teams and other tenure agents are an important aspect of the new agents tenure track.	Tenured agents tend to stay in their positions for long periods of time and that is very important to an industry that requires a high level of technical expertise to be able to work effectively with the ag industry... The board would not like to see a change to high turnover of personnel where non-tenured personnel use these positions as a training ground to advance to better paying or more stable positions as has happened in other states where extension agents are not tenured... The present tenure system is not perfect but it has given NJ a very stable Extension program. Complaints about extension personnel not responding to calls for info or troubleshooting assistance are heard. Rather than trash the tenure system, however, there needs to be a system for addressing these complaints... If stakeholder input is sought and valued in the tenure process, problem personnel can be removed before personnel is granted tenure...

<p>How can the environmental and resource management agents better meet the needs of production ag? Do not include water use certifications with DEP</p>	<p>We'll do we really need 3 of them, when the money stopped coming in for these 3 "H2O agents" out the door they should have gone, unless they were able to set their salary like many of the agents are now being asked to do. If we recall these guys had DEP "ties" send them over to them, why do we need to "find" work for them. Are these tenure agents?</p>	<p>...the creation of these positions was in response to a government agency not the ag community's expressed need... The needs expressed by the ag community should direct ag production programs, not the DEP or any other government agency... This question begs the industry to find a way to justify the existence of these agents. Can they turn themselves into a fruit agent to replace Jerry Frecon or a nursery agent to replace Rich Obal...? Can they do the work that 16 of the current 25 ag agents (not including the environmental and resource mngmt agents) eligible for retirement within 5 years do? The best thing that could be done is to deny tenure to these agents and use these resources to hire a fruit agent for Southern NJ (Gloucester) and a nursery agent for Northern NJ (Monmouth) and fill vacant positions in other counties.</p>
<p>Comments on the current allocation of resources between production ag and non-production ag purposes</p>	<p>Not sure if we can provide a percentage, but is feels like we hear more and more on other issues rather than production Ag. Is there a direct link between the ocean robot crossing the Atlantic to production Ag, and if so, it is not really being communicated well to us. Or how about the H2O agents listed above, how are they directly supporting production Ag?</p>	<p>When it became apparent a few years ago that budgets were decreasing from both the federal and state governments, the 4-H department at RU obtained an agreement with the Dean and Dir. of Extension that every county in the state would have a 4-H extension agent and 4-H extension agents would be replaced with a 4-H extension agent whenever a vacancy occurred bc there are children in every county in the state. When our county board asked the Dir. of Extension about the possibility of sharing 4-H agents with another county (an option our freeholders wanted), Dir. Kaiz told us that they had to have a 4-H agent in every county "because of the Jerry Sandusky thing." Our board does not want to take anything away from the 4-H program which we wholeheartedly support, but the reality is that 4-H agents do not require a high level of technical expertise to be able to work with their clientele/stakeholders. 4-H program associates do a lot of the work with 4-Hers and seem to do a very good job.Why isn't "sharing" across county lines a good option for 4-H agents too?... The hiring of resource management agents demonstrated a movement away from production ag to a more activist environmental program... This was a political move. This was also manifested when the college removed the word 'agriculture' from its name and became SEBS... there are some very clear needs identified in the 2012 white paper... RCE/NJAES admin needs to start addressing the needs and priorities of the ag community and not the desires of RCE/NJAES admin. RCE/NJAES has a responsibility to address the needs of production ag...</p>
<p>Comments on communications regarding RCE/NJAES issues</p> <p>Is the county board sufficiently informed on RCE/NJAES activities at both the state and county levels?</p>	<p>We receive monthly reports from the Ag, FCS, and 4H agents, along with reports from our BOM rep when warranted. A monthly or semi monthly update would be nice detailing progress in each of the areas. Something like what is sent out on a weekly basis now showing press releases, but we don't really want the press statement, we want raw material.</p>	<p>There is still a problem with communications between RCE/NJAES at the state level. Essentially, there is no communication. At the county level, there are very good communications.</p>

<p>What is your opinion about the listening session held in February '13 at the State Ag Convention?</p>	<p>Think it is going well until, we would ask a question and it felt like they were using up time answering that question, phillabustering...and the announcement of the Landscape Architect Agent surprised the majority of us.</p>	<p>It allowed the Dean and Dir. of extension a chance to talk, but it was a very one-sided conversation. It was obvious the Extension Dir. did not understand or appreciate the process farmers and nurserymen went through to identify the needs of each commodity group and then prioritize those needs... For example, if a particular area such as IPM was not identified as a need by the farmers and nurserymen, it was because current staff and programs were addressing that need in the ag community. That did not mean IPM is viewed as unimportant or that it was overlooked as the director insinuated... The listening session also illustrated how little regard the Dean has for the ag community...</p>
<p>Which NJAES publications are useful to the growers/producers in your county? Identify.</p>	<p>The plant & pest advisory</p>	<p>Cultivating Cumberland newsletter and Weekly Plant & Pest Advisory newsletter</p>
<p>Comments on the funding for RCE/NJAES personnel and programs</p> <p>Would the county board be interested in receiving budget information from RCE/NJAES about its operations?</p>	<p>Of course, they have had no problem asking us to support them or advocating on their behalf, it is only appropriate that those advocating know how, when and where the funds are being used or distributed.</p>	<p>The BOA is interested in receiving budget info that is clear and explicit. Grouping various expenditures under "Ag" ...in a pie chart provides no useful info and only serves to convince the recipient that someone is trying to obfuscate the components of the budget.</p>
<p>Will the county board commit to a lobbying campaign with its local state legislators to seek supplemental state budget funding for RCE/NJAES?</p>	<p>Our county board has in the past, but don't ask us to do so when we have no idea how funds are to be used.</p>	<p>...it is obvious that major cuts have occurred... the Dean has not used the available funds in a manner that benefited the majority of farmers and nurserymen... Bulking up administration, funding a FIC which benefits less than 1% of the ag community and still isn't self-sufficient, instituting environmental and landscape architecture programs made a bad situation worse. Some of these programs would not be bad in times of plenty, but when budgets are being cut, adding expenses to an already stretched budget is less than wise. BOA feels that lobbying efforts... should focus on the fact that NJAES has no other means of obtaining long term steady funding except through the government while the university has the ability of obtaining additional funds through tuition increases... There is currently an adversarial relationship btw RCE/NJAES admin and the ag community. The Dean, in particular, alienated the ag community with the diversion of NJAES funds...it is difficult to ask the ag community to support RCE/NJAESby lobbying when the Dean and Director have demonstrated an unwillingness to address the needs of the ag community. Farmers have been heard to express the desire to "divorce Rutgers and give the land grant institution status to some other college or university". Our county BOA feels the \$1 million allocation is not a good idea. Long term increased funding that allows for the hiring of much needed specialist and agents will go a long way in meeting the needs of production ag. The \$1million allocation is more of a "feel good" measure that is unlikely to have long term benefits.</p>
<p>How would the county board allocate \$1 million...?</p>	<p>We don't believe that the 1 million was received.</p>	
<p>Other issues not covered - Ag or non-ag</p>		

QUESTIONS		Gloucester	Hunterdon
Comments on the 2012 "Annual Needs of Production Ag assessment"		Yes. An annual report by the BOM would be helpful to communicate with stakeholders. Especially to give updates on progress of priority items. We feel as a group, the BOM and stakeholders did not receive an appropriate response to the 2012 "white paper" and agricultural issues were not fully addressed. The white paper covered the GBOA's issues, however the response did not address our issues.	has to be documented and a grass roots effort from the constituents. It's needed.
Comments on the ranking exercise by RCE/NJAES this past year		The response to the ranking exercise by RCE/NJAES was defensive and non-constructive. The only opportunity to see the results was if we attended the Ag Convention and saw Dr. Katz's presentation. We still do not have the coverage on priority positions requested.	don't waste our time if you're not going to listen. Pitted different commodity groups against each other.
Input on County Ag Agents			
Satisfied with current level of service?		Have always been satisfied with our Ag Agents in Gloucester. They have always gone above and beyond their duties. We in GC have a strong, high demand 4-H program, with the largest equine program for 4-H in the state, and do not have a 4-H agent faculty member. We request strong support for 4-H for Gloucester county and are in need of an agent. GC ranks 3rd in ag production in the state and have a vacant ag agent position in tree fruit and viticulture that is a high priority need.	Field crops – rely on Penn State or industry. No support from Rutgers. Rutgers is far behind on field crops. Vegetables – needs are not being met or lacking since Bill T. retired. Fruit – needs are met in Hunterdon since the only fruit agent left is stationed in Hunterdon.
Your position on "sharing" agents across county boundaries		This has always been done as far as we know, but it is not a justification for cutting positions. Thinning of service is not the answer. Need cooperative people on the ground to develop and deliver programs.	Sharing is fine – technology helps. But, priority needs to be given to commercial growers.
Is the county board "in the loop" with county freeholder decisions on financial support?		GCBOA has always had good communications with county administration. Cnty leaders frequently attend our annual meetings and tours. We appreciate the continuity our ag agents bring us by bridging us with county freeholders. Through their presentation GC ag and all that Cooperative Extension represents in the county is well respected and supported.	Not so much anymore. Meetings with freeholders have fallen by the wayside. Did NJAES do away with this? They (NJAES) deal directly with freeholders now without input from the county board. No more meetings with the freeholders and county extension people. Used to have meetings and it worked.

<p>Your position on the use of "tenure track status" for county ag agents?</p>	<p>We are for systems that provide promotion and incentive for our county ag agents, however, the tenure system is so overburdened with time consuming issues like grant chasing, journal writing and research for county agents who in our opinion should be able to do programming for education and outreach to stakeholders. The reason we feel agents are doing more of these tasks is due to lack of specialist support that was once in place and is no longer there. One of the biggest mistakes in our opinion was to do away with the specialist department that worked with agents to deliver research results.</p>	<p>Mixed feelings on this. A lot of people don't love tenure but feel it may be necessary in this case to attract the caliber of person that is needed for the agent position.</p>
<p>How can the environmental and resource management agents better meet the needs of production ag? Do not include water use certifications with DEP</p>	<p>These agents do not have to exclusively work with agriculture; however, they should be working on agricultural water quality issues, like irrigation water testing and conservation, manure management for water protection, and other ag issues that impact everyone in our communities.</p>	<p>Maybe work with Chris Abrupta on projects. High density zoning, stream buffers. Leery of their motives (with these particular hires) because of their DEP background.. Aquaculture. Water chestnuts in ponds. Chemical solutions, not manual solutions. They need different responsibilities. These positions were not a priority hire.</p>
<p>Comments on the current allocation of resources between production ag and non-production ag purposes</p>	<p>RU as a broader institution has moved away from the land grant mission to support commercial ag and other land grant missions. This leaves RCE/NJAES struggling financially to continue its mandate. This is a difficult question since we do not know the percentage split of funding allocated for different programs. It would be nice to see the finances of NJAES to answer this question properly.</p>	<p>too hard to offer a percentage – the perception is the NJAES has shifted away from production ag. Not looking for the agents from 50 years ago, we realize that needs change. But production needs to be the number 1 priority.</p>
<p>Comments on communications regarding RCE/NJAES issues</p>	<p>The only way our board gets info is from the BOM rep. BOM minutes should be sent directly to the county presidents. We have open communication from the county extension office, but weak communications from the state level at RU.</p>	<p>No</p>
<p>What is your opinion about the listening session held in February '13 at the State Ag Convention?</p>	<p>L. Katz's presentation at the listening session was offensive. Comments made about low productivity of having tenured agents versus program associates in counties was not appreciated and is not the case in GC. We have always had highly productive agents. Listening sessions are for stakeholders to make comments for presenters to be acknowledged and consider for later action; not to have the speaker take up all the time and not field questions from the audience.</p>	<p>Listening session was BS. They are going to do what they are going to do. They don't listen to what the production ag community needs and wants. Has to be run differently – maybe someone from the BOM needs to serve as moderator. (Pat Butch would be great at this) Don't let them run it.</p>
<p>Which NJAES publications are useful to the growers/producers in your county? Identify.</p>	<p>Publications on contemporary issues and notifications of edu programs are most important. Most unimportant publications are those that are purely promotional that give selective info that is for PR purposes only. Updated production guides and online updates like animal health advisories, plant and pest advisories, and agricultural issue alerts.</p>	<p>Plant & Pest Advisory – however there are concerns about their new format. It used to be a weekly newsletter and now it's very scattered with bits and pieces coming out several times a week instead of in one uniform email newsletter. Everyone is fine with it being emailed instead of hard copies.</p>

<p>Comments on the funding for RCE/NJAES personnel and programs</p>		
<p>Would the county board be interested in receiving budget information from RCE/NJAES about its operations?</p>	<p>Of course we would like to see budget info from RCE/NJAES. Since it is a public institution we should be receiving at least annual financial reports of where our tax dollars are going.</p>	<p>Yes. They want input and budget info before the money is spent. Accountability.</p>
<p>Will the county board commit to a lobbying campaign with its local state legislators to seek supplemental state budget funding for RCE/NJAES?</p>	<p>The GCBOA already does this on our own, but would like to increase our activity in this area with assistance and info from RCE/NJAES leadership.</p>	<p>They are still leery of how NJAES would spend the funds if they were successful in getting them. There is a lot of distrust in NJAES and they may find a way to funnel the money into non production ag/ useful projects.</p>
<p>How would the county board allocate \$1 million...?</p>	<p>There are always innovations in ag. Priorities (for \$1mill) are the same in the areas of tree fruit, viticulture, nursery and vegetable entomology. In the area of 4-H we feel that some of the educational topics have been neglected. We need to revitalize the education of humane training of animals and the ethics of animal ownership. This has always been a traditional strength of 4-H programs in our state and we believe this topic needs to be re-evaluated.</p>	<p>The board didn't think they could answer this question because it would pit commodity groups against each other.</p>
<p>Other issues not covered - Ag or non-ag</p>	<p>Over decades RCE/NJAES, State Bd. Of Ag, Cnty Bds. Of Ag, NJFB and other ag support groups have worked cooperatively together to have a strong agricultural industry in our state. This also includes other RCE programs like FCHS and 4-H that are supported and valued by the ag industry since they weave together programs like nutrition, food sustainability and youth education in ag related subjects. We would ask that RU leadership recognize the constructive aspects of debate and disagreement in reaching decisions. These are signs of a healthy, open and innovative institution that strives in the process of excellence.</p>	<p>The board was specifically asked if 4-H, consumer sciences or any other areas had any concerns. There were none. Everyone in Hunterdon is very happy with their 4-H program and they don't want anyone from NJAES disrupting it. There was an issue regarding NJAES hiring process - They need to be more proactive in filling positions they know of. Have a search committee in place or maybe a program assoc in place to take over some responsibilities.</p>

QUESTIONS		Mercer	Middlesex	Monmouth
Comments on the 2012 "Annual Needs of Production Ag assessment"	Everyone is in favor of the annual assessment, feel it is extremely important	We liked the process.	Yes, important avenue of communication.	
Comments on the ranking exercise by RCEN/JAES this past year	County board is aware of the rankings. It is having difficulty understanding why they are dragging their feet in approving Meredith for a tenured county agent.	We liked the ranking process, however, we do not understand why our #1 priority was left off the priority list. Rutgers currently has an ineffective "soil fertility specialist". Please continue with the hires for the nursery & marketing specialist, add fertility specialist back as #1, and continue with the list.	Monmouth County is aware of the State's priorities and the process to determine those priorities. However, our county differs slightly from the State priorities. We still have the same priorities in the county as last year. IPM was our overwhelming #1 and another season has gone by without change. County is encouraged by NJAES announcement to proceed with hires in some prioritized areas, however, process is slow...over 1 1/2 years until actual hire occurs.	
Input on County Ag Agents				
Satisfied with current level of service?	Mercer is satisfied with the current level of support in relation to its needs but would like to have a permanent position as promised.	Yes, but the agents need to have specialists positions filled so that they can work together with specialists to conduct research and programs to help the entire farm community.	Somewhat. We have gone from 2 agents to 1. We have lost a hands on "production ag" agent who spent much time on nursery and vegetable production. This has not been replaced. We are very concerned that the present utilization of the county agriculture agent by Rutgers is pulling services away from Monmouth agriculture. The county ag agent is working in classrooms and online teaching which should be covered by tuition dollars. There was some talk of tuition dollars flowing back to production ag via exchange of teaching, however, we are now hearing those dollars are not available. Generally, Monmouth County wants more money spent on specialized assistance to production ag.	
Your position on "sharing" agents across county boundaries	Sharing agents is okay, not to exceed 3 counties.	On paper it works. In some counties, depending on financial support from the county, it does not. Do NOT formalize any agreements regarding cross county support, or you will likely lose county financial support in many counties. Our county receives considerable support from the county and regionalization would jeopardize that support.	We have shared agents' areas of expertise in the past and it has worked. Our county is somewhat apprehensive about sharing agents. We value "our" primary ag agent who is committed to our farmers and residents. We would consider sharing an agent with another county above and beyond our Primary full time agent.	
Is the county board "in the loop" with county freeholder decisions on financial support?	Yes, Mercer has a great rapport with our county government. We had a legislative breakfast at a farm in early September. It was a great success.	Yes. We have an excellent freeholder that is very interested in supporting agriculture.	We receive second hand information through our county agent. Although we have a good relationship it is felt we need to participate more directly with our Freeholders regarding financial matters.	

<p>Your position on the use of "tenure track status" for county ag agents?</p>	<p>In favor of tenure track</p>	<p>It is very important for agents and specialists. County boards of ag need to be more involved in the hiring process with agricultural agents and ag based specialists, and the administration needs to listen to the recommendations of the search committee (not hire the #2 or #3 candidate without ever offering it to #1).</p>	<p>Divided. Often tenure track positions attract more qualified expertise; it also takes time away from direct service.</p>
<p>How can the environmental and resource management agents better meet the needs of production ag? Do not include water use certifications with DEP</p>	<p>Many were still under the impression the positions were being paid by DEP. The major concern, there is NO agricultural input.</p>	<p>Irrigation and food safety issues related to production ag. It is our opinion that they currently are not serving the ag community. If they can't serve the Ag community (as this institution is supposed to do), then we need to let several go, and free up the funds that are needed for the more pressing issues (as should have been done when the DEP grant money ran out to begin with).</p>	<p>Yes, we have needs in this area not met especially following the last two major hurricanes: storm water management (including severe erosion); ways to minimize salt water flooding of crops following severe storms; greenhouse run off; New farm and farm expansion project assistance; manure management</p>
<p>Comments on the current allocation of resources between production ag and non-production ag purposes</p>	<p>Per our county needs in relation to our diverse community we are 85/15 split. Our goal would be an 80/20 split</p>	<p>Yes, but we still don't know what the federal funds are that correspond to the budget so we can't give a split. The dean of the Ag Experiment station needs to be on equal footing to the college dean to insure that the mission of the experiment station to serve the ag community is a priority.</p>	<p>Yes, we feel a shift towards non-production ag particularly now that we have lost 1 agricultural agent. NJAES applauds their IPM program with good reason, however, we have yet to receive this service. Furthermore, this service is also not available in the private sector in our area. A percentage ranking between ag and non ag is difficult.</p>
<p>Comments on communications regarding RCE/NJAES Is the county board sufficiently informed on RCE/NJAES activities at both the state and county levels?</p>	<p>Mercer feels they have been sufficiently informed per RCE/NJAES activity</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Yes, Monmouth County is well informed via our representatives on BOM and State Committee. However, even though requested, we still do not have sufficient budget information.</p>
<p>What is your opinion about the listening session held in February '13 at the State Ag Convention?</p>	<p>The listening session was one sided, their side, not very productive, more of a waste of time</p>	<p>What happened to the "listening component"? Keep on schedule. There should be a time limit on responses; 1-2 questions per person, 1 response. It was basically a waste of time because the university administration avoided really answering the questions, and so it ended early.</p>	<p>Session gave Dean Katz (sic) opportunity to present NJAES position. Demonstrated College is beginning to hear concerns. However, it was a one way conversation.</p>
<p>Which NJAES publications are useful to the growers/producers in your county? Identify.</p>	<p>Need to improve on the organic farming recommendations. We have a very strong organic base</p>	<p>Plant & Pest advisory, Vegetable & Fruit growers guides, Penn State Agronomy Guide.</p>	<p>Plant & Pest Advisory; Vegetable Production Recommendations; Ornamental Horticulture; Turf Grass; Commercial Fruit Recommendations. Growers are good with online delivery.</p>

<p>Comments on the funding for RCE/NJAES personnel and programs</p>			
<p>Would the county board be interested in receiving budget information from RCE/NJAES about its operations?</p>	<p>Everyone would like them to be a lot more transparent as was in the 80's and early 90's</p>	<p>Yes, we've been asking for this for years? How can directors not have budgets to share, unless they have something to hide? Do we need to pursue the Open Public Records Act to release budget information?</p>	<p>Yes, budget information before it is spent and accountability afterwards.</p>
<p>Will the county board commit to a lobbying campaign with its local state legislators to seek supplemental state budget funding for RCE/NJAES?</p>	<p>Mercer has a strong lobbying initiative and an open dialogue as needed.</p>	<p>Yes, as we always have, but the dean and directors of extension and experiment station need to be truthful and share information when asked to provide budgets and follow-up information after meetings.</p>	<p>Yes, if the funds are dedicated to production agriculture.</p>
<p>How would the county board allocate \$1 million...?</p>	<p>1 million dollars could be spent on expanding our niche commodities like Organic</p>	<p>Research on the following: phytophthora, stink bugs, mile-a-minute, viral/bacterial issues in fruit, micronutrient issues, Honey-Crisp apple production, plum/peach decline. Alternately, we could hire agents and "magically" find the funding for future years as the dean seems to do in administration.</p>	<p>We have concern that this question pits one commodity against another. Monmouth would like to see the funds shared among the research farms.</p>
<p>Other issues not covered - Ag or non-ag</p>		<p>Show us the true budget and allocation as we've been calling for! We may need to utilize the Open Public Records Act to get detailed information that we have been asking for years.</p>	<p>Need more livestock assistance in the area of small animal expertise, sheep, goats, cows. CASE (Curriculum for Agricultural Science Education) supported at Rutgers University. Non-ag production areas, 4-H, Master Gardeners and Family Sciences, are happy with their programs as expressed at this meeting and at the Monmouth County stakeholders meeting.</p>

QUESTIONS	Morris	Ocean	Somerset
Comments on the 2012 "Annual Needs of Production Ag assessment"	Yes	Yes	It was well done the first time and should continue.
Comments on the ranking exercise by RCE/NJAES this past year	Yes but need to do an evaluation yearly b/c of changes in personnel and needs.	Ocean County needs are to fill a hybridized agent position with responsibilities for water quality, natural resources and act as an agriculture liaison.	Nursery specialist hire should be completed ASAP.
Input on County Ag Agents	Yes	No agent, service is being provided by a program associate-like county employee.	Yes, but our ag agent spends half his time on state Master Gardener management. Too much.
Satisfied with current level of service?	Define "sharing". We are fine with sharing specialists across counties but believe each county should have its own ag agent. Knowledge sharing is fine but two counties sharing an agent is no good. Two freeholder boards to deal with etc.	Necessary, but often works poorly.	We have been doing it for some time. As long as freeholders don't mind the sharing, it is OK.
Your position on "sharing" agents across county boundaries	Not really	Yes	Not as much as we should be. Advisory Bd endorsement of the RCE budget is pretty much boilerplate. No room to move.
Is the county board "in the loop" with county freeholder decisions on financial support?	Hard to get but once they get it gives them a lot of freedom.	This is fine, but the requirement for tenure are often unachievable for even good results-producing agents. The acknowledgement of achievements is very different between the college to the county.	We don't like tenure, but realize it is necessary.
Your position on the use of "tenure track status" for county ag agents?	Well it would be good if they could do water use certifications, as their expertise is not in production ag. We should take the money that pays for them and put it towards ag agents. What exactly do the water agents do that is production ag related?	They simply must be more engaged with the agriculture sector.	STOP rain barrel seminars for yuppy homeowners and concentrate on water use advise on production farms.
How can the environmental and resource management agents better meet the needs of production ag? Do not include water use certifications with DEP	Yes. The support has shifted WAY too far from ag. Should be 80/20. We have 5 water agents but no fruit agent in the south.		Yes, too far removed. As long as the NJAES director reports to the dean of SEBS, AES will take a backseat.
Comments on the current allocation of resources between production ag and non-production ag purposes			
Comments on communications regarding RCE/NJAES	Yes, because of Carol (BOM rep) and Pete (Ag agent)	Yes	Yes
Is the county board sufficiently informed on RCE/NJAES activities at both the state and county levels?			

<p>What is your opinion about the listening session held in February '13 at the State Ag Convention?</p>		<p>It is a good way for counties to get on the same page and coordinated, however, it's often to drawn out and personal.</p>	<p>Most feel that it was a talking session, not a listening session. Responses to questions did not answer the question.</p>
<p>Which NJAES publications are useful to the growers/producers in your county? Identify.</p>	<p>Email blasts</p>		<p>Plant & Pest advisory, Vegetable & Fruit growers guides.</p>
<p>Comments on the funding for RCE/NJAES personnel and Would the county board be interested in receiving budget information from RCE/NJAES about its operations?</p>	<p>Yes of course</p>	<p>Everyone wants to see where the money is being spent.</p>	<p>Well, of course! That has been requested for at least six years.</p>
<p>Will the county board commit to a lobbying campaign with its local state legislators to seek supplemental state budget funding for RCE/NJAES?</p>	<p>Yes, only if we are guaranteed to get ag agents not the college</p>	<p>Yes when the requests are reasonable.</p>	<p>Yes, when we think we are being dealt with honestly by RCE/NJAES.</p>
<p>How would the county board allocate \$1 million...?</p>	<p>Could change year to year. Weed control, phytopthera</p>		<p>No particular response.</p>
<p>Other issues not covered - Ag or non-ag</p>	<p>No succession planning. Need to take a look at agents at retirement age or within 5 years of retirement. Who is there to replace them?</p>		<p>FCHS and 4-H in Somerset are well run and utilized. Freeholders fund them adequately at this time.</p>

QUESTIONS	Sussex	Union	Warren
Comments on the 2012 "Annual Needs of Production Ag assessment"		The UCBOA feels the survey and the follow up annual report are a good idea in expressing the cnty bds needs and issues.	Didn't help, lead or respond to our needs.
Comments on the ranking exercise by RCE/NJAES this past year		The ranking exercise is a good attempt to prioritize each county's needs throughout the state. This is a difficult task as NJ is such a diverse environment. The needs of Union Cnty are greatly different from those in Burlington or Ocean. This offers an opportunity for all to express their needs and concerns and gives a way of weighting these needs around the state.	Showed needs, no actions to fill it.
Input on County Ag Agents Satisfied with current level of service?	The Sussex County ag community is satisfied that it's primary needs have been fulfilled by the personnel provided by NJAES. We are satisfied with the excellent work by Steven Komar, our ag agent and head of the county extension service. The same can be said for Dave Foord, 4-H program associate and his assistant, Michelle Teitsma.	Our current level of service from our cnty agents is adequate and we are satisfied with it.	No - want position of Ag Agent filled, commercial ag is not being served.
Your position on "sharing" agents across county boundaries	Considering the monetary problems that NJAES is confronted with, we have no objection to shared services by agents and associates.	Sharing agents is an excellent way to share resources and should be encouraged throughout the state as needed.	It is acceptable as long as we do not lose the services that we previously had.
Is the county board "in the loop" with county freeholder decisions on financial support?	We have excellent rapport and support from our County Freeholders.	We try to keep in the loop with cnty freeholders and their decisions on financial support but feel communication with them is poor and they do not include us as we would like. If we see something lacking or needed, we try to let them know our feelings but how they follow up is not communicated back often.	Yes
Your position on the use of "tenure track status" for county ag agents?			Yes
How can the environmental and resource management agents better meet the needs of production ag? Do not include water use certifications with DEP			N/A

<p>Comments on the current allocation of resources between production ag and non-production ag purposes</p>		<p>Union City's needs from the RCE/NJAES are different from many other parts of the state and we feel that the current allocation of resources between production ag purposes and non-production ag purposes works well for us. Our county's needs are more in the non-production area. Again, this is not the case of the whole state and must be weighted against the other counties. The states needs have changed since the RCE/NJAES was established and it must allocate some resources to non-production ag to best serve the state.</p>	<p>Yes, way too far away. 90%</p>
<p>Comments on communications regarding RCE/NJAES Is the county board sufficiently informed on RCE/NJAES activities at both the state and county levels?</p>		<p>We believe that our county board is sufficiently informed of RCE/NJAES thanks to our representative on the BOM.</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>What is your opinion about the listening session held in February '13 at the State Ag Convention?</p>		<p>We were unable to attend the listening session at the state ag convention but welcome any opportunity to become more informed.</p>	<p>Didn't answer. Nothing definitive said in regards to services.</p>
<p>Which NJAES publications are useful to the growers/producers in you county? Identify.</p>			<p>Plant/Pest, Commercial Fruit and Vegetable, Commercial Crop Production.</p>
<p>Comments on the funding for RCE/NJAES personnel and Would the county board be interested in receiving budget information from RCE/NJAES about its operations?</p>		<p>We would be interested in receiving budget information from RCE/NJAES on its operations</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>Will the county board commit to a lobbying campaign with its local state legislators to seek supplemental state budget funding for RCE/NJAES?</p>			<p>Yes, if full transparency of funding from college</p>
<p>How would the county board allocate \$1 million...?</p>			<p>Reduce wildlife damage. Fund research farms.</p>
<p>Other issues not covered - Ag or non-ag</p>			<p>Agriculture Agent.</p>

Annual Assessment of the Needs of Production Agriculture in New Jersey
with input from New Jersey Farm Bureau and
the County Boards of Agriculture of New Jersey

September 2012

Historically, the efficiencies that have been achieved in production agriculture during the twentieth century have been the result of publicly supported agricultural research carried out by the nation's land grant universities and the United States Department of Agriculture Agricultural Research Service (USDA ARS). During the past several years, dollars for publicly-supported agricultural research have been reduced, programs have been cut back, retiring personnel have not been replaced and the agricultural community is feeling the effects in decreased research and extension.

While state and federal budget constraints are acknowledged, however, there is a growing sentiment among the agriculture community that the land grant university at the New Jersey Agriculture Experiment Station (NJAES) has also shifted its focus and limited resources away from programs that support the agriculture industry.

An example of this shifting focus is perhaps most evident in personnel decisions that have been made over the past several years. Some of the industry's most relied upon agricultural agents and specialists have retired. Despite the agriculture industry's efforts, those positions have either remained vacant or program associates/program coordinators (with lesser degree requirements) have been hired in the place of tenure track faculty. Further, in what many see as a blatant example of a movement away from its agricultural mission, the NJAES hired five environmental county agents whose work does not relate to production agriculture at a time when the agriculture community was being told that the aforementioned agents and specialists could not be replaced. The impacts of these hiring decisions are evident as the agriculture community works with the remaining agricultural agents who are facing additional pressures to manage research responsibilities that were once in the wheelhouse of specialists.

The agriculture community is also concerned with the NJAES budget priorities as they are focused less on programs that benefit production agriculture. One example of this is the increased amount of time that some specialists are spending teaching rather than doing agricultural research and extension, even though those positions receive funding from the NJAES budget.

It is because of these concerns that the agriculture community has set out to identify current key research and extension needs for the industry to maintain and increase our ability to feed our nation and the growing population of the world. It has been the role of publicly supported agricultural research to improve the quality and efficiencies in production agriculture, which today allows one farmer to feed over 100 people. It is this efficiency that correlates with less than 10% of an average person's income being spent on food. As we look to

the future, it is the increase in production efficiency which will allow our farmers to produce enough food to feed a growing population. To meet this demand for increased agricultural production efficiency, we must have the research that the land grant universities and the USDA Agricultural Research Service provide. The private sector alone cannot provide the basic research required.

A committee of farmers representing different commodity groups was selected by County Boards of Agriculture throughout the state to determine the needs of production agriculture with respect to agricultural research and extension through Rutgers University, our land grant university, and the New Jersey Agricultural Experiment Station. This effort to examine each commodity's needs for support from specialists and agricultural agents has been a collaboration of the County Boards of Agriculture, the New Jersey State Board of Agriculture, the Board of Managers and the New Jersey Farm Bureau. These needs stated below will be assessed and reviewed on an annual basis by the aforementioned parties.

Overall Findings

The Committee holds a steadfast position that in order to best serve the agriculture industry, the university and the NJAES must maintain a team of both specialists and agents. Specialists are needed to do the applied research and to assist agents with problem solving when issues arise. Agents are necessary to fulfill their role as communicators to the agriculture community.

The Committee recommends that the hiring process be more inclusive of the agriculture community in order to address the needs of the industry. The NJAES should better utilize its Board of Managers to receive advice and approval on hiring priorities, the interview process and hiring decisions.

Needs for Researchers and Specialists

All Commodities:

Across all commodity groups, the Committee identified the following needs:

- **Fertility Specialist:** To determine adequate fertility needs for optimum plant growth without producing excess nutrient loads in conventional and organic production and in using soilless media. There is also a need for research on the use of time release fertilizers to provide adequate nutrition for optimum plant growth in most crops.
- **Mechanization Specialist:** To benefit all sectors of the agricultural industry in New Jersey. There is a need for an agricultural engineer to work on mechanization and labor saving devices and to evaluate equipment that may be available in Europe or other parts of the world to determine the suitability of this equipment for New Jersey agriculture. Labor is becoming more of an issue all the time. Mechanization is critical to keeping NJ agriculture viable when labor shortages occur.
- **Plant Pathologists, Entomologists, Weed Scientists:** Every commodity needs to have researchers and specialists to work on diseases, insects and weeds that threaten our crops. The Committee strongly recommends that plant pathologists, entomologists and weed scientists that retire be replaced as soon as possible with PhD level candidates.

- **Irrigation Management Specialist:** The Committee identified a need for an irrigation management specialist that could work with all commodity groups as well as work on water allocation issues.
- **Marketing Specialist:** Research and education are necessary for all facets of marketing including; direct marketing, retail marketing and agritourism. A marketing specialist would assist all commodities.

Nursery:

- **Nursery Management Specialist:** The Committee found the University and NJAES to have a very inadequate staff to provide research and extension for the highest value agricultural commodity group in the state. A Nursery Management Specialist should be a priority.
- **Entomologist:** Research is needed to study insect pests of ornamental plants
- **Plant Pathologist:** Research to study diseases of ornamental plants commonly found in nurseries are also needed.

Floriculture:

- **Floriculture specialist:** The current specialist in this position at the University is nearing retirement age. The Committee recommends this position be filled with another floriculture specialist when this retirement occurs.

Sod:

- The Committee found that sod was being adequately served. There is sufficient funding coming from outside the University and NJAES to adequately staff a research and extension program for sod.

Vegetables:

- The Committee found support for the vegetable industry to be profoundly lacking with regard to a vegetable horticultural researcher or specialist for the state's second highest income generating agricultural industry.
- **Vegetable Horticulturist:** A specialist is needed to do research on cultural practices, variety evaluation, etc. The horticulturist at the University left to take a position in NY approximately 15 years ago and has not been replaced. The horticulturist at RAREC retired approximately 10 years ago and has not been replaced. Dr. Mel Henninger has just retired. There is no indication that Dr. Henninger's position will be filled.
- **Vegetable Entomologist:** This position is vacant due to the retirement of the vegetable entomologist at RAREC. This position needs to be filled at the PhD level. This position must not be filled with a program associate working under the tree fruit entomologist.

Cranberry and Blueberry:

- **Physiologist:** The cranberry industry, in particular, needs a Physiologist to research the physiological effects of increasing temperature on cranberry production. A physiologist could also work on physiological problems of blueberries.

Livestock:

- **Nutrient Management Specialist:** A specialist is needed to do research on nutrient management. In particular, the dairy industry is in need of a specialist to do research in the area of nutrient management and milk quality.

Equine:

- The Committee identified a need for more services for the equine industry as a whole and in particular in southern New Jersey. There are great facilities that service the northern part of the state, however, services are lacking in the southern region. Although not necessarily a specialist need, the Committee found that the equine industry needs more outreach and education in the area of manure management and its impacts on the environment.
- **Nutrient Management Specialist – Equine:** Horse hay and pasture are different from that required by dairy animals and this is a matter of concern to the equine industry.

Apiary:

- **Honey Bee Specialist:** The recent hire of a pollinator specialist to do research on wild bees does not meet the needs of the agriculture industry for a honey bee specialist.

Aquaculture:

- **Aquaculture Specialist:** The Committee identified two specific needs for aquaculture: research on how to overwinter small clams and the mechanization of oyster culture. It should be noted that there is currently someone working in these areas on a temporary, grant funded basis. The committee feels this position should be funded on a permanent basis.

Needs for Extension Agents

The Director of Extension, Dr. Larry Katz, has stated that NJAES is considering replacing some agricultural agents with program coordinators or program associates as a possible cost-cutting measure. The Committee considered the pros and cons of tenure track faculty (agents) versus non tenure track staff (program coordinators or program associates). The tenured agent faculty has provided a very stable, professional extension program to production agriculture throughout the state. When comparing New Jersey's tenured agent faculty to agent staff in other states without tenure, the Committee found that the tenured faculty tends to stay in their positions for a longer period of time and have a higher degree of technical expertise. The agricultural community values this expertise and the ability to build trusted relationships with its agriculture agents. The only downside the Committee found is the occasional agent that may not perform up to the level required, but the Committee did not feel this weakness warranted the loss in stability and expertise found with the current tenure system.

It is the Committee's understanding that of the 25 agricultural agents (not including the five environmental county agents) there are 16 agricultural agents that are either already eligible or who will be eligible within 5 years for retirement. This statistic is staggering when it is looked at with the possibility that these positions may not be filled by the NJAES, especially given the last eight agricultural agents to retire have not been replaced. The Committee strongly urges NJAES to replace retiring agents with tenure track agent faculty as quickly as possible and at the same level of technical expertise now required (Master's degree or higher).

Most pressing is the need to hire an agent with expertise in tree fruit to replace the retiring Jerry Frecon in Gloucester County and an agent with expertise in nursery to replace the recently retired Rich Obal in Monmouth County. However, concerns were also expressed that it must be a priority to keep agriculture agents in both the north and south regions of the state with expertise in tree fruit, vegetables, small fruit, nursery, livestock, field crops and marketing. In order to maintain the continuity of the aquaculture program in South Jersey, a plan must be put forth in order to ensure the replacement the Marine Agent stationed in Ocean County upon his retirement. The Committee also found a need for an agent with expertise in the area of organic production. Please note that this does not mean there needs to be an agent dedicated solely to organic agriculture, but the Committee feels this is a growing field that is currently underserved by the NJAES.

Conclusion

The value of the work provided by the NJAES agricultural agents and specialists in areas that impact agriculture producer needs cannot be overstated. The agricultural community's appreciation for the work that comes out of its land grant university is great. Although we understand the strict budgetary constraints facing the NJAES, there is a vital need to continue and improve upon programs that will allow the agricultural industry to grow efficiently and better meet the needs of New Jersey and beyond. The Committee, on behalf of the agricultural industry in New Jersey, urges Rutgers University and the New Jersey Agricultural Experiment Station to increase the involvement of the industry it serves in hiring priorities and decisions. Going forward, top priorities must include the hiring of a horticulturist and entomologist for vegetable crops, and a nursery management specialist, plant pathologist and entomologist for ornamental crops to meet the needs of the two highest income-generating commodities in the state. It must also be a priority to hire a replacement for the retiring agricultural extension agent in Gloucester County working with tree fruit and the retired agricultural agent in Monmouth County working with nursery. The other needs outlined in this report should be accomplished within the next three years. The agricultural community in New Jersey stands ready to support NJAES requests for public funding to meet these needs.

Footnote

There is an existing structure in place to identify the needs of the production agriculture community at the NJAES. This is accomplished through the Board of Managers with support from the county boards of agriculture, stakeholder meetings, and other agricultural organizations. The utilization of this structure by the NJAES is imperative to the success of production agriculture in NJ.

Signed and Dated:

Lou Makrancy, President

RESOLUTION # 11

NEW JERSEY AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION

1 **WHEREAS**, New Jersey’s agricultural community is faced with a multitude of
2 challenges that threaten its viability and sustainability, including: land use regulation;
3 rising production costs; Right to Farm issues; water-quality concerns; wildlife damage;
4 and rising taxes; and

5 **WHEREAS**, New Jersey agriculture’s viability and sustainability are also
6 impacted by unexploited market opportunities and limited access to innovations that
7 would enhance prosperity, stewardship potential and compatibility with other land uses;
8 and

9 **WHEREAS**, given the economic impacts and public benefits of the agricultural
10 and food complex, not only in rural areas but also in the state’s urban and suburban
11 communities, the constraints on the industry impinge upon the assurance of food
12 security, nutrition and health, water quality and supply, environmental sustainability,
13 economic development, and the quality of life for all residents of the Garden State; and

14 **WHEREAS**, New Jersey’s status as the nation’s most densely populated state
15 means its environmental pressures exceed those of other states, and thus have raised
16 the environment to become a key quality-of-life issue; and

17 **WHEREAS**, this requires new policies and technologies that are effective in
18 maintaining the delicate balance between environmental quality and economic growth,
19 and the New Jersey Agricultural Experiment Station (NJAES) provides the expertise and
20 information needed to develop the policies and technologies that strike that balance; and

21 **WHEREAS**, the recent budget constraints faced by NJAES, including recent
22 large budget cuts or flat budgets, and the need to continue meeting operational costs,

23 have meant that less funding is available for salaries, programs and research, and
24 funding dedicated to production agriculture projects has been strained, leading to a
25 constant danger of outlying extension stations losing capacity to be productive; and

26 **WHEREAS**, the NJAES' ability to support production agriculture has decreased
27 as agricultural agents and specialists have retired and not been replaced; and

28 **WHEREAS**, exacerbating the funding cuts has been a threat that the federal
29 formula funding for state agricultural experiment stations could be replaced with
30 competitive grant funding only; and

31 **WHEREAS**, as specialists, agents and other program staff are not replaced, staff
32 have less time to make farm visits and keep abreast of what is happening in the fields;
33 and

34 **WHEREAS**, applied research areas formerly covered by specialists have been
35 left uncovered, replacements for highly effective extension specialists who have retired
36 have not been found; and

37 **WHEREAS**, the circumstances detailed above have all occurred during a time
38 when NJAES continues to provide services to other areas, further diluting scarce funds
39 for production agriculture research and extension; and

40 **WHEREAS**, further implementation of similar measures will further negatively
41 impact the delivery of crucial agricultural programs across the state; and

42 **WHEREAS**, the people of New Jersey fund Rutgers University, and intellectual
43 and financial return is expected to create more employment and a higher standard of
44 living for the population of New Jersey and the United States.

45 **NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, that we, the delegates to the 99th State
46 Agricultural Convention, assembled in Atlantic City, New Jersey on February 5-6, 2014,
47 do hereby declare that support for production agriculture must be improved and

48 maintained if production efficiencies are to be achieved to feed our state and nation at
49 the levels required to make food affordable.

50 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that we call upon the Dean of the School of
51 Environmental and Biological Sciences and the Director of the New Jersey Agricultural
52 Experiment Station (NJAES), in cooperation with its Board of Managers, County Boards
53 of Agriculture, the New Jersey State Board of Agriculture and the Rutgers Cooperative
54 Extension staff to implement the recommendations of the Board of Managers and the
55 strategic plan recommendations of the ARMA (Agricultural and Resource Management)
56 report, all developed over the past two years and based on the Annual Report by the
57 Board of Managers, (1) to fill positions (agents, specialists and expert program staff), in
58 a manner that will enable the continued delivery of quality programming to production
59 agriculture; (2) to address agricultural concerns identified in the Board of Managers
60 Annual Report; and (3) to develop new programs as identified by stakeholders in
61 agriculture and natural resources.

62 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that we call upon the Dean of the School of
63 Environmental and Biological Sciences and the Director of the New Jersey Agricultural
64 Experiment Station, in cooperation with its Board of Managers, County Boards of
65 Agriculture, the New Jersey State Board of Agriculture and the Rutgers Cooperative
66 Extension staff to further improve the timeliness of communications among those groups
67 on key issues.

68 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that we strongly urge that this strategic plan
69 continue to incorporate a balance of maintaining tenure-track agricultural agents that
70 deliver educational programs, as well as conduct applied research benefiting the
71 agricultural community, and sufficient specialists to meet the applied research needs of
72 that community, and that such hires include participation with the New Jersey State

73 Board of Agriculture, the NJAES Board of Managers and the New Jersey Farm Bureau
74 before these hiring decisions are made.

75 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that we strongly urge the New Jersey State Board
76 of Agriculture, the NJAES Board of Managers and the New Jersey Farm Bureau to work
77 with the Governor, the Legislature and the county Boards of Chosen Freeholders to
78 restore adequate funding for agricultural research to compliment the extramural grants,
79 contracts and bequests secured by NJAES staff in the past fiscal years.

80 **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that we also urge the USDA to provide a stable
81 source of funding for the Land Grant University and Extension programs.



**NEW JERSEY
STATE HORTICULTURAL SOCIETY**
176 Airport Road, Hackettstown, New Jersey 07840

Appendix F

February 11, 2014

Dear Dean Goodman,

I am writing this letter on behalf on the New Jersey State Horticultural Society. On January 29th, 2014, the board voted unanimously to send a letter regarding the Commercial Tree Fruit Recommendation Guide. For several years in a row now, the latest edition of this publication has not been available for purchase in time for the Mid-Atlantic Fruit and Vegetable Convention that takes place in Hershey, PA the last week in January. This presents a problem since this guide is not only used by NJ fruit growers but also by growers throughout the Mid-Atlantic region. The Hershey convention is attended by over 2,000 growers annually and is the perfect venue to have the Tree Fruit Production Guide available for purchase for NJ growers and growers outside of NJ. This is one of the only opportunities that growers that live outside of the state have to purchase the guide. We had many people come up to our registration desk throughout all three days inquiring about the Guide. All of these people expressed their disappointment in not being able to purchase the Guide for yet another year in a row.

We realize that putting this guide together on an annual basis is a monumental task that cannot just be thrown together, however, it is extremely important that the latest version of the manual is available for the Hershey convention and the rest of the winter meetings that follow. The NJSHS addressed this issue with Dan Ward several years ago when it first happened. We thought it would be taken care of the following year, but unfortunately the problem is still ongoing. It is a great testament to the NJAES and all the agents and specialists that are involved in creating the Guide that it is such high demand throughout NJ and the surrounding region. We heard from many people (growers, researchers and industry people) that they look forward to purchasing the NJ recommendations because it is by far the best guide available. The latest version of the Tree Fruit Recommendation Guide also contains vital and current information that growers need to start planning their pest control programs, fertilization programs and new plantings for the upcoming year. That planning starts in the winter months.

Simply put, it is unacceptable not to have the latest version of the Tree Fruit Recommendation Guide available for purchase at the Mid-Atlantic Fruit and Vegetable Convention. Please let us know if we can assist in expediting this process in any way. The NJSHS would be happy to help in any way possible to make sure that the guide is published before the annual Mid-Atlantic Fruit and Vegetable Convention.

Sincerely,

Meredith Compton
NJSHS. President

PRESIDENT
Meredith Compton
150 Pittstown Road
Pittstown, NJ 08867
908-713-1705
peacefulvalleyorchards1@gmail.com

VICE-PRESIDENT
Dale Davis IV
8 Route 24
Chester, NJ 07930
908-879-2696
Dale4stonyhill@gmail.com

SECRETARY
Peter Nitzsche
RCE Morris County
P.O. Box 900
Morristown, NJ
07963-0900
973-285-8300
nitzsche@njaes.rutgers.edu

TREASURER
Gary Mount
330 Cold Soil Road
Princeton, NJ 08540
609-924-2310
gbmount@alumni.princeton.edu

PAST PRESIDENT
David G. Duffield
324 Chapel Hts. Rd.
Sewell, NJ 08080
856-589-0158
duff4020@gmail.com

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Greg Donaldson 2011-2016
176 Airport Road
Hackettstown, NJ 07840
908-852-9122
greg@donaldsonfarms.net

Jim Giamarese 2012-2014
155 Fresh Ponds Road
East Brunswick, NJ 08816
732-599-3988
giamarese@comcast.net

John Hauser 2013-2015
336 Ticetown Road
Oldbridge, NJ 08857
732-591-1966
hauserhillfarms@verizon.net

James Bourgeois 2013-2016
122 Oakdale Road
Chester, NJ 07930
609-364-8005
jamesbourgeois@yahoo.com

Ken Wightman 2014-2016
1111 Mt. Kimble Ave.
Morristown, NJ 07960
973-425-9819
wightmansfarms@yahoo.com

Anthony Yula 2014-2016
500 University Boulevard
Glassboro, NJ 08028
856-217-3636
summitcityfarms@yahoo.com