

NASA EPSCoR Caucus Executive Committee Meeting Agenda

Date: **December 9, 2025**

Time: 4:00 PM Eastern, 5:00 PM Puerto Rico, 3:00 PM Central, 2:00 PM Mountain, 1:00 PM Pacific, 12:00 PM Alaska, 11:00 AM Hawaii, 7:00 AM (+1) Guam

Part 1 ExCom business (ExCom and invited participants)—60 minutes

Welcome, roll, agenda C. Cole

Secretary's report (approval of minutes from last meeting) P. Oemig

NASA updates D. Berger

2/28/2026 Caucus meeting agenda All ExCom

NASA EPSCoR Advocacy L. Gilbert, L. Katz

EPSCoR / IDeA Foundation J. Molesworth

Other business All ExCom

Part 2 Open session (All)—30 minutes

Comments and questions from the floor All

Adjourn

Meeting Notes:

Chip: Welcome everybody. Thank you for joining today. Secretary's report.

Paulo: Are there any corrections or edits to the minutes from Nov. 11

Chip moved to approve, Sara seconded. All in favor. None against.

Minutes from Nov. 11 approved.

Chip: Next agenda item: Updates from NASA. Dave.

Dave: Glad to be back. Sorry we missed the last mtg with the furlough. Big thanks to Chip for the pre-meeting to send updates.

Will summarize, very glad to be back. Very optimistic with the future of EPSCoR. Every single month I get great feedback. We're on a CR January 30th. It limits the budget for EPSCoR

We have resume ISS and R3 reviews from last year. It is my hope that we can submit the selection to NSSC prior to Jan 30th.

Due to the particulars of last year's award process, we won't be able to award until Q4.

Toni: Q4, does that mean August-July 2026 timeframe?

Dave: Yes, I'm talking about the federal government fiscal year to award ISS and R3s.

We are meeting with the planetary sciences division, working on the research list. We have a list; however, we're making sure it is relevant to future missions and current staff.

Great feedback on research areas, please reach out. I've heard from some folks how it has become so specific, and resembling R3s. I would say, it's a work in progress. I'm thinking of an alignment to mission directorates. At the same time, specific research topics on the NOFO are good for some people.

Gerardo: Can we expect award letters to come in soon for continuing awards?

Dave: I'm working with Torry Johnson – Expect RID annual amounts to be funded on time. The Q4 delay doesn't apply to current awards.

Denise: Do you have an estimate when the NOFO will come out?

Dave: My best estimate will be late March at the earliest.

Denise: I appreciate that the R3s will be evaluated. I submitted during the closure an NCE on one of our grants. How do we track it?

Dave: I will try to get you an answer asap. Agency-EPSCoR is a good email.

Dave: New process, I'm not allowed to send congratulation letters directly. Now it will all be through the NSSC.

For the basic NOFO instead of having specific research areas, we could make it broader to align to mission directorates and their technology roadmaps. Yet, from other consortia I've heard that providing specific areas is helpful.

Given the nature of NASA today, I intend to put into the NOFO 35% rubric category that regardless of if you are focusing on a research category or not, that won't affect your scoring.

Sara: That seems like a great compromise. We'll be happy to do a survey.

Dave: We lost Josh. Our new addition to EPSCoR is Allison Rapp.

Chip: The Caucus can run surveys too. I'll be happy to sit down with you and discuss the type of questions to ask.

Dave: It's my intent to bring Jim and Matt to the February meeting in DC.

The RID augmentation is still fully supported. FY26 ISS and R3 are not in the plan. The FY26 NOFO depends on funding availability.

Leslie A. in chat: Will there be changes to the indirect limits for the NOFO?

Dave: Not to my knowledge. I'll double check.

Chip: Since Dave has to leave. I would like to open it up to all to ask questions for Dave.
[None]

Dave: I'm available to set up times to talk to anyone here. I encourage communication.

Colleen: Thank you for sharing all that information, Dave.

Chip: Back to the EPSCoR agenda. Caucus meeting in DC. Here is a draft for Saturday, February 28. We can move things around. We start at 8:30 am, announcements and introductions. Then Dave. I would like to confirm with Leslee for updates (45min). Update from Jessica M. about the IDeA Foundation. We have slots for three topics (~30min each).

Melanie: Don't know if it is a topic for this meeting, Kathy has talked about no longer having R3s and put that money into the RID. That's something we discussed last year.

Chip: Great idea for a topic, grant mechanisms.

Denise: We had this conversation back and forth; do we go back to TIMs?

Chip: Also, a good topic. It's worth revisiting since we have new leadership.

Paulo: If R3s are brought back, how will they be run?

Sara: Does Dave need more than one hour?

Dave: I yield back, but one hour would be good for us: We to talk about reporting, letters of recommendation, and Matt Pierce wants to talk about research communities.

Melanie: They might need more time if OSTEM goes somewhere else within the agency.

Cass: Torry wants to come to the Saturday Caucus meeting.

Chip: I have been leaving it up to Dave for the NASA folks who want to come.
Ending at 1:00 pm ET?

Leslee: Hill update. Elaine Ho would like to have a call with me tomorrow. I might have something to share next time.

As you know we're under CR through January 30th. There has been some positive movement with the minibuses. Congress is mired in the National Authorization Act and extending the subsidies for the Affordable Care Act. The NASA EPSCoR program is 26M through statute. House only funds NASA EPSCoR and Space Grant but asking to move them to the support mission directorate. House and Senate must come to an agreement. Our ask for FY26 was 30M. I would ask the same amount if the Caucus agrees. The ask for FY27 is not known at the moment. The Senate Commerce Committee advanced the nomination of Jared Isaacman to be the new NASA Administrator to the whole Senate. I expect his nomination will get approved. From staff, questions on OSTEM support will be asked.

Chip: We can definitely get you feedback on the ask. Can I connect with you; involve the whole Caucus for feedback?

Leslee: I'm getting a lot of questions requesting the FY27 Ask. Any final bill will not be 26M, but I would ask a little more.

Melanie: The Inspector General report talks about reshuffling EPSCoR states. Increasing the number of states.

Leslee: I haven't seen any movement to change the number of states.

Jessica M: Haven't seen anything either.

Sara: Initial 30M seems a good ask. I would advocate for that.

Chip: I agree.

Shawna: 30M sounds good to me too.

Chip: Does anyone oppose a 30M ask? [None opposed]

Leslee: Good and if we want to address any language, we have time to do that.

Chip: Next item, Jessica.

Jessica: Thanks to the group for settling on an ask of 30M. We'll be ironing out the request letters. A special focus on the foundation newsletter is regarding the annual meeting on February 23. For those of you who want to attend, our newsletter will have a registration link; registration is free, and there will be a hotel link as well. We are working on the VIP speakers.

Chip: Thank you and thank you for hosting us on February 28.

That concludes our agenda.

Melanie: I'm reading the chat from Cass: "Please consider the Hyatt Capitol Hill for your hotel if you are attending this meeting! We have a contract with them!" Which meeting do you mean, Cass?

Cass: All the meetings. The Hyatt is fully renovated.

Colleen: Agenda item for Caucus meeting: Propose TIMs/Research Communities. Louisiana researchers really enjoyed the TIMs. Jeepie would get division heads to do research presentations online and university researchers would get invited. Jeepie recruited the NASA folks, I created online meetings and sent out the invitations. Maybe this could be a steppingstone to TIMs or Matt's research communities.

Last year, we were limited in participation for the Saturday Caucus meeting. Are there any limits this time around? Last year we had a limit of one person per jurisdiction.

Chip: Two per jurisdiction would be fine. A third person would be an issue. Thank you for the reminder, Colleen.

Okay, any other comments or questions? [None]

Meeting adjourned at 5:12 pm ET.

From chat:

Leslie Aquino will there be changes to indirect limits for the basic NOFO?

Dave: Sarah McGarvey, NASA Grants Manager: Recipients and subrecipients that do not have a current Federal negotiated indirect cost rate (including provisional rate) may elect to charge a de minimis rate of up to 15 percent of modified total direct costs (MTDC). The recipient or subrecipient is authorized to determine the appropriate rate up to this limit. Federal agencies and pass-through entities may not require recipients and subrecipients to use a de minimis rate lower than the negotiated indirect cost rate or the rate elected pursuant to this subsection unless required by Federal statute or regulation. The de minimis rate must not be applied to cost reimbursement contracts issued directly by the Federal Government in accordance with the FAR. Recipients and subrecipients are not required to use the de minimis rate. When applying the de minimis rate, costs must be consistently charged as either direct or indirect costs and may not be double charged or inconsistently charged as both. The de minimis rate does not require documentation to justify its use and may be used indefinitely. Once elected, the recipient or subrecipient must use the de minimis rate for all Federal awards until the recipient or subrecipient chooses to receive a negotiated rate.

Indirect costs including the lead institution's general and administrative (G&A) expenses and Facilities & Administrative (F&A) costs are permitted under this NOFO. Any indirect costs must comply with the "Indirect Costs" section of the [GCAM](#), currently Section 22.00 Indirect Costs, and be consistent with the definition of "modified total direct costs" in 2 CFR 200.1, Definitions. The budget must clearly include information for the lead institution's overhead/ G&A expenses.