

NASA EPSCoR Caucus Executive Committee Meeting Agenda

Date: April 14, 2026

Date: May 12, 2026

Time: 4:00 p.m. Eastern and Puerto Rico, 3:00 p.m. Central, 2:00 p.m. Mountain, 1:00 p.m. Pacific, 12:00 p.m. Alaska, 10:00 a.m. Hawaii, 6:00 a.m. (+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

Clarification of appropriate down-selection for FY 27 BR NOFO ExCom / NASA

Discussion of NASA funding opportunities ExCom / NASA

Open discussion All

Upcoming Caucus elections ExCom / Nominating Committee

NASA EPSCoR Advocacy L. Gilbert, L. Katz

EPSCoR / IDeA Foundation J. Molesworth

Other business ExCom

Part 2 Open session (All)—30 minutes

Comments and questions from the floor All

Adjourn

Chip: Welcome everyone. We have a quorum.

Paulo: Secretary's report. Notes from April 14 mtg approved. Denise moved to approve, Chip seconded, all in favor.

Chip: Thank you Paulo. NASA EPSCoR updates.

Dave: Last time we spoke of a 6-week delay for the Basic Research. It has not progressed. I'm very concerned about the basic research NOFO approvals and that the selection will be in FY26 but not money will be available until FY27 and not before July 2027. Significant risk the award could be pulled back. Those risks are not acceptable. My intended pivot then is a two-step plan. RID is out to use for FY26 for the benefit of EPSCoR RID and this would be feasible since it's on an existing award. Are we giving up on the basic research FY26 here? No.

I would like to continue the review with the basic research FY26, but with those risks, I would say to release it in July with a full 90-day submission period. Then, as soon as FY27 dollars are available then release the funding. Increased RID augmentation combined with delayed release of FY26 Basic Research. I know that's non-traditional, we think these will be perpetual delays but moving forward recalibrate for July-September timeframe for release of NOFOs.

Legal term is a supplement but it's also an augmentation.

Denise: Three-year Basic Research award will not be going to come out for FY26, effectively it will come out in early Fall? For next year's solicitation?

Dave: It has been done since February, but it hasn't been approved. If approve soon then release in July for FY27.

Denise: Status of R3s?

Dave: Hoping for next month?

Paulo: Dave we need language in the FY27 Basic Research stating that jurisdictions may submit those down selected for FY26.

Chip: I read through the old NOFO and the language reads that we should open it to all in the jurisdiction. I'm happy to work with Dave on the language.

Dave: Absolutely. If it helps, absolutely I'll work with you. If we need to change the language, let me know.

Chip: Yes, I'll work with you with the language.

Dave: Will it help if legal writes an email or embedding it in the Basic Research solicitation will be better?

Paulo: I would prefer it to be embedded in the solicitation.

Angela [in chat]: This is important to know because we need to know if these funds are "extra" or not. I'm feeling bad that we're basically skipping a BR NOFO opportunity for our researchers and a reduced opportunity with the \$325k for the next year is the only recompense.

Dave: Angela, there are 28 jurisdictions, we are asking for your proposal to include an ask for up to \$525K. I was thinking \$325K will be augmentation and a 12-month extension for \$200K. \$325 TO be released in September.

Angela: Basically, we are taking out BR FY26 and everyone can get up to \$325K. I just wanted to make sure that I understood the distribution.

Dave: Yes, and I hope everyone applies for the \$325K and good for the rest of the POP.

Toni: New Hampshire is already in year five. And I want to thank you because we've received the funding already. We can divide the remaining of the money as we'd like.

There is a sentence that says you can only spend it per year. That needs revision and can let you know where that sentence is exactly in the solicitation.

Dave: Yes, please let me know.

Chip: I want to use the 200K similarly to what we have used it in the past and the balance use for two or three super pilot awards. One time only aimed at the junior faculty, to get them ready for the Basic Research. Is it allowable?

Dave: This is a non-competitive supplemental funding opportunity. We can entertain it as long as it meets the goals of the solicitation and EPSCoR. I don't see any reason why not.

Chip: Sounds good. Thank you.

Chip: Toni put that sentence from the solicitation in the chat.

Dave: Yes, per year is meaningless. This is a one-time only award and cannot exceed \$525K.

Chip: Ok, thanks and thanks Toni.

Denise: Dave, I sent you an email with a Technical Monitor question.

Dave: Josh and I are working on getting Technical Monitors for your projects.

Paulo: Dave, I also sent an email regarding a Technical Monitor; the Sc-I has identified one and the NASA person has agreed to be a Technical Monitor.

Dave: Who's NM, James? Thanks, James.

Dave: Would you rather have 28 Basic Research competitively available for your states or not doing R3s? We would need to talk immediately about the augmentation.

Chip: Discontinue R3s and putting that funding into the Basic Research NOFO?

Denise: I'm opposed to see R3s go.

Toni: R3s have been so focused in their research topics that only one university can entertain them in New Hampshire.

Shawna: They have worked well in Wyoming. Two-year better than one-year period of performance.

Paulo: The way they are processed now, that works. If they go back to the jurisdictions' offices that would require administrative support in New Mexico. R3s overall are well designed.

Melanie: Yes, I was thinking, how do people weigh in on going through the jurisdictions or not?

Chip: I see the R3s as intermediate awards for junior faculty, a great steppingstone, and leave them well positioned for a NASA NOFO. I also look at it as being designed to address a pressing NASA need. If that is working well for NASA, by all means, let's keep them.

Dave: R3s are well liked by NASA people. We are putting out more systematized solicitations through NASA Engages. I do like the idea of a two-year award. The average life award is 1.9-year for R3s.

Chip: Thanks, Dave. I think we can take questions from the rest.

Colleen: I want to say I know the headaches you and your team have. Thank you. What I thought I heard you say, since we are skipping the Basic Research NOFO this year, we can skip R3s next year. If that is what you meant, that's great. Starting with a blank slate next year it would be worth considering it.

Dave: I will consult with Dimitri, resource analyst, future year projection. If we want to prioritize basic research in FY27, then more than one selection for Basic Research in FY27?

Jacob: R3 is a great program. NSF style, double or triples the number of awards that NASA EPSCoR has to manage. I think there is a way that NASA EPSCoR can achieve. I hope we hear from Leslee about the House's proposal to eliminate OSTEM in FY27.

Chip: Leslee cannot make it today.

Jessica: I have her report 24.5 billion for NASA, the House Appropriations Committee eliminates OSTEM. 26 million for EPSCoR. Senate markup schedule is unknown at this time.

Chip: Thank you very much, Jessica.

Dave: We are on track to provide nearly the same amount of awards. The incremental model of funding, now they come at 3.5 million instead of 10.5 million. Maybe we can do more than the 14 selections for FY27 if more than 14 in FY27, I could do some forecasting. What are your thoughts?

Chip: July to October, Basic Research NOFO in July with an October deadline?

Dave: And going forward, every opportunity, July to October, solicitation season.

Colleen: Were there be set periods of performance for those awards?

Dave: If researchers academic calendars are agnostic, then, I would say no. As soon as available model.

Colleen: In an ideal world, the PIs can put their own dates. July 1 to June 30, state matching to consider.

Chip: In Vermont, we structure deadlines in early spring. It's an intense period in Vermont.

Toni: The only caveat, no one is going to do anything during the Christmas break.

Matt: What would the best timeframe be?

Chip: October to January speaking for Vermont.

Colleen: Part of the issue is the notice of the award. You get selected but then you have to wait on what your period of performance will be.

Paulo: What's the anticipated timeline for the ISS selections?

Dave: R3s are going to be announced first and then the ISS.

Chip: Nominating committee, any updates.

Colleen: Leslie put something in the chat “**Nominating Committee call for nominations will be forthcoming ... upcoming vacancies on Executive Committee include: Treasurer, Secretary, and two Members-at-large; and one vacancy on the Nominating Committee.”
I guess an email is coming out.

Chip: Happy to chat about the positions.

Jessica: I would like to emphasize again the work that Dave and his team are doing. We’re seeing across the agencies similar issues; we’re focusing on the budget and a lot of what we are dealing with comes from an Executive Order from August 7, 2025. What does mean is that you have political appointees who are making decisions on what gets release or not. NIH similar position with COBRE. It’s an election year, continuing resolution to pass in September and budget not wrap until end of the year or early next year. More delays. I put the report language in the chat: “Report language released today RE: NASA EPSCoR. Established Program to Stimulate Competitive Research (EPSCoR).— The recommendation includes \$26,000,000 for EPSCoR. Within the amount provided, the Committee directs NASA to allocate no more than ten percent of EPSCoR funding for administration and other overhead costs. The Committee acknowledges the important role EPSCoR plays in spurring innovation, bolstering research capabilities at institutions that are historically underserved by Federal research and development funding, and strengthening the STEM workforce.”

Matt: Climate Impact group, how do we strengthen capacity to support early career faculty? Monthly seminar series through the Goddard Institute. An email is forthcoming.

Chip: It sounds like a great opportunity for students and faculty alike.

Colleen: From my perspective more is better and I can think who can benefit from it and direct them to the seminars.

Matt: And I’ll share docs for your review.

Colleen: Who is coming to the NSF meeting in New Orleans. Organize meet up? I’ll be happy to coordinate.

Chip: I’ll be there. Shawna is coming too.

Meeting adjourned at 5:30 pm ET.