### ASSOCIATION OF WESTERN AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION DIRECTORS AND

## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

211 POST OFFICE BUILDING BERKELEY 1, CALIFORNIA

OFFICE OF THE RECORDING SECRETARY

September 7, 1962

: Western Directors

: John O. Gerald, Recording Secretary

SUBJECT: Transmittal of Minutes of August 7-9, 1962, Meeting at Bozeman,

Montana

Enclosed is a copy of the Minutes of your recent meeting. Appropriations for 1962-63 had not been passed at time of publication of these Minutes, and the budget data shown herein on pages 21 and 31-33 are still subject to adjustment. Listed below are items for your specific attention.

For Specific Attention of	Page No.	Sidehead or Other Identification
All Directors	8-13	Means of Reducing Number of Regional Projects /Note: with my apologies for the length of the summary; time was not available to me to collate the various comments made, and report identical or similar views in general terms.
	20	Plans for ASU&LGC meetings for 1963
	29-30	Administrative Adviser assignments for 1962-63
	22-24	Record of non-RRF Supported Projects
	24	Call for positive recommendation on publication for WM-23, (closed) Wool Marketing
	25	Joint meeting with Western Extension Directors, March 24-28, 1963
	<b>27-2</b> 8	Place and dates of Summer 1963 meeting
	<b>2</b> 8	Costs of meetings
All Administrative Advisers	31-33	1963-64 Budget projections
VANTABLE	21-22	1962-63 Budget adjustments (tentative)

### 2-Western Directors-9/7/62

For Specific Attention of	Page No.	Sidehead or Other Identification
RRC Members	11-12	Motion relative to publication and distribution of "policies and criteria for review and evaluation of regional research projects."
	17	Motion relative to Station P&C fund system
Alexander	14	RRC report on WM-17, Frozen Fruit and Vegetable Marketing
	19	Motion relative to coordination of meats research
Asleson	16	RRC report on W-56, Nema. & Rt.Diseases
	<b>2</b> 7	Appreciation
Beacher	17-18	RRC report on revised Manual of Procedures
Bohmont	16	RRC report on W-60, Textiles
Buchanan	14	RRC report on WM-37, Livestock Transportation
Byerly	26	CSESS Review Journal, discussion and motion
E1y	16	RRC report on W-46, Stresses, Cattle and Sheep
Farris	17-18	RRC report on revised Manual of Procedures
Frevert	20	Consensus on review required for the home economics project to be submitted to NIH
	<b>2</b> 7	Appointment to committee to study special travel fund
Henderson	15	RRC report on WM-42, Initial Timber Processors
	<b>2</b> 5	Appointment to assist in planning 1963 agricultural adjustment conference
Hilston	27	W-49 Workshop

## 3-Western Directors-9/7/62

For Specific Attention of	Page No.	Sidehead or Other Identification
Huffman	16	RRC report on W-70, On-Farm Water Use
	21	Motion approving sense of resolution from Committee of Nine re reporting of research to Advisory Committees
	25	Appointment to assist in planning 1963 agricultural adjustment conference
	27	Appreciation
	23	Representative to Interregional Land Tenure Committee
Knoblauch	25 <b>-2</b> 6	Nominations for Officers for 1963
Leyendecker	14	RRC report on WM-41, Cotton Marketing
Myers	27	Appointment to committee to study special travel fund
Peterson	5	Motion relative to national group to study implementation of OECD seed certification
	<b>2</b> 0	1963 Collaborators Conference, assignments
Price	5	Motion relative to national group to study implementation of OECD seed certification
	16-17	Motion relative to project packet preparation for W-39, Fluorine Effects
	21	Motion approving sense of resolution from Committee of Nine re reporting of research to Advisory Committees
Thorne	15	RRC report on W-, Economic Institu- tions of Water Transfer
	27	Appointment to committee to study special travel fund
	27-28	Place and Dates of Summer 1963 Meeting

## 4-Western Directors-9/7/62

For Specific Attention of	Page No.	Sidehead or Other Identification
Vaux	14	RRC report on W-72, Forest Insects
Wheeler	19	Motion relative to coordination of meats research
	21	Motion approving sense of resolution from Committee of Nine re reporting of research to Advisory Committees

Attachments

Jo Gord Col

# MINUTES OF WESTERN DIRECTORS' MEETING Bozeman, Montana

August 7-9, 1962

The meeting was called to order at 8:30 a.m. by Chairman Ensign. The following were present during all or part of the meeting.

John O. Gerald

Land Management, Washington, D. C.

R. K. Frevert	Arizona
H. E. Myers	Arizona
D. G. Aldrich, Jr.	California
E. G. Linsley	California
M. L. Peterson	California
W. R. Pritchard	California
D. W. Bohmont	Colorado
S. S. Wheeler	Colorado
M. M. Rosenberg	Hawaii
R. D. Ensign	Idaho
J. E. Kraus	Idaho
J. A. Asleson	Montana
L. P. Carter	Montana
R. E. Huffman	Montana
R. E. Ely	Nevada
A. S. Curry	New Mexico
M. L. Wilson	New Mexico
R. W. Henderson	Oregon
F. E. Price	Oregon
D. W. Thorne	Utah
M. T. Buchanan	Washington
L. W. Rasmussen	Washington
N. W. Hilston	Wyoming
T. C. Byerly	CSESS
O. T. Copeland	Forest Service
K. S. Landstrom	Department of Interior
B. T. Shaw	ARS
Fred Stitt	WURDD

#### Introductions

Ensign introduced D. G. Aldrich, Jr., University Dean of Agriculture, University of California; M. L. Peterson, Associate Dean and Director, California Agricultural Experiment Station; F. Stitt, Western Utilization Research and Development Division; L. P. Carter, Assistant Professor of Agronomy, Montana State College; O. L. Copeland, Forest Service, Ogden, Utah; W. R. Pritchard, Dean and Assistant Director, California Agricultural Experiment Station; M. L. Wilson, New Mexico Agricultural Experiment Station; B. T. Shaw, Administrator, ARS; T. C. Byerly, Administrator, CSESS, and K. S. Landstrom, Director, Bureau of

Recording Secretary

#### Approval of March 1962 Minutes

Buchanan moved, Bohmont seconded, that Minutes of the March 7-9, 1962 meeting be approved as distributed. Passed.

#### Letter of Appreciation

Chairman Ensign read a letter from E. C. Elting, Deputy Administrator, ARS, responding to the expression of appreciation and well-wishes extended by Western Directors at the March 1962 meeting. The letter follows:

"Dear Dr. Ensign:

"Thank you for your letter of March 13 containing the expression of appreciation and well wishes from the Western Experiment Station Directors. I am deeply gratified that my efforts over the past several years in working so intimately with your group should be so recognized.

"I am equally gratified by your expression of hopes for a continued and fruitful relationship. In my present assignment of assisting the Administrator of the Agricultural Research Service to discharge his delegated responsibility for coordinating the research activities of the Department, the cooperation of the Directors of the State Experiment Stations individually, by regional groups, and as a national association, is vitally essential in an effective effort in this area. You may be sure, therefore, that I am heartened and encouraged by this expression of appreciation on my part to your group.

"Sincerely yours,

/s/ E. C. Elting

"E. C. Elting
Deputy Administrator"

# Comments of CSESS Representative

Byerly reported on a number of matters of interest to Directors and built his comments primarily around the topic, Research Trends and the State Experiment Stations. He mentioned the past cooperation of USDA and the State Experiment Stations, and emphasized the manner in which this cooperation has built strength in the research programs of the two groups. The Hatch Act has proven to be a very solid grant program for research; a practice that may be found desirable for certain other agencies granting funds for research. He pointed out that certain other funds have been granted in large blocks resulting in some concentration of research at a few large institutions. While such concentration is sound for some types of research, the Hatch Act promotes competency of research personnel in each of the 53 Agricultural Experiment Stations. Such agricultural research has contributed materially to the decline of the proportion of expendable income that is used for food and to the high rate of growth per year in agriculture as compared to the remainder of the economy.

Byerly commented upon the manner in which research is promoted, planned and conducted. Disciplines and the organization of most Experiment Stations around disciplinary lines encourages basic research, and this accounts for roughly 35 percent of Hatch funds expenditures. This tendency towards basic research at the State Experiment Stations and in the Department of Agriculture is offset to a great extent by the fact that groups requesting research and having means for actively lobbying for appropriations for research are oriented along commodity or problem lines.

Byerly then examined the regional research program, its origins, its problems and its progress. The original act was phrased so as to permit two or more states to work together on common problems; such work was to be described in projects recommended by a Committee of Nine to the Secretary of Agriculture for approval. Every regional project has an administrative adviser who is a Director or Assistant Director of the State Experiment Station. These advisers potentially have major influence on both the nature of the research conducted and upon the administrative procedures used in the conduct of these studies. Thus, it is not true that the State Experiment Stations have no control over regional research.

Byerly commented that each regional project should be examined thoroughly from the point of view of concentration of effort, assignment of funds to areas of competence and other means for achieving better results. He recognized the problems of building competence and of determining and maintaining interests in problem solution.

Byerly commented upon the status of appropriations bills, the Facilities Bill, Forestry Bill, and S-3579, the so-called Anderson Bill, which proposes to establish a water resource research institute in each state. The Bill calls for water research projects conducted at the Agricultural Experiment Stations to be reported to the Department of Interior. The National Science Foundation is studying problems of coordination between agencies inherent in this area of research as well as others.

Byerly also mentioned the growing concern about the need for further basic production research. He pointed out that recent estimates indicate that the population of 1980 can be fed with no more harvested acreage than is to be harvested in 1962. These estimates include allowances for supply of export markets also. He stated his opinion that optimal use of resources should be a chief aim of research at the State Experiment Stations.

Byerly explained his views regarding the need for a review journal that would include critical reviews of research underway at Experiment Stations and elsewhere and expressions of views as to how research should be guided and administered. Potential contributors would be Department Heads, Directors and CSESS technical staff. He solicited opinion from the Directors. He also mentioned an article to be published in a national magazine that

describes the dangers of uncontrolled use of chemicals in agriculture and of the need for acquainting people with what has been done in establishing the limits of human tolerances, of deterioration of chemical residues in harvesting and processing channels and other elements of uses of chemicals in agriculture that control or entirely eliminate the dangers cited in the article.

#### Legislative Subcommittee

Buchanan reported upon various activities of the Legislative Subcommittee since the March meeting. He also commented upon the increased cost of doing research and the apparent adoption by various groups of the philosphy that increases in these costs must be met.

Buchanan mentioned the problem of correlating activities of the Legislative Subcommittee with those of ESCOP and the means used in taking advantage of staff functions and getting materials from Directors for use in special hearings. In particular, he noted that whereas ESCOP and the Legislative Subcommittee may emphasize certain research goals, projections from Directors for uses of funds do not support the emphasis given. He expressed concern that what is now being done of necessity has greater priority than do new projects. He suggested that perhaps defense of the "zero base" budget, reflecting no change in lines of research, would be reasonable, but that the use of increments to research funds should be in projects receiving emphasis by various groups concerned with funding problems.

Buchanan also suggested that the Legislative Subcommittee and ESCOP might make greater use of CSESS staff in determining and documenting the emerging trends in research emphasis; that the Legislative Subcommittee might be merged in some fashion with ESCOP for some coordination; and that there must be improved communication and follow through in the documentations by individual Directors.

ESCOP

Price followed the point made by Buchanan that the Legislative Subcommittee and ESCOP must find means for effectively coordinating activities. He pointed out the problem of calling meetings of ESCOP to fill special needs. He stated that joint membership on ESCOP of all Legislative Subcommittee members would seemingly solve the problem of information exchange between the two groups. It would also assist in travel since both ESCOP and Legislative Subcommittee meet in early April in Washington, D. C., and also at the time of the Land Grant Colleges meetings. He also questioned the appropriateness for certain purposes of the current structure of ESCOP.

He commented upon the resolution referred to ESCOP concerning the 1954 statement of the seed policy. It was the consensus of ESCOP that ESCOP itself should not delve into such technical matters but rather that the statement should be referred to State Experiment Station Directors for their individual attention. He suggested that a special committee could be appointed to review the matter, if there is a genuine need for such a committee.

The resolution of Western Directors in March 1962 relative to preparation of weather data punch cards by the Weather Bureau was not acted upon by ESCOP, other than to authorize Western Directors to proceed directly in working out arrangements with the Weather Bureau. Price reported that the other regions have previously made such arrangements or have proceeded to prepare cards without Weather Bureau assistance.

Price next mentioned the seed certification required for export of seeds to countries in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. Shaw also commented upon recent developments in the Department of Agriculture with respect to this and suggested that Western Directors name two representatives who might meet with a group to be organized at the national level to consider arrangements and memorandums of agreement for accomplishment of the seed certification program. He described, in brief, the memorandum of agreement being developed in the Department of Agriculture. Thorne moved, Peterson seconded, that Western Directors approve, in principle, the tentative agreement as described and that Price and Peterson be appointed to meet with the group for consideration of the agreement in more detail. Passed.

# Initiation of New Members

Curry called for the initiation of three new members into the Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors. Without coercion of undue nature, Western Directors declared Byerly, Peterson and Pritchard to be duly initiated, but only after they had provided a little fire and quite a bit of smoke, figuratively and literally.

#### **ESMRAC**

Price reported for Alexander on activities of ESMRAC since the March meeting. The written report presented by Alexander through Price follows:

"ESMRAC met April 16, 17, and 18 in Washington. Major business was the review and recommendations on the large number of projects proposed for support by Title II funds. Of the total of \$500,000 available, \$355,000 was required to finance current projects extending through next year, leaving \$145,000 available to initiate new work. ESMRAC has recommended that the request for an additional \$500,000 be made for fiscal year 1965.

"There is an increasing accumulation of unactivated Title II project proposals in the CSESS files. ESMRAC has suggested return of all of these to the respective stations, and recommends that only a very carefully selected group of projects be sent in for consideration in the future from each station.

"ESMRAC recommended that no substantial change be made in definition of the marketing requirement, but an effort will be made to make the language in the Manual (SES-OD-1100) more specific in one or more places. This topic of definition of marketing research occupied most of the time at the half day joint meeting with the Committee of Nine. Some Committee of Nine members argued for a more liberal definition, so more work could be classed as marketing.

"The type of projects being financed with Title II marketing funds was reviewed. In earlier years, most of the projects were in the area of marketing economics. At the present time, more than forty percent of the studies in the marketing program are technological, with processing and utilization research predominating. However, all of these projects contain discernible and direct marketing connections.

"The matter of coordination of meat marketing research was considered further at this meeting. The recommendations of a meeting in Chicago held on April 13 and attended by three of the five ESYRAC members and by Dr. Stout were reviewed. It was concluded by ESMRAC that the recommendation of the Chicago meeting should be presented to ESCOP along with other possible approaches directed toward improvement of direction and coordination of meat quality and consumer preference research. The other alternatives were as follows:

- "1. A symposium or series of them, including leading researchers in the field, sponsored by an appropriate organization such as the American Institute of Food Technologists.
- "2. A symposium sponsored by one of the States with an interest in this area of research.
- "3. Request the American Meat Institute or Reciprocal Meat Conference to direct aspects of their program to this effort either at their regular meeting or at special sessions."

#### Committee of Nine

Rosenberg reported on the meeting of the Committee of Nine at Atlanta, Georgia, in June. He reported that the five year review for W-52 and the termination report of W-32 were reviewed and accepted. He noted that the Committee of Nine had not yet received a termination report for W-43.

The Committee of Nine did not take action to fund a second CRF project in 1962-63, although the Committee did express favor for a project entitled "Impact of the Common Market on American Agriculture." The Committee will review the potentials for a second project at the November 1962 meeting and will receive a report from Dr. Bennett S. White of CSESS concerning the qualification of the above titled project for marketing funds.

Rosenberg reported 1962-63 RRF's and commented upon Committee of Nine decisions on 1963-64 apportionments of RRF. He also commented upon the leadership role of the Committee of Nine and upon activities of subcommittees assigned to study simplification

of procedures. He also stated that CSESS personnel, in particular Drs. Farris and Beacher, have done an excellent job in revising the Manual of Procedures and deserve considerable credit for the job.

#### Soil and Water Conservation Research

Thorne acted as chairman of a panel to discuss the rising public concern over the use of soil and water resources. Thorne mentioned the President's Committee on Outdoor Recreation, Congressional Committees for study of land and water resources and other groups and factors contributing to the flow of information to the public concerning the need for conserving such resources and using them wisely. He pointed out that recreational use of these outdoor resources has been increasing at about ten percent per year. The demand for recreational use has a major influence on national policies and programs now and creates considerable stresses and strains on former uses and on competing new uses.

Thorne noted that the problems come to focus to a considerable extent in the Western States where 40 percent of the land and 90 percent of public lands are located. He stated the objectives of this panel to be, to characterize the soil and water conservation research area; to define the most pressing problems; to indicate where responsibilities may lie; and to determine how best to coordinate and cooperate in conduct of this research.

Drs. Shaw, Copeland, Landstrom and Frevert participated in the symposium and the discussions that followed. Their remarks are to be published at a later time for the use of Directors.

WAERC

Huffman reported that WAERC had raised questions concerning the criteria used in reviewing project packets by RRC and Directors and that he had discussed these questions with RRC earlier in the week. The question was raised by Price and others, are standards set by the Manual of Procedures or are the standards those chosen by the members of the RRC? In particular, could Western Directors develop specific criteria that would not be subject to wide variations as members of the review panel change over time? The question was also raised, will an emphasis on reduction in numbers of projects lead to broader scale projects? Huffman stated that WAERC attempts to write specific projects of short duration but that problems of packet preparation and review make the wisdom of such course of action questionable. He suggested that in view of his discussions of these and other matters with RRC; of discussions likely to ensue when the RRC report is presented; and, of the revised "Manual," further discussion of these issues could be deferred.

WSWRC

Thorne reported that WSWRC plans to meet in Reno, Nevada, during the week of November 29, 1962. The program for the meeting of WSWRC is "Where Next in Soil and Water Research."

The soils survey work group has submitted its report on western soils and the Soil Conservation Service is helping on the charts.

#### REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON REGIONAL RESEARCH

to

## THE WESTERN DIRECTORS Bozeman, Montana

August 7-9, 1962

The following were present at the August 6, 1962 meeting of the Regional Research Committee:

J. A. Asleson

N. W. Hilston

L. W. Rasmussen

R. E. Huffman

J. O. Gerald, Recording Secretary

#### A. INTERIM ACTIONS

- WM-17, Frozen Fruit and Vegetable Marketing, was extended to 6/30/63.
- W-48, Weather and Crops, was approved by the Committee of Nine to terminate 6/30/67.
- WM-35, Seed Marketing, was approved by the Committee of Nine to 6/30/67.
- WM-38, Cooperatives, also was approved, to 6/30/65.
- W-33, Water Application, termination report was received.
- W-41, Urinary Calculi, critical review was received and RRC expresses its thanks to the Committee for this appraisal.
- W-54, Adjusting Farming, comprehensive review was received, and RRC is pleased to have it.

#### B. MEANS OF REDUCING NUMBER OF REGIONAL PROJECTS

RRC reviewed the charge from Western Directors (page 16, March 1962, Minutes) that RRC consider a plan for reducing number of active regional projects that would, (1) separate problems and projects, (2) request Directors to establish areas, priorities and fund allocations by areas, and (3) develop a colleague-evaluation plan as an additional source of advice to Directors in the approval of specific projects within the areas that receive prior approval.

The RRC in reviewing the present 63 regional projects found they could be grouped into eight areas of work; namely: Animal Science, Plant Science, Engineering, Chemistry, Climatology, Economics and Marketing, Soils, and Human Science. RRC concludes, and asks your acceptance of the fact, that these areas represent those for which regional research is quite appropriate for the Western

Region. RRC proposes that Western Directors should assume responsibility for determining the amount of research work to be done within the areas and specify the amount of RRF to be allocated to each in support of the research.

It is recommended that the number of regional projects be reduced as a means of cutting down administrative time and expense and further to increase the RRF per project.

The accomplishment of this is to be by a review of the presently active projects within each of the eight areas to determine: (1) the progress and contribution of each; (2) those to be continued; (3) those to be discontinued at the stated termination date or two years hence, whichever occurs first; and (4) the number of projects which can be adequately funded. The review of each area should also point out needed new work. The reviews are to be made by: WAERC - Economics and marketing; WSWRC - Soils and water; Home Economists - Human Science; RRC - Climatology; and the Administrative Advisers of the projects within the areas of Animal Science, Plant Science, Engineering and Chemistry. The recommendations of each group are to be submitted to the RRC for overall consideration and the formulation of recommendations to Western Directors.

The Western Directors will make final determinations as to the projects to be maintained in each area and the amount of RRF for each project and each area. Participation in regional research shall be on the basis of competence but with some consideration being given to Stations to protect their current level of RRF allotments.

/Asleson moved, Rosenberg seconded, acceptance of the report included in Section B. Several Directors stated that they would prefer that action to adopt or reject the course of action recommended be postponed to a later time in this meeting to permit careful consideration of the proposal.

Rasmussen was asked to explain in more detail some of the factors leading to his proposal to RRC which was essentially the same as that presented by RRC.

Rasmussen responded that he had classified 11 areas which in his opinion needed regional research work conducted and then he considered how to proceed from the current program to the 11 areas he felt were needed. He classified the

present program of research and found that there were some projects in all of the 11 areas; for example, in animal science, 15 projects were active in 1961-62 and had \$450,000 of RRF allotted to the 15 projects. In plant science, there were 16 projects with \$350,000.

Rasmussen stated that his next consideration was, do we need 15 projects in animal science, 16 in plant science, and who determines how many and how much in each area. He referred to the actions of Directors in March 1962 (page 16) which stated that Western Directors would make such determinations. He next considered the large number of contributing projects active in each of the areas of research and decided that funds authorized by Directors should be awarded to contributing projects on the basis of competence. He stated it to be his opinion that every state in the West has certain competencies for regional research and, therefore, all would remain active in the total regional research program, even under a program of reduced numbers of projects, but, nonetheless, felt that the current funding levels should be protected in some measure. Upon questioning, he stated that he did not consider his classification of projects as final but rather as simply a starting point in a program for reducing numbers of projects.

Peterson asked about the relationship of contributing projects to regional projects and indicated that the degree of interest in regional projects varies from state to state. He suggested that the results desired by Directors might be achieved more efficiently by reducing the number of states participating in each project than by reducing the number of regional projects.

/Aldrich stated his opinion to be that technical committees with which he had met seemed to be more concerned with distribution of funds than with the acceptability of contributing projects as such.

Price commented that the original philosophy of regional research was to encourage cooperation, coordination and prevention of duplication of research among the states and that the intent was that states would add funds to projects receiving some funds from the regional research monies. He stated it to be his opinion that the regional research program has done an excellent job of coordinating the use of both RRF and other funds and that withdrawal of non-RRF from regional projects will result in a lower degree of coordination of the total research job done by Experiment Stations

Aldrich stated that unless a state is interested enough in a regional program to support it with non-regional funds, then that state perhaps should not enter the regional project.

Kraus stated that reduction in numbers of regional projects would not solve the problem of coordination, unless State programs coincidentally matched what was left in the regional program.

/Curry commented that the recent tendency of Western Directors toward giving approval for reducing the number of projects, for increasing the proportion of RRF in regional projects, and for withdrawal of non-RRF from the regional program, is contrary to the original philosophy of regional research provisions of the Research and Marketing Act. He commented that the CRF program also seems contrary to this original philosophy. He stated it to be his belief that great benefits come from effective communication among technical workers, these benefits extending far beyond the regional program.

Rosenberg cited the paragraph in the revised Manual of Procedures on the philosophy of regional research. He pointed out that that paragraph does not lend support to current efforts to concentrate work or to finance projects entirely or in large measure from RRF alone. He mentioned a letter of several years ago in which the time required to administer the regional research program was criticized. He asked if administrative time is important enough to justify the current trend towards fewer projects. He stated it to be his opinion that there are real values to scientists working in a specific area to get together to discuss methodology, problem definition, and other matters of research import. He stated that administrative efficiency is only one of many goals that should be served.

Shaw commented upon the original Hatch Act and some of the criticisms concerning the execution of that Act. These criticisms have been primarily that the Hatch Act shares funds too broadly. He stated that the original philosophy of the regional research program was that some pooling of effort would be good and that the research work could be concentrated while leaving the planning and direction of the work diversified.

Myers moved, Henderson seconded, that the motion, to accept the RRC report, be amended, to accept the report for publication in the Minutes with action to adopt or reject the course proposed to be taken at a later time. The amendment passed.

The main motion as amended passed.

At a later time, this issue was again considered. Peterson asked that a record of policies of Western Directors on preparation of projects be distributed to Directors for review prior to the next meeting. Peterson moved, Price seconded, that the Western Directors and the Regional Research Committee, (1) prepare a statement of our present policies and criteria for review and evaluation of regional

research projects, and (2) that in the future when such policies and criteria are in need of revision or enlargement that these be distributed by the Secretary to the Directors for study before the meeting. Passed.

Henderson reported that over 70 contributing projects of less than \$2,000 are active in 1962-63 in the Western Region and over 150 of less than \$3,000 are active. He noted that this record results in bad public relations with various groups. Henderson moved, Peterson seconded, that Western Directors instruct technical committees that effective July 1, 1963, the minimum acceptable RRF allocation for a state contributing project will be \$3,000. Any exceptions to this will require approval by the Western Directors.

Thorne stated that he believed \$3,000 minimum would be a good level from a public relations point of view but that it would eliminate some very good projects. He asked if it could not be expressed as the desire of Western Directors that no allotment be less than \$3,000 but that with justification smaller allotments would be recommended.

Rasmussen stated that passing of the motion presented by Asleson and seconded by Rosenberg would solve the problem more directly than with Henderson's motion, since Western Directors rather than technical committees would then establish budgets. He suggested that Administrative Advisers should be much more active in budgeting than they have been in the past. He thought perhaps Administrative Advisers rather than technical committees should recommend budget allotments.

Rosenberg pointed out that the West is very heterogeneous and that the climatic and natural variations from place to place and year to year are so great that concentrating research at one place or one time would be dangerous. The biological nature of many research undertakings requires replications and their distributions over space and over time gives more useful results than would be achieved by concentrating them at a particular place and a particular time.

Dohmont expressed concern that the motion under discussion might cause technical committees to incur difficulties.

Curry commented that Western Directors have been through this same discussion many times and that the results of regional research cannot be expressed in dollars. He again pointed out that RRF was not given to do jobs but rather to encourage cooperation among states. RRF plus additional dollars was the original intent and has always been the rule. He emphatically stated it to be his view that Western Directors cannot judge soundness of financing by looking at RRF allotments only.

/Following a number of other comments regarding funding and problems of judging the adequacy of funding by looking at only one source of funds, Rosenberg moved, Hilston seconded, that the motion be tabled for the moment and that a committee be appointed to consider the discussion and what solution might be offered to Directors. Passed.

The Chairman appointed Henderson, Peterson and Bohmont to draft a possible replacement for Henderson's motion.

At a later time, Myers moved, Wheeler seconded, that the motion be withdrawn from the table for further consideration. Passed. Henderson and Peterson reported that they wished to withdraw the motion and the second of the motion in favor of a substitute motion prepared by the committee appointed to consider the problem.

Bohmont moved, Henderson seconded, that Administrative Advisers be instructed to convey to the technical committees the concern of the Western Directors over the inadequacy of the RRF allotments to many of the contributing projects and to encourage the technical committees to take steps to correct this situation. The suggested first step should be to critically review the allocations to each state. Revised allocations should be made in a manner that will assure responsible financing of funded contributing projects. This may involve, (1) reallocation of funds, (2) reduction in number of funded contributing projects, and/or (3) requests for additional funds for the regional project. In no case should a reallocation be achieved by creating a hardship through the closing of worthwhile station projects.

Rosenberg commented that the motion would only stir up technical committees; that both Western Directors and technical committees recognize shortages of funds and need no further reminder. He stated that if the situation is as serious as the discussion suggests, that Western Directors should simply hold down approvals in the future and divert new and released funds to under-funded projects.

/It was suggested that Directors should defer any action until the next meeting. Buchanan moved, Myers seconded, that the motion be tabled, but printed in the Minutes for study prior to the next meeting. In discussion, Wheeler pointed out that RRC and Western Directors are operating in the dark on budgets and that they cannot expect to make intelligent decisions on allotments until knowledge of total funds available is in hand. The motion passed.

/For information of Directors, recent discussions of the matters considered above are recorded in the March 1961 Minutes, page 21; the November 1961 Minutes, pages 6-7; and in March 1962 Minutes, pages 15-16./

#### C. NEW PROJECTS REVIEWED

W-72, The Identification and Biologies of Insects Destructive to Cones and Seeds of Forest Trees - RRC noted that cross referencing of objectives, procedures, and contributing projects was vague. RRC recommends that Western Directors withhold authorization for further development of this area for lack of RRF.

/Myers moved, Price seconded, adoption of the recommendation. Passed./

D. PROPOSALS FOR REVISIONS, REPLACEMENTS, AND NEW PROJECTS

WM-17, Frozen Fruit and Vegetable Marketing - The technical committee and WAERC have recommended reorganization of the current committee to bring in representatives of other interested states to prepare an outline of new work needed in the general area of locational and product competition for agricultural products.

RRC recommends that the request be granted and that the Administrative Adviser of WM-17 proceed with this reorganization for planning a project for review at the November 1962 or March 1963 meetings of RRC and Directors.

/Asleson moved, Myers seconded, adoption of the recommendation. Passed./

WM-37, Livestock Transportation, was authorized for a replacement project 7/1/63, to be augmented 7/1/64 upon conclusion of WM-39, Direct Buying of Livestock.

RRC recommends that the WM-37 and 39 Technical Committees be authorized to proceed with this development along the lines recommended by WAERC in its August 2, 1962, report.

Asleson moved, Rosenberg seconded, adoption of the recommendation. Passed.

WM-41, Cotton Marketing, was also authorized for a replacement at the March 1962 meeting of Directors. RRC recommends that the WM-41 Technical Committee proceed along the lines recommended by WAERC and the Technical Committee.

Asleson moved, Bohmont seconded, adoption of the recommendation. Curry asked if WAERC and WM-41
Technical Committee recommendations were reconciled by RRC. RRC Chairman responded that WAERC had adopted the proposal of the Technical Committee in full, and, consequently, there were no differences in recommendations to be reconciled. Passed.

bai

wM-42, Initial Timber Processors, Technical Committee has proposed a replacement project to be activated 7/1/63. RRC agrees with WAERC recommendations, and therefore recommends that you authorize the WM-42 Committee to proceed with this development.

Asleson moved, Hilston seconded, adoption of the recommendation. Passed.

W--, Economic Institutions of Water Transfer, has been recommended by WAERC to be activated 7/1/63. RRC recognizes this as an area of vital concern, and recommends that Director Thorne be appointed Administrative Adviser to this area to organize a technical committee to prepare an outline for activation 7/1/63. It is anticipated that some states could not become active in this project prior to the termination 6/30/64 of W-70, On-Farm Use of Water.

/Asleson moved, Hilston seconded, adoption of the recommendation. Rosenberg asked if these recommendations were not contrary to the RRC interest in reducing numbers of projects. Asleson replied that records indicate WAERC has kept number of economics projects within reasonable bounds. Passed./

- W--, Ruminant Physiology, has been presented as a proposal for new research. Although this area has been on the pending list for some time, RRC recommends that further development be withheld pending availability of funds and authorization to proceed.
- W--, Processing and Post Harvest Storage of Fruits and Vegetables, has also been presented as a proposal. Although RRC believes that the area merits work, it recommends that further development of the proposal be deferred. Its activation must await discontinuance of other projects or large increments of regional research funds in any event.
- W--, Influence of Small Mammals on Western Rangelands RRC recommends deferral of any authorization for further development.

Following review of three new proposals, Ruminant Physiology; Processing and Post Harvest Storage of Fruits and Vegetables; and Influence of Small Mammals, questions were raised as to why the latter two proposals, from outside the range of priorities established three years ago, were considered at this time. The question was also raised, if these proposals could be added to the list of projects established. Rasmussen commented that the March 1962 action of Western Directors calling for a one or two page statement of problem before authorization of a technical committee to prepare project packets,

had in his opinion succeeded the earlier action on priorities and that the old list is now simply of historical concern and not for current consideration. Price asked if this old list of priorities should be prepared as proposals so that files on proposals would be complete. Asleson pointed out that Ruminant Physiology was on the old list and in view of current efforts to reduce number of projects, he would be inclined to discourage preparation of proposals for all of the old titles. He further felt it would be unfair to retain the proposals on Post Harvest Storage and Small Mammals in the files, under the circumstances.

/Wheeler moved, Myers seconded, that Post Harvest Storage and Small Mammals be added to the list of titles that will receive consideration at a later time by RRC and Directors. Passed./

#### E. OTHER PROJECT NOTES

W-60, Textiles, proposes to reallocate some funds in 1962-63. RRC sees no problems with the proposal, recommends approval of this, but notes for the guidance of the committee that procedures for such transfers are established and should be followed.

/Asleson moved, Henderson seconded, adoption of the recommendation. Passed./

W-70, On-Farm Water Use, was originally prepared for a five-year duration to 6/30/65, but was approved for only a three-year term. WAERC has recommended a one-year extension to 6/30/64. RRC recommends that the request be granted.

Asleson moved, Hilston seconded, extension to 6/30/64 as recommended. Passed.

W-39, W-46, and W-56 are all due to close 6/30/63. RRC reminds administrative advisers to these projects that proposals for revision, replacement, or extension will be necessary if continued work beyond 6/30/63 is needed and justified.

Question was raised as to how W-39 proposal could be prepared and then the project packet prepared in time for activation 7/1/63. The technical committee ordinarily meets in January of each year, and action as recommended in March 1962 has not been possible to date. The March 1962 review of W-39 by RRC and Directors indicated that an adequate project could likely be prepared.

Masmussen moved, Henderson seconded, that the technical committee for W-39 be authorized to proceed with preparation of a full project outline, as a revision or a replacement, for review by RRC and Directors in March 1963. Passed.

Technical Committee lists have been requested by several Directors. Due to incomplete records of changes in assignments of representatives, the Recording Secretary is doubtful that such lists as he might duplicate from currently-available records would be of use. He asks for your expression of views.

/Several Directors responded that they found such lists quite useful. The Recording Secretary was requested to make a survey of all Stations within the near future to obtain current assignments to all projects and to publish a master list of technical committee memberships. Directors requested also that this survey be repeated each year, preferably in the Fall.

P&C Procedures are again in question. RRC feels that the charge to technical committees that sufficient funds be withheld for reasonable travel needs of all authorized travelers explains much of the variations in allotments. Hawaii-Mainland travel on some projects, representatives of Stations having non-RRF supported contributing projects, administrative advisers, interregional coordinating groups, etc., are all authorized travel, but RRC has no record of all such needs for all projects. Nonetheless, RRC recognizes that wide variations in amount per traveler allotted by the different committees does result in transfers of funds in some cases, and insufficient P&C funds to pay all authorized travel claims in others. Consequently, RRC recommends that Directors reconsider the applicability of a single P&C fund at each Station for Western conditions. The cost and cumbersome nature of the current system led WAERC earlier this year to recommend similarly that you consider the merits of a Station fund system rather than the project fund system now used.

Asleson moved, Hilston seconded, that RRC develop a detailed system for assigning P&C funds to Stations rather than to projects for review by Directors in November 1962 or March 1963. Rosenberg commented that such system could greatly simplify the procedures used in paying travel claims. Price asked about any surplus funds left in a Station's P&C account and what disposition might be made of these surpluses. Directors felt that such surpluses would be transferred in the usual manner to other contributing projects. The motion passed.

#### F. REVISION OF MANUAL OF PROCEDURES

RRC reviewed the revised Manual of Procedures for Cooperative Regional Research. The revision is very well done, in the opinion of RRC, but four points were raised for

consideration by CSESS in any further revisions made.

- 1) Should not further information be inserted on what procedures will be used in adding new contributing projects to an on-going project?
- 2) Is the need for notification by administrative advisers of proposed contributing project acceptance supplanted by the "Ensign" procedures? If not, should not the "Manual" repeat former instructions on this?
- 3) On page 23, the revised Manual specifies that "A copy of the approved outline will be furnished to each participating station for a station project number, and to the other cooperating agencies." By whom, and how does he get the copies for this distribution, are questions that may be raised by technical committees.
- 4) Section 6.15 on page 49 raises two questions Is the last sentence in accord with Western Directors' policies that additional representatives can be approved only with recommendation of Western Directors? And, is the last sentence in accord with a station P&C fund procedure, as recommended above, or only with a project P&C fund system?

/RRC Chairman presented the questions raised to Directors, and Directors discussed these with Rosenberg who attended the Committee of Nine meeting at which the revised Manuai was reviewed in detail. Although this discussion indicated that some of the questions raised by RRC may not be pertinent, it was, nonetheless, concluded by consensus that the questions would be recorded in these Minutes and forwarded to Farris of CSESS for consideration. Rosenberg distributed copies of the W-57 project that were prepared in the manner prescribed by the Ensign proposal.

#### Coordination of Research in Meats

Wheeler reported on the resolution of the American Society of Animal Science recommending that a coordination of meats research in the Western Region is needed. The communication from the ASAS follows:

- 'WHEREAS, increased emphasis on meats research was recommended by the Western Section of the A.S.A.S. in 1961,
- 'WHEREAS, three regional projects exist which deal with meats research,
- 'WHEREAS, concern has been indicated regarding possible duplication of effort and lack of coordination of the meats research program. Those areas of concern should be investigated before additional regional research projects in meats are considered.

"The Western Section, A.S.A.S., recommends to the Western Regional Directors that a Western Regional Coordinating Committee be formed to review and to coordinate existing regional research in meats and to investigate areas of additional research and make such recommendations as determined necessary for an improved, coordinated and integrated meats research program. It is suggested that this committee be composed of one member from each of the existing regional projects (W-1, W-61, WM-33), at least two committee members at large representing related disciplines, and an administrative adviser.

"To facilitate the work of this committee, it is further recommended that each Director be encouraged to set up at his respective station an interdepartmental coordinating committee for meats research."

Price reported on the action taken by ESCOP as a result of the national meeting held earlier this year to discuss the problems of coordination of meats research raised by ESMRAC. ESCOP felt that each regional association of Directors should take steps to coordinate the research within its region. Price asked what purposes such coordinating group would serve. Would their function be to coordinate the work now underway or would they also serve as a clearing house for proposals for new research? He stated that he felt the biggest problem for the West was that of coordinating the work of the several disciplines involved in meat research. Myers asked if the problem would be solved by having the technical committees of W-1, W-61, and WM-33 meet together.

Price moved, Rasmussen seconded, that a committee be set up to determine what needs to be done to coordinate meats research in the West, this committee to be an ad hoc committee composed of one representative from each of the technical committees, W-1, W-61, and WM-33; a food technologist; a home economist; and two economists engaged in meats marketing research. The last four members are to be selected by the Administrative Advisers of W-1 and WM-33. These two Administrative Advisers will meet with the ad hoc committee and will report back to Western Directors in the spring or summer of 1963. Continuation of this group beyond the spring or summer of 1963 will be decided by Western Directors following review of its recommendations. Passed.

Meeting of Home
Economists to
Prepare a Research Proposal

Frevert reported that a group of home economists met in Tucson to prepare a "regional" research project to be submitted to the National Institutes of Health. This meeting was authorized by Western Directors in March 1962. Frevert reported that the subject of the project is a study of use of time by housewives. The technical group felt that one Station should submit the project to NIH; act as a recipient of funds; and then reimburse other Stations through a subcontract or other procedure for their contributions to the project.

Question was raised if the project outline should come before Western Directors prior to submittal to NIH. By consensus, it was agreed that the project would go only to those Directors whose Stations plan to participate.

#### 1963 ASU&LGC Meetings

Thorne reported progress in developing a program for the Division of Agriculture meeting in November. He noted for Directors' attention that the Experiment Station dinner is scheduled for Tuesday evening, rather than on Monday as previously scheduled.

Ensign reported that he had reserved the period 4 to 5:30 p.m., Monday, November 12, for a meeting of Western Directors and had requested that a room be assigned for this period. He also reported that he is attempting to schedule a second meeting of Western Directors, perhaps on Wednesday afternoon, November 14.

#### 1963 Collaborators Conference

Dr. Fred Stitt of WURDD, ARS, explained the history of the Collaborators Conference and presented three alternative topics that the Western Regional Laboratory recommends for the 1963 Collaborators Conference. The three topics proposed were 1) Research on Natural Fibers, 2) Advances in Food Processing Methods, and 3) Technology of Agricultural Product Development for the Export Market.

Wheeler asked that the usual procedures for selecting a topic be followed. A count of the preferential ballots submitted by each of the Stations showed first choice to be for topic No. 3, Technology of Agricultural Product Development for the Export Market; and second choice, for topic No. 1, Research on Natural Fibers.

Peterson was asked to assign some member of the California Station to serve as technical collaborator to work with the Laboratory in developing the program, and Peterson was also asked to represent the Directors at the conference.

Resolution Concerning Review of Research by Advisory Committees Rosenberg presented a resolution by the Committee of Nine, as follows:

"It is moved that the Committee of Nine approve in principle and transmit through the four Regional Associations of Directors to ESCOP for further development and ultimate consideration by the Secretary of Agriculture a proposal which adequately covers the following points:

- "(1) That the Secretary of Agriculture be requested to provide, through proper legislative procedure or policy development, for adequate presentation to the research and marketing advisory committees of the Department, information on all of the research activities in each commodity field and service area, including the ARS, CSESS, AMS, ERS, FS, FCS, SRS, etc.;
- "(2) That research supported by funds of Federal origin for which the Department of Agriculture is responsible through CSESS be presented similarly;

- "(3) That the State Experiment Stations should be encouraged to report, at least in a general way, research supported by all other funds, including non-Federal funds and Federal funds other than those originating with the Department of Agriculture;
- "(4) That reports on 'other funds' research of a confidential nature given by State Experiment Stations be retained in confidence by CSESS;
- "(5) That the primary aim of this proposal would be to present a reasonably complete research story to the advisory committees."

Rosenberg commented that, in his opinion, the philosophy behind the resolution was appropriate but other Directors questioned if the mechanics could be worked out adequately.

Frevert moved, Rosenberg seconded, that Western Directors express approval of the sense of the resolution, providing the mechanics can be worked out by CSESS. <u>Passed</u>. The resolution, therefore, is recommended to ESCOP by Western Directors.

# Administrative Adviser Assignments for 1962-63

RRC Chairman distributed a list of Administrative Adviser assignments recommended by RRC for 1962-63. Following several substitutions recommended by various Directors, Myers moved, Rosenberg seconded, that the list as amended be approved. Passed. The list is attached at the end of these Minutes, pages 29 and 30.

# Budget Projections for 1963-

RRC Chairman distributed a table showing RRC recommendations for RRF budgets by projects for 1963-64 and explained that these were somewhat tentative subject to Congressional action on 1962-63 appropriations and on actions by the Committee of Nine relative to funds for interregional projects, Central Research Fund projects, and Committee of Nine expenses.

Myers moved, Rosenberg seconded, that RRC recommendations on budget projections for 1963-64 be approved. Passed.

Myers moved, Henderson seconded, that RRC and Chairman of Western Directors be authorized to revise these projections, if needed, in line with actual appropriations for 1962-63 and with Committee of Nine allotments of RRF to the Western Region for 1963-64. Passed. Budget tables are attached, pp. 31-33.

# Adjustments of 1962-63 Budgets

RRC Chairman explained how RRC would propose to adjust 1962-63 budgets should appropriations differ from what was anticipated at the time budgets were prepared in March 1962. These were as follows:

"RRC reviewed budget allotments recommended in March for 1962-63, and prepared tentative recommendations to supplement those prepared in March. RRC recommends

that administrative advisers for the following projects be authorized to recommend state allotments for the 1962-63 fiscal year at the \$2.0m level of increase, of the following amounts:

"W-37 - \$17,420 W-45 - \$40,700 W-48 - \$24,000 W-49 - \$47,500 W-50 - \$20,020 W-51 - \$20,700

W-56 - \$20,000

"In addition, RRC recommends that WAERC be authorized to recommend allotments for \$117,160 nonmarketing funds, and \$304,847 marketing funds.

"These recommendations, plus a one-year special added allotment of \$9,600 to California for testing a vaccine hoped to present a solution of vibrionic abortion in ewes under W-27, should bring Directors' budget recommendations approximately into accord with RRF available at the \$2.0m increase level."

Myers moved, Rosenberg seconded, that the tentative proposals of RRC be approved, subject to adjustment by RRC and Chairman of Western Directors, if necessary. Passed.

RRF Supported Projects RRC Chairman commented that the CSESS record of projects contributing to regional projects, not receiving RRF support in 1962-63, seemed incomplete to him. By consensus, it was agreed that the CSESS record would be included in these Minutes for the attention of each Director. These are:

#### ARIZONA - None

#### CALIFORNIA

1216	(W-1)	- Experiments to Investigate the Nature of Genetic Improvement in Beef Cattle
1938	(W-1)	- Economic and Quality Beef
1877	(W-12)	- Inheritance of Resistance to Fusarium Root Rot in Beans
1824	(W-27)	- Investigation on Epidemiology and Reservoir of Ovine Vibriosis Infection
1633	(W <b>-</b> 39)	- Effect of Air Pollution Upon Agricultural Crops
1902	(W-40)	- Breeding Alfalfa for Resistance to

Anthracnose and Cerocospora

2004 (W-45)	- Metabolic Fate of 2,4-Dichlorophenoxy- acetic Acid (2,4-D) Fed in Daily Rations to Lactating Dairy Animals
1814 (W-56)	- Nematode Transmission of Plant Viruses
1869 (W-65)	- Hydraulics of Surface Irrigation Systems
COLORADO - No	ne
<u>HAWAII</u> - None	
IDAHO	
S-324 (W-48)	- Analysis of Climatological Data
394 (W-56)	- Identification of Potato Nematodes and Their Role in Diseases
382 (W-62)	- Analysis of Pre-Harvest Cost of Oper- ating Farm Power
MONTANA	
981 (W-38)	- Crop Residues on Fungus-Induced Root Diseases of Sugar Beets
930 (W-58)	- Moisture Stress During Germination on Genetic Shift in Forage
<u>NEVADA</u>	
390 (W-1)	- Effect of Genetic-Environmental Inter- actions on Selection Responses
405 (W-6)	- Lupinus and Astragalus Spp. for Forage
433 (W-56)	- Breeding Alfalfa for Resistance to Root-Knot Nematodes
450 (W-67)	- Moisture and Root Temperature Effects on Potato Tubers
NEW MEXICO	
28 (WM-23)	- Methods and Procedures to Improve Marketing of Wools
43 (W-6)	- Testing and Evaluation of New Foreign and Native Plants
116 (W-31)	- Influence of Salt Content and Moisture upon Mineralization of Nitrogen
182 (W-35)	- Life History and Control of Parasites in Sheep

104 (W-60)	- Evaluation of Degradation of Cotton Fabrics Exposed to Weather
OREGON	
345 (WM-26)	- Survey of Factors Affecting Consumer Purchases of Fruits, etc.
432 (WM-40)	- Impact of Changing Market Organization on Canning Industry
155 (W-49)	- Improving Semen Production, Evaluation, and Preservation
436 (W-62)	- Cost of Farm Machinery Used for Seedbed Preparation, etc.
UTAH	
452 (W-35)	- Protozoan Diseases of Livestock in Utah
364 (W-39)	- Fluorosis in Plants and Animals
529 (W-49)	- Investigation into Causes of Early Embryonic Death in Cattle
WASHINGTON	
1589 (W-5)	- Study of Avian Pleuropneumonia-Like Organisms
WYOMING	
741 (W-38)	- The Effect of the Decomposition Products of Crop Residues and Certain Soil Organisms of Fungus-Induced Root Diseases
764 (W-56)	- The Effect of Nematodes in Root Disease

Former WM-23
Technical Committee be Provided Funds for Publishing

Asleson reported that RRC had knowledge of the desire of some members of the former WM-23 technical committee that funds be provided for the publication of a regional report during 1962-63. In the absence of information concerning the need for a regional publication, no action was taken by RRC or Directors. By consensus, it was agreed that a firm recommendation from anyone having an interest in publishing a regional report on this project should be forwarded to the Chairman for consideration at a later meeting of Western Directors.

Complexes of Crops

Representative
for Planning
June 1963
Agricultural
Adjustment
Conference

Huffman reported that a conference on impacts of agricultural adjustment policies on research administration is being planned for 1963 and that Western Directors have been requested to appoint someone to assist in planning this program. He reported that travel expenses for any travel necessary in performing this function would be paid by the Iowa Center for Agricultural Adjustment. The Chairman called for nominations.

Price moved, Myers seconded, that Henderson be nominated to serve on the program planning group. Passed.

Buchanan moved, Thorne seconded, that nominations be closed and that a unanimous ballot for Henderson be cast. Passed.

Proposal that
Western Directors have a
Joint Meeting
with Extension
Directors

Ensign reported that he had received a letter from Dr. Lowell Watts, Chairman of the Western Extension Directors, proposing that a joint meeting of the two associations be held in 1963. The letter proposed that one day's session be joint and that the Western Directors name the location and dates for such Joint meeting.

Huffman moved, Myers seconded, that Western Directors extend an invitation to the Western Extension Directors to meet jointly in March 1963. Passed.

Peterson reported that the prior arrangements made at the University of California Conference Center at Lake Arrowhead for meeting of Western Directors, March 24-27, might be affected by this decision. He was authorized to investigate the situation at the Conference Center with regard to facilities to accommodate approximately 100 people and for an extension of dates through March 28. He later reported that arrangements could be made for such joint meeting at Lake Arrowhead Conference Center.

Buchanan moved, Myers seconded, that Western Extension Directors be informed that the meeting would be at the University of California Conference Center, Lake Arrowhead, California, and that Western Directors plan to meet March 24-28. Passed.

Nominations for Officers for 1963

Price, Chairman; Rosenberg and Ely presented the report of the Nominating Committee. The slate follows:

Chairman of Western Directors (1 yr. term) - Frevert

Secretary of Western Directors (1 yr. term) - Linsley

Alternate Chairman of Western Directors (1 yr. term) - Ensign

Member of RRC (3 yr. term) - Ely

Alternate Member of RRC (1 yr. term) - Bohmont

Member of Committee of Nine (3 yr. term) - Rasmussen

Member, Committee of Nine, to complete Jasper's term (1 year) - Rosenberg

Alternate Member, Committee of Nine (1 yr. term) - Asleson

Member of ESCOP (4 yr. term) - Buchanan

Member of Legislative Subcommittee (2 yr. term) - Price

Hilston moved, Peterson seconded, that nominations be closed and that a unanimous ballot be cast for the slate presented by the Nominating Committee. Passed.

Huffman stated that the workload and travel fund situation at Montana prevented him from carrying out his responsibilities as a member of ESCOP as fully and effectively as he would wish, and asked that his resignation as a member of ESCOP be accepted.

Myers moved, Thorne seconded, that Huffman's resignation from ESCOP be accepted and that Price be nominated unanimously to complete his term (2 years). Passed.

to Publish Review Journal

Directors reopened the subject mentioned by Byerly earlier in the meeting concerning the need for a Journal that would review the state of the art in various fields of agricultural research. The question of what audience would be served by such a Journal was raised. Several Directors gave as their opinion that it should be directed not only towards research administrators, as seemingly proposed by CSESS, but also towards Congressmen and certain lay groups. The question was also raised as to whether the primary purpose of the Journal would be to provide an outlet for writings by CSESS technical staff that would encourage them to keep abreast of developments in their area of responsibilities and to give them opportunity to maintain a professional status through such writings. It was pointed out that if such is the purpose, the articles will be written in technical language for the enhancement of prestige of the writers and not as a means of providing understanding to lay readers. The question was also raised if such a Journal might not overlap other U.S.D.A. journals, particularly the ARS Journal.

Thorne moved, Buchanan seconded, that in view of several needs for such a Journal, Western Directors express support and encouragement for Dr. Byerly's tentative suggestion for some such review journal. Passed.

Special Fund for Reimbursing
Travel Costs of Members of Legislative Subcommittee

Price suggested that Western Directors should give consideration to the wisdom and the practicality of setting up a special fund to cover the travel costs of members of various groups, particularly the Legislative Subcommittee, for meetings held outside the region and for travel to make the many personal contacts necessary for the effective performance of their duties.

Following expressions by several Directors of agreement with such proposal, Price moved, Wheeler seconded, that the Chairman appoint a committee made up of former Legislative Subcommittee

~

members to study this question. Passed.

Myers, Chairman; Thorne; and Frevert were appointed by the Chairman following adjournment.

Approval of a
Workshop for
the W-49 Technical Committee

Thorne, Administrative Adviser to W-49, reported that the W-49 committee planned to meet in Logan later this year. The group requests that Western Directors authorize them to extend their meeting for two extra days to permit them to conduct a workshop on hormones.

Thorne moved, Hilston seconded, that the technical committee be authorized to extend its meeting for the two days and that the additional costs involved be approved. Passed.

Appreciation to

Montana State
College and
Asleson and
Huffman

Ensign expressed the appreciation of Western Directors to Montana State College for the very fine facilities provided, to the State of Montana for the excellent weather enjoyed, and to Asleson and Huffman for the arrangements that were made for the comfort and convenience of Western Directors. Directors indicated their full agreement with this expression with applause.

Buchanan moved, Peterson seconded, that the Chairman be asked to write letters of thanks to Montana personnel and to those who participated in the panel on soil and water research, and that these letters be recorded in the Minutes. <u>Passed</u>.

The letter to Asleson follows:

"Dear Director Asleson:

"Upon behalf of the Western Experiment Station Directors we wish to express our appreciation for the excellent accommodations for our summer meetings. We especially appreciate the fine barbecue and all other social activities connected with our meetings. Please relay our appreciation to your staff and wives for the pleasant stay in Bozeman. All of your arrangements contributed to a successful meeting.

"Sincerely,

/s/ R. D. Ensign,

"R. D. Ensign, Chairman
Western Experiment Station
Directors"

Copies of other letters written by Chairman, as specified in this motion, were not available to Recording Secretary at the time these Minutes were published.

Place and Dates of 1963 Summer Meeting Thorne extended an invitation to Western Directors to meet in Utah in the summer of 1963 and asked for an expression of views as to location and dates desired.

Myers moved, Buchanan seconded, that Western Directors plan to meet on the campus of the Utah State University at Logan in August 1963, but that dates be arranged so as not to conflict with other regional meetings, if at all feasible. In particular, the Great Plains Council and the Western Farm Economics Association usually meet in August. The motion passed.

A Western Representative to the Interregional Land Tenure Committee

Huffman reported that the Interregional Land Tenure Committee, which is sponsored by the Farm Foundation, has requested that the Western Region name a representative to it. He reported that WAERC had recommended Dr. M. M. Kelso of the University of Arizona as the Western Regional representative.

Huffman moved, Buchanan seconded, appointment of Dr. Kelso. Passed.

Expression of
Concern about
Costs of Western
Directors Meetings at Host
Institutions

Buchanan commented upon the very excellent arrangements made and upon the costs necessarily incurred by local personnel that have been enjoyed by Western Directors during this meeting and in the past. He suggested that such costs should be borne by the individuals of the group in attendance and not by the personnel at the host institution.

Buchanan moved, Price seconded, that Western Directors express their wishes that California personnel for the next spring meeting and personnel at any succeeding meeting places make necessary local arrangements for the comfort and convenience of Western Directors, but with full understanding and agreement that the persons attending the meetings will pay the out-of-pocket costs for such arrangements. Passed.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Joelerald

John O. Gerald Recording Secretary

Attachments

# ADMINISTRATIVE ADVISERS WESTERN REGIONAL PROJECTS FOR 1962-63

		1961-62 Adviser	1962-63 Adviser
W-1	Beef Cattle Breeding	Wheeler	Wheeler
W <b>-</b> 5	Poultry Diseases	Rasmussen	Rasmussen
W-6	New Plants	Briggs & Sharp	Peterson
W-7	Turkey Breeding	Rosenberg	Rosenberg
W~12	Bean Breeding	Ensign	Ensign
W-16	Range Economics	Leyendecker	Leyendecker
W-24	Cotton Mechanization	Curry	Frevert
W-25	Rangeland Improvement	Bohmont	Bohmont
W-27	Sheep Vibriosis	Jasper & Sharp	Pritchard
W-31	Soil Nitrogen	Myers	Myers
W-34	Range Livestock Nutrition	Hilston	Hilston
W-35	Ruminant Parasites	Jasper & Sharp	Pritchard
W-37	Rangeland Grasshoppers	Linsley & Sharp	Linsley
W-38	Fungus Root Diseases	Adams	Adams
W-39	Fluorine Effects	Price	Price
W-40	Breeding Forage Plants	Ensign	Ensign
W-41	Urinary Calculi	Jasper & Sharp	Pritchard
W-44	Cholesterol Metabolism	Wheeler	Wheeler
₩-45	Pesticide Residues	Boyce & Sharp	Boyce
W <b>-</b> 46	Stresses, Cattle and Sheep	Ely	Ely
W-47	Root Responses	Ensign	(closed 6/30/62)
W-48	Weather and Crops	Asleson	Asleson
W-49	Cattle Breeding Failures	Burgoyne & Thorne	Hilston
W-50	Stresses and Performance-Hens	Rosenberg	Rosenberg
W-51	Drainage Design	Frevert	Frevert
₩~52	Biochemistry, Herbicidal Action	Rasmussen	Rasmussen
W <b>-</b> 54	Adjusting Farming	Asleson	Asleson
W <b>~</b> 56	Nematodes and Root Diseases	Asleson	Asleson
W-57	Amino Acid Utilization	Hilston	Hilston
W-58	Forage Crop Production	Ensign	Ensign
<b>W−</b> 59	Price and Income Policy	Buchanan	Buchanan
W-60	Textiles	Bohmont	Bohmont
W-61	Sheep Breeding	Adams	Adams
W-62	Farm Power and Machinery Costs	Frevert	Frevert
W <b>-</b> 63	Weed Control	Curry	Bohmont
W-64	Fruit Viruses	Kraus	Kraus
W-65	Irrigation Hydraulics	Frevert	Frevert
W-66	Soil Structures	Thorne	Thorne
₩-67	Soil-Plant-Water Relationships	Thorne	Thorne
W-68	Soil Moisture Movement	Thorne	Thorne
W <b>-6</b> 9	Housing	Rasmussen	Rasmussen
W <b>-7</b> 0	On-Farm Water Use	Huffman	Huffman
W-71	Tree Seedling Establishment	Vaux & Sharp	Vaux
W-72	Forest Insects	Vaux & Sharp	Vaux & Linsley
W-73	Water Conservation	Thorne	Thorne
W-74	Leguminous Forage Insects	Linsley & Sharp	Linsley
W-75	Water Resource Management	Wheeler	Wheeler
W	Farm Labor Requirements	Frevert	Frevert
W	Water Transfer	(None)	Thorne

		1961-62 Adviser	<u>1962-63 Adviser</u>
WM-16	Grain Insect Control	Boyce & Sharp	Boyce
WM-17	Frozen Fruits & Vegetables	Alexander	Alexander
WM-20	Hay and Feed	Asleson	Asleson
WM-23	Wool	Hilston	(closed 6/30/62)
WM-26	Consumer Purchases	Alexander	Alexander
WM-33	Meat Quality	Alexander	Alexander
WM-35	Seed Marketing	Henderson	Henderson
WM-36	Dairy Consumption	Sharp	(closed 6/30/62)
WM-37		Buchanan	Buchanan
WM-38	Cooperatives	Alexander	Alexander
WM-39	Direct Buying, Livestock	Buchanan	Buchanan
WM-40	Retail Procurement	Buchanan	Buchanan
WM-41	Cotton Marketing	Curry	Leyendecker
WM-42	Timber Processors	Vaux & Sharp	Henderson
WM <del>-</del> 43		Henderson	Henderson
WM-44	Promotion and Utilization	Huffman	Huf fman
WM-46	Milk Market Organization	Sharp	Ely
WM	Integration and Coordination	Alexander	Alexander

### INTERREGIONAL AND CENTRAL RESEARCH

IR-1	Solanum	Kraus	Kraus
IR-2	Deciduous Tree Fruit Stocks	Kraus	Kraus
IR-3	National Policies	Huffman	Huffman
CRF-1	Weed Control	Rasmussen	Rasmussen

### **OTHER**

Nonfat Solids Breeding	Buchanan	
WAERC	Huffman	Huffman
WSWRC	Thorne	Thorne

1963-64 Budget Projections for Western Regional Research Projects Recommended by Western Directors Bozeman, Montana, August 9, 1962

P	roject Description	1962-6	3 Budget	1963-64	Projection	ons (over 1	961-62)
No.	Title	Level	Dollars				\$12.0m Inc.
<u>W-1</u>	Beef Cattle Breeding	\$0m.	\$ 79,600	\$ xxx	\$ xxx	\$ <b>xx</b> x	\$ xxx
-		\$1&0m.	82,000	82,000	82,000	90,000	90,000
<u>W-5</u>	Poultry Diseases	Both	20,000	20,000	20,000	30,000	30,000
<u>W-6</u>	New Plants	Both	40,850	40,850	40,850	45,850	45,850
W7	Turkey Breeding	Both	17,000	17,000	17,000	20,000	20,000
<u>W-12</u>	Bean Breeding	Both	20,200	20,200	20,200	21,400	21,400
W-16	Range Economics	\$0m.	19,820	XXX	XXX	XXX	xxx
:		\$1.0m.	20,620	19,620	20,020	22,220	22,720
W-24	Cotton Mechanization	Both	17,000	17,000	17,000	18,000	18,000
W-25	Rangeland Improvement	Both	60,000	60,000	60,000	63,600	63,600
<u>W-27</u>	Sheep Vibriosis	Both	35,000	35,000	35,000	37,000	37,000
<u>W-31</u>	Soil Nitrogen	Both	36,500	36,500	36,500	40,000	40,000
<u>W-34</u>	Range Lvstk. Nutrition	Both	56,000	56,000	56,000	62,000	62,000
W-35	Ruminant Parasites	Both	50,900	50,900	50,900	56,900	56,900
W-37	Rangeland Grasshoppers	Both	15,420	15,420	17,420	18,420	18,420
<u>w-38</u>	Fungus Root Diseases	Both	30,300	30,300	30,300	35,300	35,300
W-39	Fluorine Effects	Both	25,000	25,000	25,000	30,000	30,000
W-40	Breeding Forage Plants	Both	40,700	40,700	40,700	43,200	43,200
W - 41	Urinary Calculi	Both	26,000	26,000	26,000	35,000	35,000
W-44	Cholesterol Metabolism	Both	37,000	37,000	37,000	40,000	40,000
W-45	Pesticide Residues	Both	35,700	35,700	40,700	50,000	50,000
W-46	Stresses, Cattle & Sheep	Both	26,000	26,000	26,000	40,000	40,000
W-48	Weather and Crops	Both	19,700	19,700	24,000	30,000	30,000
W-49	Cattle Breeding Failures	\$0m.	40,000	XXX	xxx	xxx	xxx
		\$1.0m.	42,500	42,500	47,500	50,000	50,000
W-50	Stresses & PerformHens	Both	17,020	17,020	20,020	25,020	25,020
W-51	Drainage Design	Both	16,700	16,700	20,700	40,000	40,000
W-52	Biochem, Herb. Action	\$Om.	9,000	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx
		\$1.0m.	13,000	12,400	13,000	25,000	25,000
W-54	Adjusting Farming	\$0m.	39,620	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx
		\$1.0m.	41,920		49,620	53,420	54,420
W~56	Nemat.& Root Diseases	\$0m.	12,600	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx
		\$1.0m.		1	20,000	30,000	30,000
W-57	Amino Acid Utilization	Both	45,420	1	45,420	50,420	50,420
W-58	Forage Crop Production	Both	27,300		27,300		30,000
W-59	Price & Income Policy	\$0m.	7,120	7	XXX	xxx	xxx
		\$1.0m.		1	0	0	0

Project Description	11962-	ύ3 Budget	1062-6	4 Projection		1061 60
No. Title	Level		\$1.0m Inc.	\$2.0m Inc.	\$11.0m Inc.	1961-62) \$12.0m Inc.
W-60 Textiles	Both	\$ 10,420				T
W-61 Sheep Breeding	Both	16,200	†	<del>                                     </del>	45,000	
W-62 Farm Power & Machiner	y \$0m.	7,500		xxx	xxx	xxx
	\$1.0m	8,000	0	0	0	0
W-63 Weed Control	Both	42,100	42,100	42,100	45,000	45,000
W-64 Fruit Viruses	Both	27,000	27,000	27,000	33,000	33,000
W-65 Irrigation Hydraulics	Both	29,700	29,700	29,700	35,700	35,700
W-66 Soil Structures	Both	27,800	27,800	27,800	34,800	34,300
W-67 Soil-Plant-Water Rela	. Both	37,500	37,500	37,500	40,000	40,000
W-68 Soil-Moisture Movemen	t Both	11,000	11,000	15,050	25,000	25,000
W-69 Housing	Both	21,000	21,000	21,000	22,200	22,200
W-70 On-Farm Water Use	\$0m.	15,300	xxx	XXX	xxx	xxx
	\$1.Qm.	17,800	18,800	20,800	26,300	27,300′
W-71 Tree Seedling Establ.	Both	18,600	18,600	18,600	24,600	24,600
W-72 Forest Insects	Both	0	0	0	25,000	25,000
W-73 Water Conservation	Both	28,000	28,000	23,000	40,000	40,000
W-74 Legum. Seed Insects	Both	20,200	20,200	20,200	30,200	30,200
W-75 Water Resource Mgmt.	\$0m.	9,200	xxx	XXX	xxx	xxx
***	\$1.Cm.	10,800	11,220	13,220	17,920	18,420
W Ruminant Physiology	Both	0	0	0	40,000	40,000
W Cattle Feeding Compet	• Both	0	0	0	24,000	30,000
W Water Transfer	Both	0	0	0	7,000	7,500 '
W Farm Labor Requiremen	ts Both	0	11,400	13,400	20,200	21,700
W Rodents			0	0	24,950	40,000
W New Work			0	0	0	22,250
RRC Reserve			0	0	10,000	10,000
TOTAL NONMARKETING	\$1.0m.	\$1,264,540	\$1,263,940	\$1,312,240	\$1,716,040	\$ <b>1,764,3</b> 40
WM-16 Grain Insect Control	Both	18,000	18,000	18,000	20,000	20,000
WM-17 Frts.& Vegts. Mktg.	\$Om.	17,800	XXX	xxx	ххх	xxx
	\$1.0m.	17,900				
WM-20 Hay & Feed Mktg.	\$0m.	23,600	XXX	XXX	XXX	xxx
	\$1.0m.	24,150	21,300	21,800	24,350	24,350'
WM-26 Consumer Purchases	Both	16,000	16,000	16,000	18,000	18,000
WM-33 Meat Quality & Mktg.	\$0m.	17,400	xxx	xxx	xxx	xxx
	\$1.0m,	21,000	21,000	21,000	27,000	30,000
WM-35 Seed Marketing	\$0m.	13,420	ххх	XXX	xxx	xxx
	\$1.0m.	14,020	14,020	14,020	20,020	21,264
WM-37 Lvstk. Transportation	\$0m.	36,532	xxx	xxx	XXX	xxx
	\$1.0m	36,957				

Project Description		3 Budget		64 Projecti		
No. Title	Level	Dollars	\$1.0m.Inc	.\$2.0m, Inc.	\$11.0m Inc	\$12.0m Inc
WM-38 Mgmt.& Organ., Coops.	\$Om.	\$ 28,800	\$ xxx	XXX	xxx	xxx
	\$1.0m.	31,150	26,350	26,350	30,850	<b>30,8</b> 50
WM-39 Direct Buying, Lvstk.	\$0m.	35,500	XXX	XXX.	xxx	xxx
	\$1.0m.	36,950	<b>2</b> 9,450	29,450	33,250	<b>33,2</b> 50
WM-40 Retail Procurement	\$0m.	31,800	XXX	xxx	ххх	xxx
	\$1.0m.	32,700	30,600	31,600	35,800 <sup>4</sup>	35,800
WM-41 Cotton Marketing	\$Om.	4,120	XXX	XXX	ххх	xxx
	\$1.0m.	4,570	·			
WM-42 Timber Processors	\$0m.	33,200	XXX	ххх	ххх	xxx
:	\$1.0m.	33,800	36,400	37,200	42,050	<b>42,0</b> 50
WM-43 Bulk Handling	\$0m.	22,320	xxx	ххх	xxx	xxx
	\$1.0m.	22,370	22,920	23,420	26,320	26,320
WM-44 Promotion & Utilization	\$0m.	15,500	xxx	XXX	XXX	xxx
	\$1.0m.	15,800	14,400	15,400	23,500	23,900
WM-46 Milk Mkt. Organization	\$0m.	35,300	ххх	xxx	ххх	xxx
	\$1.0m.	35,500	39,000	39,300	43,400	43,400
WM-17R Froz.Food & Veg. Mkt.	Both	0	23, 350	25,3/50	38,900	38,900 <sup>6</sup>
WM-37 Livestock Marketing	Both	0	40,882	47,232	67,002	67,358
WM-41 Cotton Marketing	Both	0	7,350	7,550	10,625	11,625
WM Coordination & Integ.	Both	0	0	0	26,500	33,450
TOTAL MARKETING	\$0m.	\$ 349,292	XXX	xxx	xxx	ххх
	\$1.0m	360,867	\$ 361,222	\$ 374,172	\$ 487,567	\$ 500,517
TOTAL ALL WESTERN PROJECTS	\$0m.	xxx	XXX	жжж	жжж	жжж
	\$1.0m.	\$1,625,407	\$1,625,162	\$1,686,412	\$2,203,607	\$2,264,857