

WESTERN ASSOCIATION OF AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION DIRECTORS
AND
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
212 POST OFFICE BUILDING
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94701

OFFICE OF THE
RECORDING SECRETARY

April 6, 1968

TO : Western Directors

FROM : Leo R. Gray, Recording Secretary *L.R.G.*

SUBJECT: Minutes of Spring 1968 Meetings of Western Directors

Minutes of the Spring 1968 Meetings are attached.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Item</u>	<u>Page</u>
Call to Order and Attendance	1
Introductions and Announcements.	1
November 1967 Minutes.	2
Comments of CSRS Representatives	2
Report of DAL.	7
Report on Position of DAL by WD Executive Committee.	11
ESCOP.	13
Appointment of DAL to ESCOP.	14
ESCOP Legislative Subcommittee	15
Committee of Nine.	23
WAERC.	26
WSWRC.	27
WHEAL.	28
WSSC	29
Codling Moth Control Program	29
ARPC	30
RRC.	30
Miscellaneous.	42
Workshop on PPB.	42
Plant Patents.	42
Cooperative Agreement Re: Dubois Sheep Laboratory.	43
Property Records	43
Contingency Funds for Travel	44
Suggestions for Land Grant College Agriculture Division Program.	44
Future WD Meetings	45
Resolutions.	45
Adjournment.	47
APPENDICES	48

Items below are listed for your specific attention.

<u>For Specific Attention of</u>	<u>Page No.</u>	<u>Sidehead or Other Identification</u>
All Directors	2 - 7	Comments of CSRS Representatives
	7 - 11	Report of DAL
	11 - 13	Report on Position of DAL
	13 - 23	ESCOP & ESCOP Legislative Sub-committee
	23 - 26	Committee of Nine
	26 - 27	WAERC
	30	ARPC
	30 - 42	RRC Report
	42 - 44	Miscellaneous
	45	Future WD Meetings
	45	Resolutions and Appreciations
Asleson	36	RRC Report, Item IV C
	37	RRC Report, Item V a
	42	Miscellaneous 1.
Ayres	32	RRC Report, Item II A
	34	RRC Report, Item III B
	41	RRC Report, Item IV
Burris	37	RRC Report, Item V A
	41	RRC Report, Item VI
Ensign	42	Miscellaneous 2.
	43	Miscellaneous 3.
Frevert	27 - 28	WSWRC
	34	RRC Report, Item III A

<u>For Specific Attention of</u>	<u>Page No.</u>	<u>Sidehead or Other Identification</u>
Hervey	36	RRC Report, Item IV D
	41	RRC Report, Item VI
	42	Miscellaneous 1.
Hill	35	RRC Report, Item IV B
	37 - 40	RRC Report, Item V A
Hilston	32	RRC Report, Item II B
Jensen	32	RRC Report, Item II C
Kelly	42	Miscellaneous 2.
Kraus	43	Miscellaneous 4.
Leyendecker	34	RRC Report, Item II H
Linsley	33	RRC Report, Item II G
	41	RRC Report, Item VI
	42	Miscellaneous 1.
Rasmussen	32	RRC Report, Item II D
	33	RRC Report, Item II E
C. Wilson	26 - 27	WAERC
	36	RRC Report, Item IV E
	37	RRC Report, Item IV F
	41	RRC Report, Item VI
M. Wilson	35	RRC Report, Item IV A
	37 - 40	RRC Report, Item V A & B
Wood	29	WSSC
	33	RRC Report, Item II F
	42	Miscellaneous 2.

MINUTES OF WESTERN DIRECTORS'
REGULAR SPRING MEETING

Room 297, Agricultural Building
New Mexico State University
Las Cruces, New Mexico
February 26-March 1, 1968

Call to Order
and Attendance

Chairman Hervey convened the meeting on February 28, 1968 at 8:40 a.m. Those present during all or part of the meeting included:

H. E. Myers	Arizona
R. K. Frevert	Arizona
C. F. Kelly	California
E. G. Linsley	California
R. Jensen	Colorado
D. F. Hervey	Colorado
C. P. Wilson	Hawaii
J. E. Kraus	Idaho
R. D. Ensign	Idaho
M. J. Burris	Montana
D. W. Bohmont	Nevada
R. E. Ely	Nevada
P. J. Leyendecker	New Mexico
M. L. Wilson	New Mexico
W. P. Stephens	New Mexico
G. B. Wood	Oregon
K. W. Hill	Utah
C. E. Clark	Utah
J. S. Robins	Washington
L. W. Rasmussen	Washington
N. W. Hilston	Wyoming
L. C. Ayres	Wyoming
M. T. Buchanan	Director-at-Large
T. S. Ronningen	CSRS
C. F. Sierk	CSRS
A. S. Curry	Director Emeritus, New Mexico
D. A. Burgoyne	Director Emeritus, Utah
L. R. Gray	Recording Secretary

Introductions
and Announcements

M. L. Wilson welcomed the Western Directors and made local arrangements announcements. Among other activities, he announced that WD would be guests of New Mexico State University at a luncheon in the Regents' Room.

Later, Dean Leyendecker also welcomed WD and gave a brief description of the growth of the NMSU campus. Current student enrollment is up 20 percent from a year ago. The student-teacher ratio is now 21 to 1 in the College of AGRICULTURE.

Hervey introduced Dr. William P. Stephens, the new Assistant Director of the New Mexico Station. Ely accepted the assignment of rendering an appropriate indoctrination to the neophyte. After a trying experience, neophyte Stephens was welcomed to the group by acclamation.

Hill introduced Director Emeritus D. A. Burgoyne, who retired from the Utah Station in March 1967.

Leyendecker, later - at the luncheon - introduced his predecessor, Director Emeritus A. S. Curry, and Dr. J. E. Kirby, the new Assistant Director of Extension Service.

Hervey appointed a Resolutions Committee consisting of Kelly and Frevert. Later, he appointed Wood as an additional member of this committee.

November 1967
Minutes

Western Directors unanimously adopted the November 1967 Western Directors' Minutes as distributed.

Comments of CSRS
Representatives

Ronningen - 1. Regarding the budget reduction (Note: refer to Byerly's memorandum to all SAES Directors - CSRS-SL-2558(4) - dated 12/22/67), this reduction came out of the House Joint Resolution No. 888, which made it a matter of law. By the time it reached USDA, the Secretary was told to reduce his budget by more than \$700 million. The Secretary made some policy decisions regarding research that would be compatible with some high priority goals he had set for FY '68. This meant some lower priority areas had to be cut in order to achieve these goals. The PEPS translated the reduction into program elements to be cut by agencies. The CSRS portion that was ordered to be cut totaled \$4.2 million - this was not debatable. CSRS had to indicate how the recision was to be made. Even if the long range plan had not existed there probably would have been a recision of this nature at this time.

- The proposed increase in Hatch funds was \$3.7 million. CSRS did not want to go below FY '67 levels. The recision had to come from McIntire-Stennis funds and competitive grants. The outcome was the following percentage decreases: Hatch - 7.5%; McIntire-Stennis - 3.5%; Contracts and Grants - 10%; and Administration in CSRS - 10%. CSRS decision was to lump SAES at about 4% below FY '67 levels for designated program elements, and hold other elements at the FY '68 level. CSRS was not administratively permitted to conduct previous discussions with SAES prior to arriving at these decisions behind closed doors.

- CSRS needs maximum information from SAES regarding their intentions for utilizing funds in case of cut-backs or holding the line on budget matters. CSRS is forbidden, by law, to tell SAES what the pattern of effects of such decisions would be. CSRS needs maximum information

on hand for critical moments when they do not have time to communicate with SAES, and must make quick decisions behind the "curtain." When the "curtain" is down, CSRS is legally admonished to not talk.

- CSRS is wholly in accord with Buchanan and other Directors in desiring more cooperation in planning.

Bohmert raised a question as to whether a document exists that says CSRS can not seek assistance in determining how budget adjustments may best be made.

Sierk noted that when the final Department budget goes to Bureau of the Budget, the "curtain" goes down and stays down until BOB releases the information. Thus, cooperative assistance is essential during normal budget preparation periods when USDA's budget is being prepared.

During the discussion, the selection of priority areas was questioned. It was noted that national and state priorities may differ, since low priority areas selected on a national basis may be high priority areas in some states.

There was considerable concern among WD about the authority for the statement in Byerly's memorandum as to how state funds should be used. It was noted that the word used in the memo was "should" rather than "must," because of the validity of remarks by SAES representatives.

Ronningen pointed out that USDA wanted SAES to make changes in their program, not merely changes in their books.

The question was raised as to whether this law (HJR 888) took precedence over the Hatch Act. It was noted that since this was a Congressional Act, it could take precedence over the Hatch Act.

Ronningen - CSRS takes the position that within the Station, the power of the Director is absolute. However, when working cooperatively, SAES Directors have to relinquish some of their decision-making freedom. CSRS is subject to the Secretary's decisions, but SAES Directors are free to question the Secretary

- 2. Congressional Hearings for the FY '69 budget are scheduled for March 14 in the House, and March 20 in the Senate.

- 3. Budget - The whole bundle of budget materials of action, research and extension agencies are included in the USDA package taken to the Bureau of the Budget. CSRS no longer has direct communication with BOB regarding the budget; however, there still are ties with individuals.

- 4. The new Director of the National Agricultural Library (NAL) is John Sherrod. The former Director, Foster Mohrhardt retired January 13, 1968. It is expected that the pattern of service set up under Mohrhardt will continue. A vocabulary of key words was developed to cover all of agriculture in CRIS, and this is compatible with developments at NAL.

- 5. Food and Weather - An Agricultural Climatology Service, a unit of the Commerce Department's Environmental Science Service Administration (ESSA), moved into USDA's South Building in Washington, D. C. Dr. Gerald L. Barger is head of this ESSA unit. (Note: A summary statement describing this new service was enclosed with Byerly's "pink sheet" (ESL No. 938, dated February 9, 1968).)

- 6. Task Force on Agricultural Pollution - In addition to research task forces, the President has established an "inter-Departmental task force on agricultural pollution." Ken Grant is the USDA representative. There is a committee in USDA compiling information on six source areas of agricultural pollution. (It was noted that this might have some dangerous implications since it pinpoints agriculture as a source of pollution.)

- 7. Eutrophication - An industry-agriculture meeting on eutrophication of lakes will take place in Chicago, March 7 and 8, 1968. SAES have been asked to send a representative. Brown and Hazen have been contacted. (NOTE: There is an article in the Agricultural Science Review, Fourth Quarter 1967, entitled, "Agricultural Drainage and Eutrophication." This article gives the following description of the term eutrophication:

"Eutrophication is the excessive fertilization of waters with nutrients, notably nitrogen and phosphorous, which ultimately result in the degradation of the material beauty and usefulness of the waters. Both natural as well as manmade causes contribute to eutrophication.")

- 8. Temporary People with CSRS - USDA has difficulty recruiting people from SAES to CSRS. Fringe benefits in USDA now approximate about 26 percent of annual salary. SAES benefits are sufficiently attractive to make CSRS not too attractive. Two ways CSRS can get temporary people are:

- a. Replace staff members on temporary leave; and
- b. Obtain people of significant stature that would not otherwise be available.

SAES Directors who have promising staff members might encourage them to look toward CSRS for a sabbatical leave in which CSRS foots the bill.

- 9. Personnel. Dr. Miller, a soil scientist, has been hired as a team leader to go to India. Bennett White will likely go to Kenya around the end of May for a couple of years.

- 10. CSRS Regional Director. Arrangements for such a position with the Western Region will be carried out first because the West has named a reasonably permanent location for its DAL. The CSRS man should be compatible with the DAL.

Basically, this man would:

- a. Represent CSRS within the Region;
- b. Carry on program reviews within the Region;
- c. Work with WD and their DAL and Secretary on program planning; and
- d. Work on how, when and under what conditions subject matter reviews will be carried out.

The objective is to facilitate programs that would be of more use to Directors at their Stations. (The position will be set up essentially on a trial basis subject to review every couple of years, or so.) The title of the position has not been set.

Sierk - CSRS is currently in the process of studying project appraisals made at technical committee meetings from 9/30/67 to 2/1/68. These appraisals will be reviewed with the Committee of Nine at their April meeting. Reactions to appraisals have been received from Administrative Advisers and others by mail and otherwise.

- At the last count, 24 projects have been developed under the new format for RRF project outlines.

- RRF must be thought of as a special fund; it is not a formula fund. It should, and will be, worked out as a fund that individual states can utilize as they wish and in which each will get their appropriate share.

Frevert - Has CSRS taken any steps to correct the wording in Byerly's letter regarding this criteria rating system for evaluating projects?

- It should be clear to Directors that this criteria system of evaluation was tried under the Long Range Plan and the majority felt that this was not a valid evaluation and thus, not a satisfactory way to proceed. Thus, it appears CSRS is adopting a system that was tried and didn't work. Putting numbers for evaluation on projects is not a good way to rate them. They should be evaluated subjectively.

Ronningen indicated the point CSRS is trying to bring out is a means to provide an improved basis for making relative judgments.

Hervey - At the Corvallis meeting, Western Directors went on record as favoring two kinds of regional approaches; those that are regionally centered, and those that are not so centered but are conglomerate types that bring people together - (see WD Minutes of July 1966, p. 15).

Kelly - We, in the West, might set up some kind of arrangement or project whereby we can put figures into it to appraise the relative input-output ratios.

Sierk - There is a new format being developed for regional research projects that will call for an input (of people and money) by individual states. This will be discussed at the April Committee of Nine meeting. There has not been very good documentation of the participation of USDA and other federal agencies as inputs to regional research.

Ely - This new format is called the Fortmann modification. One thing it does is bring the project leader listing up to the front page.

Burris - If such a new format for project outlines is available, why can't it be made available for all regional directors' meetings such as this so that we can review it and give our comments to our Committee of Nine representatives?

Buchanan - Has CSRS, Committee of Nine, or others, made a study of regional research projects approved since 1948, or so, to evaluate relative efficiencies in terms of input-output ratios over a period of time, and to pinpoint project structures that have yielded maximum results?

Hervey asked Sierk for further comment on anticipated changes in allocating regional research funds on other than a formula basis.

Sierk - To give SAES some idea as to where they stand in this matter, the base from which we will start will be the funds allocated for FY '68. The only difference from past procedures will be that when a particular project is terminated by a state, it does not mean that funds used for that project will continue to be allotted to that state in FY '69.

Bohmont - SAES Directors and the Committee of Nine should have more say in deciding the allocations of Regional Research Funds.

Ronningen - Congress has been pressuring the President to reduce spending. Regarding Hatch Funds, the President is requesting about the same budget for FY '69 as for FY '68, plus an adjustment for salary increases. Salary increases are expected to reach about one-half toward comparability as of 7/1/68, and the balance increased effective 7/1/69.

Report of DAL

1. Buchanan referred to Byerly's memorandum - CSRS-SL-2558(4), dated 12/22/67 - and indicated adjustments have been made in the Long Range Plan.

- a. There has been concurrence among Western Directors that perhaps the Long Range Plan is not irreversible and should be adjusted based on no increase in appropriations.
- b. There was no consultation with SAES prior to Byerly's CSRS memorandum. Understanding of the Long Range Plan was that there would be a means for joint participation and consultation of SAES and USDA on matters of program planning.
- c. There was concern that prerogatives of SAES Directors were abrogated in terms of non-substitutability of state funds.
- d. There was concern about the rollback in budget adjustments in mid-year.

Buchanan read Hazen's letter to Byerly written as Director of his station, not as Chairman of ESCOP.

2. Budget Preparation for PPBS

Buchanan - PPBS and the Long Range Study were developed separately but have to be adjusted for compatibility.

- There was some discussion of the possibility of an interim committee session of ESCOP to discuss and consider these matters and make recommendations. However, it was felt that regional Directors' meetings should discuss these matters prior to such a meeting so that representatives would be fully aware of their colleagues' attitudes regarding this matter.

- Two major things involved in implementing the Long Range Plan are:

- a. Project SMY and facilities to long range compatibility; and
- b. Develop year-to-year projections to achieve long range goals of SMY and facilities. A question is how to go about getting this done.

- Byerly invited the four DAL's to a meeting of his staff.

- The DAL's have been asked to play an intimate role in the development of SMY and facilities for dollar outlay requirements. DAL's will seek to divide up the recommendations of the 18 groupings of materials that will ultimately flow into the six goals of the Department and coordinate them into the budget proposals. Personnel on the 18 groupings will include the four DAL's plus CSRS and other USDA research agencies.

- Planning was for one-third of the difference of capital outlay to FY '72 for FY '70. Certain procedures have been established in Federal Government including USDA that have to be carried out also in SAES. If things have or would be done to which SAES take exception they were free to make separate inputs. The DAL's feel there should be a way in which they, on behalf of SAES, can participate in long range program planning and budgeting matters that will affect SAES.

- DAL's later met with Mehren. He suggested that research agencies of USDA might funnel their program plans through his office as Director of Science and Education for coordination prior to being sent to Planning Evaluation and Programming Staff. The situation has been modified such that the flow from USDA agencies would follow a parallel route to both Mehren and PEPS Director Hjort. Mehren said guidelines regarding capital outlays for FY '70 will be one-third of the total in the Long Range Plan. This may be more than SAES can absorb because authorization has not been received from the Executive Committee. So far only \$23 million has been authorized by SAES. The feeling was that expenditures are somewhat inhibited because of the Viet Nam situation. However, should there be a cessation of hostilities, additional monies may become available and the Long Range Plan for USDA and SAES ought to have some shelf projects to utilize such funds.

- Thus, there are three chances for SAES representatives to make their views and wishes known regarding priorities, namely:

- a. The go-around in dealings with CSRS representatives;
- b. The dealings at meetings with the Director of Science and Education (Mehren); and
- c. At Legislative Subcommittee meetings.

Ronningen - As long as DAL's participate, views of SAES can be considered at various stages of developments. Previously, the only chance for influence was at ESCOP Legislative Subcommittee meetings.

- There is no question about the Secretary keeping the higher priority ratings through FY '69.

Buchanan - Of crucial importance is getting more complete knowledge of where Directors plan to put their dollars over the next ten years as related to SMY projections. These need to be more carefully summarized over the four regions (and checked for compatibility among regions).

- Estimates of projections are needed, not only for an increase level but also for no increase.

3. Recommendation for new ratio of Federal-State funds for FY '70.

Buchanan - Within the FY '66 inventory total CSRS funds comprised 26 percent. Hatch was 20.6 percent. DAL's recommended to the Legislative Subcommittee that they should work towards 40 percent Federal funds under CSRS administered funds. (The Legislative Subcommittee agreed at a later meeting - Hatch funds would be 36 percent.)

4. Lining up of National Task Forces.

Buchanan - Fifteen task forces have been named; 17 have not yet been named, but 5 are almost ready to go. Letters will be forthcoming from Hazen as Chairman of ESCOP, and Mehren making formal appointments.

- So far all task force committees have commended the Long Range Study, but felt their particular areas were not adequately projected. Thus, all of these task force reports will have to be brought together and reconciled with the Long Range Study to come up with a revised plan. This will be done under the auspices of an ARPC Subcommittee comprised of DAL's, Chairman of ESCOP, the Administrative Heads of USDA research agencies and MacLay.

5. DAL Visits.

Buchanan - The Western DAL has and will continue to make visits to various states.

6. CSRS Regional Director.

Buchanan - The CSRS appointment of a regional man would be desirable. Such a man, the WD Secretary and the DAL could work together on many items.

7. OWDAL-24 (Use of CRIS in Management).

Buchanan - No comments were received from Western Directors. The committee has met. The final judgment was that you really can't displace the project as the accounting point. The committee is redefining a work unit (their name for a project) so that there will be a work unit for work at each location.

Ronningen - There is some consideration also being given to using the scientist as the module for accounting and the project as the module for research management.

8. Research Project on Research

Buchanan - Such a project might be made to evaluate micro versus macro research in terms of:

- a. Cost-benefit ratios;
- b. Cost effectiveness approach (this assumes benefits are there and tries to tie costs to them); or
- c. A descriptive approach.

9. Contacts with Major Farm Organizations.

Buchanan - The Western DAL and other DAL Offices might be helpful in organizing some manner for arranging and maintaining contacts with major farm organizations, nationally and within the region. We could seek out our key people within each region or nationally who could communicate with such organizations.

Ronningen - Has any special interest group come forth and supported increases in Hatch funds? They have come forth when cuts were being considered.

Bohmert asked whether the Western Directors could receive a listing, as viewed by DAL, of major organizations and commodities groups that might warrant representation of SAES Directors to which we can respond.

Buchanan indicated he would furnish WD's with a list (edited) and ask for recommendations and individuals to be contacted.

Hervey - If the ARS Clay Center (livestock research station) situation, for example, hasn't jelled, perhaps the regional DAL's could work on arranging an improved situation as far as SAES are concerned.

Buchanan noted that he hasn't observed any reluctance on the part of ARS to make known its plans on the development

of Clay Center. However, they haven't been as open on some other planned facilities projected for location in various states.

Buchanan - USDA has a substantial backlog of items that will materialize, because of political considerations, that were brought out at the Chicago meeting.

Bohmert commented on plans for the Human Nutrition Laboratory Facility under construction in North Dakota to which the nutrition task force committee was not privy of information regarding projected SMY's by ARS to man that facility.

Bohmert - Would it be appropriate for the Western DAL to sit down with G. Irving (ARS Administrator) to go over SMY and facility projections of ARS?

10. Buchanan - MacLay and Joy have evolved a plan to indicate the number of SMY's to be housed in particular structures by RPA's, both SAES and USDA. I would like to have an indication of SMY's to be housed by RPA's by states to use in consultation with USDA on these matters.

Burris - What about the DAL's acceptability as far as Federal agencies are concerned; do they consider him as spokesman for regional Directors?

Ronningen - As far as CSRS is concerned, the DAL is the spokesman (for long range projections).

11. Buchanan - The suggestion has again been made that all DAL's live in Washington and be headquartered there.

Report on
Position of DAL
by WD Executive
Committee

Linsley noted that certain procedures within the University of California system must be followed with regard to the position of the DAL. A proposed draft memorandum has been prepared for WD approval that would go to Kelly, under Linsley's signature as Secretary of Western Directors, and then on to appropriate people in the UC system. (See APPENDIX A.)

Linsley - The Executive Committee picked a salary increase figure of \$2,400 for FY ending June 30, 1969. Other regional directors have varying compensation arrangements. If the Western Directors went along with the proposed salary increase for DAL, he would be well within the range of compensation of other DAL's. Buchanan would have received a salary increase of 10 percent as of 7/1/67 had he stayed on at Washington State University. He received no increase when the cost of living adjustment was given to the University of California staff at Berkeley. He moved to Berkeley at his own expense and was not reimbursed by Western Directors.

Linsley also noted that the current \$60,000 budget will adequately cover the salary increase and other expenses, including those for the DAL secretary.

H. Myers moved, Ensign seconded, approval of Linsley's proposed memorandum in principle, including the \$2,400 salary increase for the Director-at-Large. PASSED.

Bohmont raised a question as to the use that has been made of the Idaho study that covered all Western Stations - a study of salaries each year in the various states regarding cost of living index and salary increases each year. The DAL should be paid for his performance, not tied to what others may receive.

Bohmont also argued that the salary adjustment should be in line with the cost-of-living change even if it is higher than the stated amount, as well as a merit increase.

Rasmussen indicated he would like to see the increase based more on merit.

Hervey and Linsley indicated the Executive Committee was considering the general level of salary increases, plus an adjustment that will make the DAL salary compatible with that of other DAL salaries and to help offset some of his moving expenses. The Executive Committee considered the merit as well as cost-of-living adjustment.

Hill - The increase for the coming year does not appear to be out of line and the magnitude of the increase is not binding for next year.

Jensen requested that Kelly give an evaluation of Buchanan's performance.

Kelly - Buchanan gives consideration to California the same as he does to all other states. Linsley's memorandum is not as complimentary and inflammatory as it ought to be. Buchanan conducts himself in a non-inflammatory manner and has been a gentleman in all of his activities.

Kelly further evaluated Buchanan as the best man among the DAL's and said he is doing a good job.

Myers - We ought not tie his increase to the Idaho study which averages all states and may be lower than for high cost areas like Washington and California.

Hervey - The increase is somewhat above the cost of living; therefore, the merit has been considered.

Buchanan filed a budget report with the Executive Committee (see APPENDIX B.)

ESCOP

Ensign - ESCOP hasn't met since the Land-Grant meetings, and minutes of those meetings have been distributed. The next meeting will be April 23-24 in Washington, D. C.

- Regarding the DAL's, they perform a valuable service on ESCOP and ESCOP Legislative Subcommittee. Minutes of the last meeting include a discussion on housing the DAL's in Washington, D. C. Ensign went on record as saying the DAL's should be in the regions to work with SAES problems there and coordinate activities at their sessions in Washington. There was also some talk about having a fifth man who would be stationed in Washington and work with the four DAL's.

- Budget development was pretty much on a SMY basis.

- Comments of Mehren regarding criticisms in the states concerning the budget cut indicated surprise that there was so little response from the states. Department people expected more of a response from the states regarding the cut.

- There appears to be a lack of information regarding projections SAES may make on facilities projections and justification to defend requests for facilities. If we did get a windfall of money as a result of deescalation in Viet Nam would the states be able to match additional monies for facilities?

- H. R. 875, dated January 10, 1967, concerns a Bill to promote the advancement of science and the education of scientists through a national program of institution grants to the colleges and universities of the United States. This Bill was introduced by Representative Miller of California, but no mention was made of agricultural sciences.

Buchanan - Thackrey's office (NASU&LGC) could be contacted as a step towards getting a reference to agricultural sciences included in H. R. 875.

Bohmont moved, Wood seconded, that Western Directors instruct its ESCOP representatives to pursue appropriate channels to see that appropriate words, such as "including agricultural sciences" are inserted in appropriate places in H. R. 875. PASSED.

Bohmont - Policy of ESCOP regarding budget cuts. ESCOP representatives should take the initiative to be responsible to seek out their regional Directors' concern regarding policy matters such as the recent budget reduction.

Myers - ESCOP, ECOP and the Deans group should coordinate their response in a parallel manner to budget reductions. Our resolutions committee should make an expression to ESCOP of our opposition to letting the manner in which such budget reduction actions were administered go unnoticed, and that we reiterate the procedural arrangements of the Hatch Act.

Bohmont - Western Directors are not so much concerned with the reduction of dollars as with the procedural steps taken in administering the reduction.

Kraus - There are two separate things; one is the cut, the other the procedure. The procedural arrangements include the timing and process of administering the reduction.

At Hervey's request for further comments regarding procedures for projections for no increase and increased budgets, Buchanan indicated he will prepare some materials for Western Directors' response and for further discussion at the summer meetings.

Wood - Perhaps some dialogue ought to be made with other DAL's.

C. Wilson indicated he had serious reservations about making projections based on a decrease.

Kraus - We ought to take the stand that if there is a cut or no increase it is the Director's responsibility to administer his program.

Appointment of
DAL to ESCOP

Hervey read Hazen's letter of 2/2/68 regarding the DAL on ESCOP. Regional associations' policies vary with regard to the role of the DAL on ESCOP. Hazen suggests the DAL be one of the three representatives to ESCOP from each region.

Myers - It is important that we make good use of the resources at our disposal.

Bohmont - ESCOP is an element of NASU&LGC. The DAL is a staff, not a line, officer of our association; and therefore is not a director of any institution. If the DAL is to have line authority in policy decision-making, we would have to rewrite the agreement regarding the DAL. As a staff member he can exert his influence but cannot vote on policy decisions.

Buchanan noted that Thackrey is a staff member of ESCOP but has been made Executive Director of NASU&LGC and as such has line authority.

Wood indicated he would feel much more comfortable if DAL's were on the ESCOP Legislative Subcommittee.

Bohmont moved that we reiterate to Hazen the Western Directors' motion expressed at our meeting in the spring of 1967, namely:

"Western Directors request ESCOP for the authority to appoint Buchanan, our DAL, as a delegate to ESCOP representing the Western Directors' Association."
(See page 10 of WD Minutes, March 1967.)

There was no second to this motion.

Rasmussen moved that Western Directors request ESCOP to respond to our prior motion (referred to in the previous paragraph). There was no second to this motion.

Hill suggested that our representatives bring this matter up for discussion at ESCOP.

Myers - "I want it on record that I favor our DAL being a regular member of ESCOP."

Ensign - The DAL can't be as effective as he might be if he was a voting member of ESCOP.

Rasmussen moved, Bohmont seconded, that the Western Director-at-Large serve on ESCOP and ESCOP Legislative Subcommittee as an ex-officio member. This motion PASSED, with two negative votes.

Western Directors unanimously favored having our DAL continue to be located in Berkeley.

ESCOP Legislative Subcommittee

Wood presented the following prepared report on the Legislative Subcommittee:

The Subcommittee met in Washington, D. C., February 21-22, 1968. Ensign and Wood represented the Western Directors.

The agenda included:

1. Review budget procedures for 1970 and firm up budget requests for 1970 (operations and facilities).
2. Divide up responsibilities for hearings with Budget, USDA Review Committee and with Senate and House Committees.
3. Present requests for fiscal 1970 to Executive Committee of NASU&LGC on 2/22/68. (Done by Dowe, Hawkins, Kottman.)
- I. Discussion of Budget Procedures (considered in developing request for FY '70)

A. Role of the Long Range Plan

1. Asking request should be related to 96 RPA's.

2. Dollars needed should be related to SMY increases in long range projection to 1972.

<u>1966 SMY's</u>	<u>1972 SMY's</u>	<u>SMY Increase to 1972</u>
6146	8362	2216

3. Requests for 1970, 1971 and 1972 should be in one-third increments of 2216 SMY increase to 1972.

4. In 1966 (base year) there were 1410 SMY's financed by Hatch, McIntire-Stennis and competitive grants as follows:

a) Hatch	90.6% of 1410 or 1278
b) McIntire-Stennis	6.0 " " " 84
c) Competitive grants	3.4 " " " <u>48</u>
	1410

5. Hatch payments to states were 20.4% of total research fund support in base period-1966.

- a) 80% expended for salaries.

6. Hatch; RRF; McIntire-Stennis; Competitive Grants; USDA Competitive Grants; and other federal dollars were 39% of funds in base period-1966.

7. Average cost of SMY in 1966 = \$37,500.

- a) Range from lowest to highest:

Social Scientists
Plant Scientists
Animal Scientists
Veterinary Scientists

/Ronningen noted that some average costs per SMY at the SAES (based on 1966 Inventory) were:

<u>RPA or Program Element</u>	<u>Average Cost/SMY</u>
Element 615 Agricultural Economics	\$ 27,400
Element 650 Home Economics	\$ 26,700
Element 646 Home Economics	\$ 39,600
Element 685 Soil and Water	\$ 33,000
RPA 307 Biological Efficiency, Field crops	\$ 36,000
RPA 311 Animal Science, (feed efficiency, livestock)	\$ 53,400
RPA 211 Veterinary Science (Diseases)	\$ 42,600
USDA Veterinary Science, (influenced by the Plum Island facility, which is very costly)	\$ 80,000 ⁷

B. Issues Developing from LRP (as considered by the Legislative Subcommittee)

1. Should Hatch provide 20.4% of funds needed to underwrite increase in SMY's projected for 1970? Or more?
 - a) All federal funds represented 39% in base period - most through CSRS.
2. Should increased cost of doing business be built into request for 1970? If so, how much?
 - a) Department guide is to add a 4% increase to value of each SMY for 1967, 1968, 1969 - or 112% increase for 1970, (compound basis). Tied to Federal Pay Act.
 - b) Therefore, 1966 SMY of \$37,500 x 112.5% = \$42,000/SMY for 1970.
3. What is a logical rationale to follow in developing a request for Hatch operating funds for 1970?
4. No guidelines yet received by USDA from Bureau of Budget for 1970 requests.

C. Guidelines Agreed Upon by Legislative Committee for 1970 Request.

1. That 40% of dollars needed for funding one-third of the increase in SMY's for 1970 be provided by CSRS administered funds.
 - a) Since Hatch provided 90.6% of CSRS administered funds in 1966, Legislative Subcommittee will request that 40% of 90.6% or 36% of increase in SMY's will be supported from Hatch funds in 1970.
2. That number of SMY's requested for Hatch support in 1970 will be 266.
 - a) $.36 \times 2216$ SMY increase = 797 SMY's supported from Hatch funds through 1972.
 - b) $797 \div 3 = 266$ for 1970
266 for 1971
266 for 1972
3. That a 6% cost of doing business adjustment be made for 1967, 1968 and 1969 and applied to value of A.E.S. SMY (\$37,500) in base period. (Av. state salary adjustment in recent years = 6%.)

- a) 6% compounded for 3 years = 26.2%.
 - b) Value of 1970 SMY - \$37,500 x 126.2% or \$47,325/SMY (excluding facilities).
4. That Hatch request for 1970 be computed as follows:
- 266 SMY's x \$47,325 or \$74,069,800.
5. That request of \$74,069,800 be allocated to 96 RPA's for 266 SMY's based upon relative cost of SMY's (See II A-7).

When compared with Dunn's CSRS data they were about \$5 million apart. The \$74 million included technical assistance, which amounted to about \$3 million which are not eligible for Hatch. This left a difference of about \$2 million. Thus, recommendation to Executive Committee of NASU&LGC will be about \$3 million less.

6. That \$24,000,000 in facilities funds be requested for 1970.

[Bohmont - We need to get proper figures and justifications built up state by state for the SAES facilities budget request of \$24 million.]

[Hervey - The \$24 million for FY '70 may be a small slice of what we may need but we have to make sure we can support a justification for this request.

[- Buchanan will work with WD's in getting refinements in facilities budgets that have been prepared.]

7. That procedures followed in developing AES request budget should approximate procedures used by CSRS. (Byerly agreed to this principle.)

[Ronningen - CSRS is willing to work with SAES in reconciling differences. (Average state salary increase of six percent is higher than the average Federal salary increase of about four percent. This could account for much of the \$2 million difference. Thus, the Legislative Subcommittee figures might be more appropriate for CSRS to use.)]

II. Some Budget Comparisons

- A. FY 1969 Hatch figure in executive budget = \$53,540,000.

1. This is the same figure approved in 1967 for Hatch payments to states in fiscal 1968.

Subsequently reduced to Fiscal 1967 level of payments to states.

2. FY 1970 request of \$74,069,800 represents an asking figure substantially greater than in 1969 executive budget.

B. Fiscal 1970 request of \$74,069,800 compares favorably with AES Directors' projections in 1966 recommendation for Hatch for a five-year period of \$74,548,000 in 1970 (see Table 1). Latter figure approved as asking figure by Legislative Subcommittee in November 1967.

C. Hatch and McIntire-Stennis requests for funding LRP increases in Forestry are shown in Table 2.

/Ronningen and Sierk noted the FY '68 budget appropriation was rescinded in actual dollars to the FY '67 level. The President's FY '69 budget appropriations total the same as for FY '68 except for a \$1 million decrease for facilities./

/Myers - Arizona has assumed no decrease in budget but rather a reduction in expenditures. Western Directors ought not go on record as acknowledging a cut in budget./

/Ensign - Byerly indicated he would increase requests for facilities grants over and above the long range plan requests for Hatch monies. Requests for competitive grants would be:

<u>Item</u>	<u>FY '69</u>	<u>FY '70</u>
Cotton	\$1.0 m	\$3.25 m
Soy Beans	.4 m	.40 m
Other	.6 m	.85 m
Technical Aid	<u>-</u>	<u>.50 m</u>
Total	\$2.0 m	\$5.00 m. <u>/</u>

/Ronningen - The question was raised, should the total CSRS monies be considered in the Long Range Plan or should separate monies be considered. An argument for separate monies would be that it would facilitate recognition of changes that could be defended in various categories in the Long Range Plan.

/ - CSRS, when considering priorities, has always rated Hatch first.

/ - Some additional funds for special projects could more readily be obtained by way of special grants./

TABLE 1
HATCH FUNDS *
TO FINANCE FEDERAL PORTION OF LRS, SAES SHARE
THOUSAND DOLLARS

Fiscal Year	1966	1968**	1969	1970	1971	1972
GOAL						
I	\$ 3,422	\$	\$ 4,970	\$ 5,478	\$ 6,240	\$ 6,893
II	10,165		13,566	15,076	16,442	18,065
III	17,795		24,214	27,058	30,248	33,006
IV	4,836		6,750	7,843	8,684	9,556
V	4,219		5,973	6,561	7,063	7,702
VI	169		283	379	411	413
VII	2,942		4,107	4,500	4,949	5,590
VIII	932		1,768	2,208	2,437	2,638
IX	2,413		4,669	5,445	6,323	7,182
TO STATES	\$46,893	\$56,773	\$66,300	\$74,548	\$82,797	\$91,045
ADMIN.	1,220	1,525	1,819	2,075	2,330	2,585
TOTAL HATCH	\$48,113	\$58,298	\$68,119	\$76,623	\$85,127	\$93,630

* Based upon proposed allocations of Directors to CSRS in 1966 as compiled by Henry Dunn. Hatch formula basis.

** 1968 figures based upon 1967 (\$51,113,000) plus increase of \$7,185,000 for total of \$58,298,000.

/Kraus expressed concern that certain quarters will likely follow the Long Range Plan as long as it is expedient. If in certain circumstances it does not turn out to be expedient it might not be followed./

/There was some discussion of the wide range of costs associated with building, maintenance, and related items that don't appear in facilities figures. Ronningen noted that CSRS recognizes SAES contributes sizeable monies in this area./

/Hervey - CSRS publishes an annual expenditures report for SAES - (15-3) - that is based on data furnished by states each year. The data are not even comparable among states because of the lack of uniformity in common denominators used in reporting./

/Ronningen - The dollars that Directors should be concerned with are those SAES dollars that have to be spent to conduct the research program./

/Western Directors noted that there are actual and real costs of which we should be aware. We should know the full real costs for doing research whether or not such costs are recognized in our budgets./

III. Some Notes for Directors

- A. Need to communicate with individual Congressmen regarding research fund needs 1969 and 1970. (Especially request for \$24,000,000 for facilities funds.)
 - 1. Senate and House hearings on AES request likely in April 1968.
 - 2. USDA agency hearings already underway.
- B. Must acquaint state legislators and other key people with need for state match for federal facility funds.
- C. USDA and Congress have received little static or complaint regarding recent research cuts to states.

Wood asked if the guidelines used in his report were acceptable to Western Directors.

Hill moved, Frevert seconded, that Western Directors support the approach used by the Legislative Subcommittee as reflected in the excellent report presented by Wood. PASSED.

Committee
of Nine

Ely - Minutes of the Committee of Nine meeting following the Land-Grant meetings at Columbus, have been distributed. Some of the subject highlights were:

1. Allocation of RRF by projects. CSRS has had experience of sizeable changes in RRF allocations by projects that weren't reported.
2. Subject of less than 1 SMY being inadequate support will be considered again.
3. Continuation of funding after termination of a project.
4. Revised project outline format - title and objectives on the front page; all other material including project leaders can be appended, since it may be out of date before the time it is approved.
5. Contingency fund requests. The normal procedure now, and for the past few years, is to recommend and have contingency funds allocated by July 1. If not done by this time action on such requests waits until the Land-Grant meetings and may have to wait until March or April before such funds are allocated. There will be no flat \$250,000 contingency fund next year, but there may be up to that amount if recommendations are made before July 1. The Committee of Nine would prefer considering these requests at the April meeting but the deadline is the June meeting.

Ely - The Committee of Nine held a special meeting at Denver, 1/4/68. Byerly's letter, CSRS-SL-2558(4), dated 12/22/67, was considered - this letter pertained to recommendations on reductions of RRF. The Committee reviewed the rescission of RRF with Dr. Sierk. He indicated some of the decline would involve sizeable differences from FY '67 allocations including some trust funds.

- A resolution was prepared indicating that the decline nationally be \$956,250 and the allocation to individual states not be less than allocations received for FY '67, exclusive of special trusts.

Burris - Adjustments in RRF were such that for FY '68 some allocations were made on other than a formula basis.

Sierk - The process was to classify projects by RPA's and total the amounts allocated by SAES Directors last May. Some Directors allocated lower priorities to certain RPA's, and this variation among Directors influenced required reductions as indicated. However, no state received less RRF for FY '68 than for FY '67, exclusive of special trusts.

Hill noted that it is the Committee of Nine's responsibility to recommend how RRF should be distributed to SAES.

Sierk - For planning purposes, SAES might consider that as of FY '68 assume the same amount of RRF will be available for FY '69. After FY '69, it is uncertain.

C. Wilson - RRC needs some guidelines for recommending priorities for projects. If no funds will be available there is no point in preparing and approving a regional research project in a low priority area for which funds may be lacking.

Ronningen noted that high priority RPA's within low priority program elements are:

1. Reproduction of livestock;
2. Systems analysis in fruit and vegetable production;
and
3. Weather modification.

Wood - We need to come to a consensus as to how we will handle requests from some of our scientists working in low priority areas as to their future.

Ensign - Perhaps we ought to call for a moratorium on increases in Hatch funds and ask that they continue to be allocated as they have in the past.

Ronningen called attention of Western Directors to the recommendation proposed to ESCOP in November 1966 regarding not going below 25 percent in allocation of Hatch funds as opposed to the CSRS interpretation that such allocation may be up to 25 percent - these interpretations of Hatch Act differ.

Ronningen - CSRS would look to the Committee of Nine for recommendations regarding the manner in which RRF will be distributed to the states. It is the Secretary's prerogative to accept the Committee of Nine's recommendations.

Hill - We should instruct our Committee of Nine representatives as to our position regarding RRF allocations.

Ronningen cautioned against making a direct challenge to Congress with respect to the Hatch Act before exploring alternatives available for a system of allocating funds to meet the legal requirements as set forth in the Act. Such exploration should be the responsibility of the C/9 and they should make the recommendation to the Secretary of Agriculture. CSRS has followed such recommendations of the C/9.

Rasmussen - We had an unsatisfactory system of allocating RRF prior to 1962. CSRS sought support to substantiate a change in the system and the system was ultimately changed to the current one. In time this system has been called a "formula" basis for allocating RRF to the states. However, RRF funds are not supposed to be allocated by "formula," per se.

Leyendecker - It is the C/9 responsibility, not CSRS, to recommend the system by which RRF are to be allocated among states.

In response to a question as to why the C/9 approved the manner in which budget reductions are to be made, Ely noted that the C/9 did not sanction FY '68 allocations of RRF to any state less than the FY '67 allocation, exclusive of trusts.

Burris - By approving the allocation at the FY '67 level, exclusive of trusts, for each state the C/9 in a sense approved the CSRS system of calculation for the allocation of RRF.

Frevert moved, Ensign seconded, that Western Directors urge its Committee of Nine representatives to seek to retain in principle the FY '67 procedures in the system of allocation of total RRF to approved regional projects. PASSED.

Sierk suggested that each state might ask for detailed information as to how fund allocations were made.

Leyendecker asked for the WD reaction to the appraisals of regional research projects.

Sierk - CSRS has assembled results of appraisals including reactions and comments of various individuals.

Kraus - This appears to be a matter that should first be considered by the Committee of Nine.

Sierk - CSRS will continue to consider programs as are recommended by the C/9. When viewing the regional program, the idea of an evaluation of regional projects is only one way of taking a critical look at the regional programs (it provides a means for an objective appraisal of the regional program balance). No good project will be turned down as long as it can be justified, is recommended by C/9, and funds are available.

Ronningen - The CSRS evaluation analysis of regional programs will be submitted to the C/9. SAES Directors often don't have the time to make an in-depth evaluation analysis such as was done by CSRS.

Ensign queried as to whether representatives to the Committee of Nine are going to conduct themselves as a national interest committee rather than a committee consisting of representatives supporting interests of their regional programs to the extent they may differ from interests of a national program.

Sierk - Twenty-four regional projects have indicated interests of states in projects outside of their region. To this extent some interests seem to transcend regional boundaries.

Hervey reviewed the Manual of Procedures' proposed new project outline format.

Ensign suggested we could use one generalized format for all regional projects and perhaps also for our state projects. This would minimize unnecessary complications and confusion due to inconsistencies in format.

Rasmussen noted that this format is essentially the same as the regular Hatch format for state projects, except that some of the items are rearranged and there is an indication of anticipated resources to be committed. The draft format, dated 1/22/68, places the duration and objectives on the front page along with the project number and title.

Hill raised the question, why is it necessary to include "anticipated resources" in the format?

Ely cautioned that requirement for "anticipated resources" in the format may open the door to eventually establishing a minimum FTE input.

Hervey - This seems to be a good place to suggest that CSRS or someone make a correlation analysis to ascertain pertinent features that they deem desirable for a regional research project.

WAERC

C. Wilson - WAERC adopted a policy statement for its advisory committees that is compatible with the Western Directors' statement concerning participation on Western Advisory Committees by Agricultural Experiment Stations (such as at Texas A&M University) outside the Region.

- In keeping with our policy statement (see WD Minutes of November 1967, p. 7, Item D.1.a.), the Chairman of Western Directors (Hervey) has received a request from Director Kunkel of the Texas Station seeking WD approval for Texas to have a representative on WAERC - (see APPENDIX C, Kunkel's memo).

Myers moved, Leyendecker seconded, that Western Directors approve admission of Texas to have a representative on WAERC, under the conditions set forth in the Texas Director's memorandum to the WD Chairman. PASSED.

C. Wilson also raised the question of dues for WAERC in light of the fact that Alaska contributes to the salary of the WAERC Secretary.

C. Wilson moved, Leyendecker seconded, that non-voting members of WAERC from outside the region not be assessed a fee for their membership. PASSED.

Hervey asked C. Wilson to review state contributions to the special WAERC fund.

C. Wilson - A four-page memorandum was distributed by Leo Gray to all Western Directors on the subject: "WAERC Actions of Interest to Western Directors." This memo was dated February 12, 1968. Among other items, this memo covered the following subjects:

1. WAERC resolution regarding the recent budget cut;
2. WAERC concern about PPBS - (no one has ever put a cost-benefit ratio on PPBS itself);
3. A four-part series of TV shows on the Food and Fiber Commission; and
4. A report on research relative to agricultural policy.

In response to the Western DAL's request, WAERC recommended numerous individuals for consideration for possible appointments to some of the national task forces.

WSWRC

Frevert - WSWRC held its annual meeting in Reno, Nevada, December 18-19, 1967. Several items were discussed (as indicated in a memorandum to Western Directors from the Administrative Adviser (Frevert), dated February 13, 1968).

1. Frevert moved, Myers seconded, that the Western Directors approve a meeting of the WSWRC Phosphate Work Group composed of representatives of each of the Western States for March 1968 at Logan, Utah. (As in previous years, this meeting to coordinate phosphate research within the region and with industry will be supported financially by the phosphate industry.) PASSED.

Kelly raised some concern over who goes where, why and when, and asked for clarification as to how expenses are to be paid to representatives to this Phosphate Work Group.

Frevert noted that expenses are submitted to and paid for directly by the phosphate industry.

2. Frevert moved, Leyendecker seconded, that Western Directors approve the WSWRC Executive Committee's request to meet at Logan, Utah in June 1968. (The primary purpose of this meeting will be to prepare recommendations for the Western Directors concerning new and revised regional projects. Travel to the meeting will be coordinated with travel to AAAS and other meetings being held at Logan.) PASSED.
3. Frevert moved, Wood seconded, that the Western Directors approve a meeting of the WSWRC Soil Fertility Diagnostic Techniques Work Group at Logan, Utah. (This meeting will be held at the time of the Western Soil Science Society meetings to minimize travel costs. This work group which is now being organized will undertake analysis and coordination of methods and procedures being used for diagnosis and recommendation for treatment of soil fertility problems.) PASSED.
4. Frevert - WSWRC proposes to meet during the week of January 15, 1969 at the University of Hawaii.
5. Frevert - WSWRC will submit recommendations concerning revision of five regional projects and initiation of work in one new area. These recommendations will be prepared by the Executive Committee from comments of the membership prior to the July meeting of the Western Directors. Statements of intent will be reviewed for W-51, W-66, W-67, W-68, W-82, and the new area of Salinity Control and Management of Drainage Waters.

- WSWRC also brought together items on suggestions for and recommendations of individuals to be appointed to some of the national task forces, at the request of the DAL.

WHEAL

Ely read a report drafted by Bohmont, Administrative Adviser for WHEAL that indicated:

1. WHEAL met (for two hours) in Chicago as part of the Home Economics National Association meetings, the week prior to the Land-Grant Meetings.
2. WHEAL reviewed their present regional research programs and status, and they discussed ways of implementing research programs through outside grant proposals.
3. WHEAL discussed procedures to follow in contributing to the long range research program.
4. WHEAL plans to meet March 11-13, 1968 in Hawaii at which time their agenda will include:

- a. Familiarize themselves with the planning report resulting from the Lincoln, Nebraska meetings as prepared by Mary Beth Linden.
- b. Discuss present long range staff projects with their experiment station director that may affect the areas of ability and interest in home economics.
- c. Present their long range staff plans that related to the high priority research areas as now suggested.
- d. View long range plans of the states which may be of regional interest.

Frevert noted that the DAL attended WAERC, WSWRC and WHEAL meetings.

Buchanan indicated he appreciated the opportunity to attend.

(NOTE: Bohmont's draft report and the consensus of this advisory group appears to indicate that they prefer to be given the designation "Western Home Economics Research Leaders" (WHERL) rather than "Western Home Economics Administrative Leaders.")

WSSC

Wood called attention to his memorandum to Western Directors dated February 17, 1968 on the subject: Annual Report "Western Social Research Advisory Committee."

Wood - WSSC hasn't met since October 1967 but would like to meet again about the end of March 1968; however, the committee lacks sufficient Farm Foundation funds for a full meeting in this Farm Foundation Fiscal Year which ends April 30, 1968.

Wood suggested alternatives to enable WSSC to meet.

C. Wilson moved, Leyendecker seconded, that in view of the funds recision, the WSSC meeting be delayed until after April 30, 1968 when the Farm Foundation's Fiscal Year ends, unless Farm Foundation funds can become available prior to that time. PASSED.

(NOTE: Wood's memorandum to Western Directors and the consensus of this advisory group appears to indicate that they prefer to be given the designation "Western Social Research Advisory Committee" (WSRAC) rather than "Western Social Science Committee.")

Codling Moth Control Program

Robins - A conference was held in Portland, January 12, 1968, to look into prospects for control of the Codling Moth.

Dr. E. G. Linsley was asked to attend as the representative of the Western Directors. A copy of Linsley's report-dated February 7, 1968 appears as APPENDIX D.

- The experimental program is going ahead. If all goes well it should be ready for commercial application in FY 1971. If RRC and Western Directors approve Linsley's recommendation, such a meeting could get underway in FY 1969. (See RRC Report, Item II G.)

ARPC

Frevert gave a brief report on the activities of ARPC, including their efforts toward cooperating with and coordinating efforts of the long range task force committees and discussing cooperation of individual states with specific laboratories.

The DAL's have attended ARPC meetings regularly and have been invited to participate.

Buchanan - The relationship between ARPC and RPDES.

- The Executive Secretary of ARPC (Elting) has retired and it is anticipated that he will be replaced within RPDES. He would be the new Executive Secretary. Assistant Secretary Mehren chairs ARPC and in his absence W. D. MacLay, Director of RPDES, chairs. N. D. Bayley has been appointed Deputy Director of Science and Education. He will facilitate coordination between MacLay (RPDES) and Mehren's offices.

Western Directors discussed the subject of cost-benefit ratio analysis. It was suggested that some alternative proposals ought to be made that would suggest an appraisal of such an evaluation of research via cost-benefit ratio analysis and come up with a suitable alternative basis or system for analyzing and evaluating research, especially in science areas. Some kind of estimate of evaluation of payoff or fulfillment of needs for research in an objective manner ought to be made. It was felt that we could agree to a development of the procedure without endangering the status quo.

The consensus of Western Directors is that we should be involved with a study of an approach to a study of the procedures used in cost-benefit ratio analysis as an appropriate means of evaluating research and come up with suitable alternatives that may be feasible.

RRC Report

REPORT OF THE WESTERN REGIONAL RESEARCH COMMITTEE to WESTERN DIRECTORS

Las Cruces, New Mexico
February 26-27, 1968

Chairman C. P. Wilson called the RRC meeting to order at 3 p.m. on February 26, 1968. Those in attendance during all or part of the meeting were:

C. P. Wilson, Chairman
E. G. Linsley
L. C. Ayres
M. J. Burris (Alternate)
C. F. Sierk, CSRS
M. T. Buchanan, DAL
L. R. Gray, Recording Secretary

I. PERSONNEL ASSIGNMENTS

Alexander	W-97, WM-33, WM-38, WM-47 and WM-55
Asleson	W-48, W-68, W-85 and W-87
Ayres	W-56, W-83 and WM-59
Bohmont	W-52, W-77, W-80, W-103 and WHEAL
Burris	W-78 and WM-48
Ely	W-46, W-93, W-98 and WM-57
Ensign	W-40, W-58, W-61 and W-96
Frevert	W-51, W-65 and WSWRC
Hervey	W-28, W-81, W-89, W-99 and Ad Hoc Water Quality
Hill	W-45, W-67, W-86, WM-53 and IR-4
Hilston	W-57, W-91, W-94 and W-95
Jensen	W-102
Kelly	W-50, W-99 and WM-51
Kraus	W-64, IR-1 and IR-2
Leyendecker	W-79
Linsley	W-84, W-92, and Ad Hoc Codling Moth
Meyer	W-1
Pritchard	W-27, W-88 and W-100
Rasmussen	W-104 and WM-56
Thorne	W-66 and W-82
Wilson (C.P.)	W-54, WAERC and Ad Hoc Factor Markets

Wilson (M.L.) W-6 and WM-54
Wood WM-35, WM-52, WM-58, W-105 and WSSC
Zivnуска W-71 and WM-60

II. REVIEW OF INTERIM ACTIONS SINCE THE NOVEMBER 1967 MEETINGS OF WESTERN DIRECTORS:

A. W-56, "Interrelation of Nematodes and Other Pathogens in Plant Disease Complexes"

RRC recommends that Western Directors approve this revised project for a period of five years, ending 6/30/73, and that Ayres continue as Administrative Adviser.

/C. Wilson moved, Frevert seconded, that WD approve this recommendation. PASSED./

B. W-57, "Interrelationships of Amino Acids and Vitamin Utilization"

RRC recommends that Western Directors approve this revised project for a five-year period ending 6/30/73, and that Hilston continue as Administrative Adviser.

/C. Wilson moved, Wood seconded, adoption of this recommendation. PASSED./

C. W-102, "Biological Methods of Control for Internal Parasites of Livestock"

RRC recommends that Western Directors approve this revised draft of a new project proposal for a five-year period ending June 30, 1973, and that Jensen continue as Administrative Adviser.

/C. Wilson moved, M. Wilson seconded, adoption of this recommendation. PASSED./

D. WM-56, "Cooperatives Role in Dynamic Agriculture"

RRC recommends that Western Directors approve this revised project proposal for a five-year period ending 6/30/73, and that Rasmussen be assigned as the new Administrative Adviser. RRC further suggests that the Administrative Adviser explore further as to the possible interest of stations outside the Western Region in participating in this project.

Wood indicated he has surveyed other stations and has had correspondence with some. He will transfer his records to Rasmussen.

/C. Wilson moved, Wood seconded, adoption of these recommendations. PASSED./

E. W- , "Economic Growth of the Agricultural Firm"

RRC recommends that Western Directors approve this new project proposal for a five-year period ending 6/30/73; that it be assigned the number W-104, and that Rasmussen be assigned as the Administrative Adviser.

/C. Wilson moved, Wood seconded, that WD approve these recommendations. PASSED./

F. W- , "Criteria for Defining Rural Development Areas"

RRC recommends that Western Directors approve this new project proposal for a three-year period ending 6/30/71; that it be assigned the number W-105; and that Wood be assigned as Administrative Adviser.

/C. Wilson moved, Ely seconded, that WD approve these recommendations. PASSED./

G. Codling Moth Control Program

Dean Linsley attended a conference called by Director Robins to look into the matter of the Codling Moth Control Program. The conference was held at Portland, Oregon, January 12, 1968. Dr. Linsley recommends to the Directors, through RRC, "that authorization be given to interested states to send representatives to a meeting to explore the feasibility of a regional research project on population ecology, physiology, and behavior of the codling moth, and that if this is deemed by the representatives to be an appropriate area for cooperative regional research, that they be authorized to draw up a project outline under the emergency clause in the RRC statement of procedures."

No regional project is being proposed. If approved, this conference travel could be funded with RRF.

Kelly raised a question as to what would be done if this committee does not come up with a project proposal; will we authorize them to continue to meet to coordinate their activities?

The consensus of WD's was to defer consideration of this question until the committee report is received.

RRC endorses Linsley's recommendation and further recommends that Western Directors authorize Linsley to be the Administrative Adviser to organize a

conference committee of interested states to consider, coordinate, and keep abreast of activities associated with problems of the codling moth control programs.

/C. Wilson moved, Wood seconded, adoption of these recommendations. PASSED./

H. Ad Hoc Committee on Evapotranspiration from Unit Source Areas

The Administrative Adviser has indicated that budget restrictions and other difficulties have hampered efforts to get an effective committee organized.

RRC recommends that Western Directors "lay on the table" further activities of this Ad Hoc Committee.

/C. Wilson moved, Wood seconded, that Western Directors approve this recommendation. PASSED./

Sierk noted there are 60 projects funded in the Western Region - 14 marketing and 46 non-marketing.

III. REQUESTS FOR EXTENSION:

A. W-65, "Hydraulics of Surface Irrigation"

RRC recommends that Western Directors approve an extension of this project for a two-year period ending 6/30/71.

/C. Wilson moved, Robins seconded, adoption of this recommendation. PASSED./

B. WM-59, "An Economic Study of the Demand for Outdoor Recreation"

RRC recommends that an appropriate addendum be prepared for the modified project outline, and that Western Directors approve an extension of this project from 7/1/68 to 6/30/72 contingent upon prior approval of the addendum by the Administrative Adviser (Ayres) and the Chairman of Western Directors. RRC further suggests that the technical committee should recognize that they are expected to live within the policy and procedures adopted by the Western Directors.

The WM-59 Technical Committee is scheduled to meet in San Francisco, March 25-26, 1968.

/C. Wilson moved, Wood seconded, adoption of these recommendations. PASSED./

IV. PROPOSALS FOR REVISED OR NEW PROJECTS:

- A. W-6, "The Introduction, Multiplication, Preservation, and Determination of the Value of New Plants for Industrial and Other Purposes"

RRC recommends that Western Directors authorize a revision of this project outline, and that it be submitted to RRC for review at the 1969 spring meeting, and that the revised project become effective 7/1/69.

During the discussion of the above recommendation by RRC, Ensign asked for a reason for the revision. M. Wilson indicated this revision was prepared at his suggestion. The W-6 project is still under the old system and has a continuing authority. What the revision will do is bring it up to date in accordance with our current system, especially as regards contributing projects by stations.

/C. Wilson moved, Jensen seconded, adoption of RRC's recommendations. PASSED./

- B. W-45, "Pesticide Residues: Their Nature and Determination in Relation to the Production and Marketability of Agricultural Products"

RRC seeks WD's authorization for RRC to approve this project on behalf of WD's and forward it to the Western Directors' Chairman for submission to the Committee of Nine.

/C. Wilson moved, Wood seconded, for WD's approval of such authority. PASSED./

Hill apologized for not getting the proposal to RRC. It was mailed to RRC members from Utah on February 15. In addition to the proposal, a five-page report of progress was mailed and was received by RRC at New Mexico State University.

However, on the last day of the meeting, the proposed revision for W-45 was received by RRC. RRC immediately went into a rump session.

/Later, C. Wilson moved, Hilston seconded, that WD's rescind the action taken earlier on W-45 and approve it as a project extending from July 1, 1968 to June 30, 1973 and that Hill continue as Administrative Adviser. PASSED./

Ensign concurred in the importance and need for this project but indicated his opposition to its source of financing via trust funds.

C. W-68 (replacement), "Measurement, Prediction and Control of Soil Water Movement"

RRC recommends that action on this project proposal be deferred until the summer meeting. This will provide an opportunity to consider this proposal along with an anticipated request for revision from W-66, "The Formation and Properties of Soil Crusts." The possibility of combining the two areas of work in a single project should be explored.

/No action required by Western Directors./

Frevert noted that W-68 has not been reviewed by WSWRC. He will communicate with Administrative Advisers of W-68 and related projects to see that their proposals for revisions are available for review by WSWRC at its June meeting.

D. W- , "An Economic Analysis of Water Quality Standards"

RRC recommends approval by Western Directors of this new area of regional research; that Hervey be assigned as Administrative Adviser to organize an Ad Hoc Committee to prepare a project outline that is to be submitted to RRC for review at the 1969 spring meeting.

/C. Wilson moved, Burris seconded, that Western Directors approve this recommendation. PASSED./

Hervey commented that this may become a replacement project, since W-81 may request a one-year extension. This project has to do with where the cost of maintaining water quality should be borne - for prevention or remedial action regarding pollution.

E. WM- , "Implications of Changing Factor Market Structure for Procurement Strategies of Agricultural Producers"

RRC recommends that Western Directors approve this as a new area of work; that C. P. Wilson be assigned as Administrative Adviser to organize an Ad Hoc Committee of interested personnel who would prepare a project outline and submit it to RRC for review at its 1969 spring meeting.

/C. Wilson moved, M. Wilson seconded, that Western Directors approve this recommendation. PASSED./

C. Wilson - Under the revised definition of marketing, research on factor markets would now be eligible for consideration for support with marketing funds.

(NOTE: See T. C. Byerly's statement, dated February 29, 1968, on "Guidelines for Use in Determining Research Eligible for Support as Marketing Under the Hatch Act as amended." This statement was enclosed with the "Pink Sheet" - ESL No. 942, March 8, 1968.)

F. WM-44 (replacement), "The Development of Experimental Models of Market Development Programs and an Evaluation of Their Relative Economic Efficiency"

RRC recommends that this proposal for an area of work be referred to WAERC for their consideration and recommendations.

RRC further recommends that the present WM-44 project terminate as of 6/30/68.

C. Wilson - If a proposal were to come up for a replacement for this project, there would be a gap of one year. With regard to the results of efforts of this project, C. Wilson noted that there have been a number of state reports, but no regional report has been prepared. It is largely a methodological study. Wilson will check with the technical committee regarding the feasibility of compiling a regional report.

/C. Wilson moved, Hilston seconded, approval of RRC's recommendations. PASSED./

V. REGIONAL FUND ALLOCATIONS:

A. Trust Fund Requests

RRC recommends that Western Directors approve Regional Research Trust Fund allotments as indicated in Column 5 of APPENDIX E-1 for the fiscal year ending 6/30/69. Total trust funds recommended are \$155,205, an increase of \$11,334 above similar funds for FY '68. The increases occur as follows: W-6, up a net increase of \$2,774; WM-48 up \$4,000; and RRF-Administration up \$4,560.

/C. Wilson moved, Hill seconded, that Western Directors approve the recommendation. PASSED, with one dissent./

Discussion of the above motion together with a motion for contingency funds for W-6 (see V. B. below) brought out the following:

Robins explained some of the background associated with this project and noted that USDA has made

sizeable financial contributions to this effort even in the face of the tight budget situation. The U. S. Army Corps of Engineers is constructing a dam, that necessitates moving the site from a location 15 miles from campus to a location 40 miles away.

M. Wilson noted the environmental conditions are different at the new site - there will be a 40 to 50 day longer growing season at the new site than that which prevails around Pullman.

Sierk - Western representatives on the C/9 will have to carry the ball on this request for contingency funds. Could the supplemental material be made available?

C. Wilson noted that if Western Directors approve of this request, direct communication could be made between the Administrative Adviser and the C/9.

Hervey asked about the need and justification in having the Administrative Adviser appear before the C/9 and argue about this need for funds.

Sierk noted that since similar projects are underway in all regions, we must concern ourselves with the fact that it is research and warrants off-the-top regional funds in all regions.

Hill noted that this regional project (W-6) faces an emergency situation caused by the need to move, it was not their choice; that it ties in with similar projects in other regions; and that Washington State University has made very significant contributions to the efforts of this regional research project. He commended the performance of the W-6 Technical Committee, and endorsed the request for contingency funds.

Sierk asked whether it would be acceptable to WD's if operational expenses (trust funds) came off-the-top nationally rather than regionally.

Ely noted that if it were nationally, the C/9 would still seek justification from each region.

Robins asked why this project couldn't be funded as an IR project.

M. Wilson noted there is a national coordinating committee of the four regional committees composed of the four Administrative Advisers and the Chairman of the four regional technical committees. This

is essentially the same manner in which IR projects operate. Two of the IR projects also participate in the national coordinating committee.

Ely noted that this project has all the earmarks of an IR project.

Ensign indicated he was in agreement with the request for contingency funds but wondered what we would do if some adverse situation developed.

Frevert suggested we ought to seek advice of the regional technical committees, such as W-6, as to their opinions regarding the possibility of becoming an IR committee, before Western Directors or other regional Directors' groups made such a recommendation.

In the discussion of the trust fund requests with respect to W-45, Ensign suggested that each Director consider this a trust fund (off-the-top) for their respective states as a base RRF figure for their states.

Rasmussen noted this trust fund was set up to facilitate allocation of expenditures that were earmarked for pesticides because some states were not adequately prepared to support this project.

Sierk asked what assurance would be made for funding W-45 if the trust funds were removed? It was noted that the pesticide earmarking is still in effect.

Kelly cautioned there might be a reshuffling of funds and that this project might be in competition for funds.

Generally, Western Directors were wary about a possible reduction in funding of this project at some stations.

Hill noted the June 1963 WD Minutes (p. 6) where Price moved, Rosenberg seconded, "that the general area of pesticidal residues be selected as the first area to be emphasized and that a committee be appointed to recommend what other elements should be included in this area."

Hill - The problem is probably as keen now as it was in 1963. It should be noted that the W-84 trust for California was largely for pesticides work. Other states have been invited to come into W-45. If they did, the total budget would be divided accordingly.

Hill noted that we might consider maintaining the current means of funding W-45 for at least one more year. He was concerned lest something might happen that might cause us to lose some of this money.

Ensign questioned the justification for maintaining trust funds for W-45 in view of our means for supporting our other regional research projects.

Ely carried this point a step further noting that when this trust was originally made it was considered a one-shot need.

Ensign and Hill noted that each state put substantially more than these trust fund amounts on W-45.

/Ensign moved to amend C. Wilson's motion for trust fund requests, Robins seconded, to read that effective July 1, 1968 the \$51,205 trust fund that has been made available to current W-45 participating states be reallocated to the same RRF base allocation to these states. Thus, the W-45 trust fund would be discontinued.

/Ensign's motion to amend C. Wilson's motion for trust fund requests was defeated 6 to 4./

Burris commented that the reason he voted against the motion was that it would mean a readjustment in RRF.

(REPEAT: C. Wilson's main motion for the original trust fund allotments PASSED with one dissent.)

B. Contingency Fund Needs

RRC recommends that Western Directors approve an allotment of \$40,000 in Contingency Funds support (off-the-top nationally) in 1968-69 for W-6, to facilitate relocation of the W-6 Plant Introduction Station from the Wawawai site in Hawaii to a new site about 40 miles from the Washington State University campus.

/C. Wilson moved, Hill seconded, approval of this recommendation. PASSED./

C. Travel Allotments

RRC calls WD's attention to the estimated number of expected authorized travelers on Regional Research Funds in FY '69.

Approximately \$88,430 of RRF should be allotted for travel of administrative advisers and technical committee members associated with the regional research program in FY '69, as indicated in APPENDIX E-3.

Kelly raised a question about the accuracy of the travel costs table, but concurred that it is intended only as a guide.

VI. TENURE ON ESCOP

RRC reviewed its charge as set forth in the Western Directors' Minutes of November 1967 (page 4), namely: "that RRC review NASU&LGC policy regarding procedure for electing ESCOP officers and report back to Western Directors." RRC will make a formal report on this matter at the summer meeting. No action required by Western Directors.

VII. GENERAL

A. Plant Patents

RRC considered the matter of Plant Patents but took no action, since it was on the agenda for the Western Directors' meeting.

B. Annual Reports

The consensus of RRC was to recommend that the total Western Directors' mailing list be used for annual reports and other matters pertaining to the regional research program.

C. Representatives to National Foundation Seed Planning Committee, as proposed by the W-40 Technical Committee:

<u>Year</u>	<u>Representative</u>	<u>Alternate</u>
1968	Melvin W. Schonhorst	Robert G. Sackett
1969	Melvin W. Schonhorst	Robert G. Sackett

RRC requests that the W-40 Technical Committee furnish names of representatives for inclusion in the Western Directors' Minutes.

In appraising the various projects recommended by RRC, C. Wilson indicated that attempts were made to ascertain projects that according to the President's budget we may not be able to fund, and those projects that are in research problem areas that with some increase might facilitate funding, as well as those which should have no trouble being funded.

Miscellaneous

1. Workshop on PPB (Summer meeting)

Western Directors' Executive Committee will work with CSRS to arrange for a resource person (such as H. W. Hjort) to make a presentation at the summer meeting regarding PPB.

2. Plant Patents

Ensign called the Directors' attention to his memorandum to Western Directors, dated February 8, 1968, and indicated ESCOP will consider this subject at its April meeting.

Ensign - The Patent Commissioner has recommended that plant patents be discontinued and that a study be made to determine an alternative method that could be devised to protect private plant breeders.

Ensign referred to a letter to Buchanan from the American Seed Trade Association explaining their position to prefer that plant patents be broadened to include all plants - both sexually and asexually propagated plants - under the protection of the Patent Act.

M. Wilson and Frevert expressed concern about the feasibility of enforcing broadened patents.

Ronningen indicated USDA has looked into this via a special committee and has recommended a delay in action on this patent, pending further communication and exchange of ideas with smaller breeders. Large breeders tend to favor patents as they now exist. Patents can be developed with Hatch funds.

Ensign - Large breeders tend to develop and release varieties under a closed system. Now they can't take varieties developed with public funds and control them under their closed systems. This eventually could reduce the number of varieties that may be available to small breeders.

After further discussion both pro and con, Hervey indicated the sense of the discussion is that ESCOP ought to support a move for a study of the effects of terminating or broadening coverage of plant patents.

Ensign requested responses from each SAES regarding feelings pro, con, or neutral about the memorandum he sent out.

3. Cooperative Agreement regarding Dubois Sheep Laboratory

Ensign introduced this subject and suggested the WD consider what they want to do about the collaborator-type relationship as set forth in the memorandum of understanding with ARS for the Dubois Sheep Laboratory. He noted that there is a problem of funding participation in this collaborator-type relationship. Three alternatives were suggested, namely: a) Retain the relationship as it now exists; b) Discontinue the relationship as it now exists; or c) Process a supplemental memorandum of understanding to accompany the master memorandum of understanding with ARS.

Ensign moved, Ayres seconded, that Dr. R. E. Hodgson be advised that future cooperation of states be handled separately by processing a supplemental memorandum of understanding for each state with ARS, (for the cooperative agreement Re: Dubois Sheep Laboratory). PASSED.

Discussion of the above motion brought out the following:

- a) Would this subject open up the matter of the general question of arrangements policies for collaborating-type relationships of SAES with various other USDA laboratories?
- b) Ronningen indicated CSRS has been asked to look into ways in which relationships between SAES and the USDA laboratories could be improved.

Some of the Directors wondered if ARS feels that the relationship with SAES should be changed and whether such a motion as proposed by Ensign would establish a precedent.

- c) Ensign noted that the present type collaboration was set up under the Bankhead-Jones Act, and that this proposed motion wouldn't change the basic relationship between ARS and the states.

Another possibility would be to develop regional projects that would encompass the work at the ARS laboratory with the SAES work.

4. Property Records

Kraus - Once Hatch funds are received by the Experiment Stations is it necessary for the states to maintain separate accounting records of expenditures for all items of equipment purchased with Hatch funds? An auditor from the Office of Inspector General was concerned that he couldn't identify purchases made with Hatch funds.

Ronningen - So long as you have a complete state station inventory as part of the University inventory, it is not necessary to maintain a separate accounting for property purchased with Hatch funds. Byerly's letter of August 16, 1966, (CSRS-SL-2528) states:

"Property purchased with funds received from CSRS, regardless of the percentage of CSRS funds used, should be identified by a decal or some other means to show that it has been purchased with these funds."

Hervey asked the CSRS representatives to arrange for Western Directors to receive an updating of Byerly's letter to clarify some of the points of confusion.

5. Contingency Funds for Travel

Rasmussen raised the question as to the policy for covering expenses for authorized travelers participating in regional projects outside the region.

The consensus answer was that it is up to the station director to cover such expenses out of his station's resources.

Buchanan indicated a disproportionate number of people that were asked to serve on the national task forces are in the California Station. Funding their travel is an added burden. Could some relief come from CSRS?

Kelly noted that if RRF money can be used on this travel, California could handle it although the departments generally handle this type of problem.

Ronningen indicated he would look into this matter.

It was felt that Hatch money could be used for this purpose.

6. Suggestions for Land-Grant College Agricultural Divisional Meeting Program in November 1968.

Myers requested suggestions for the meeting. Some recommendations were:

- a. Financial aid relationships for foreign aid.
- b. Increased activity from HEW and NSF as exemplified in the Miller Bill that seem to not recognize agricultural sciences.

- c. A discussion of the setting up of a "National Academy of Agricultural Science," somewhat similar to the National Engineering Academy of Sciences.
- d. A report on the Food and Fiber Commission.
- e. What has been the effect of name changes such as have occurred at University of California campuses, the University of Wisconsin, Ohio State University, Michigan State University, etc.

Buchanan noted that this is related to the topic, "What is the contribution of agriculture to the whole society?" This could be handled by one person or a panel.

Earl Heady of Iowa and T. W. Schultz have written on this subject.

- f. Public Land Law Review.
- g. Report by the Commission on Poverty and Rural Development Areas.
- h. The ECOP Report on Rural Community Development.

Myers requested any additional suggestions be sent to him within two weeks.

7. Western Directors' Advisory Committees

With the concurrence of WD's this agenda item was deferred to the summer meeting.

Future Meetings

Summer 1968 - WD's will meet July 24-26 and RRC will meet July 23 at Fort Collins, Colorado.

Fall 1968 - The NASU&LGC meetings will be held in Washington, D. C., November 10-13, 1968 - a Wednesday afternoon session will be scheduled from 1 p.m. to 4 p.m. as needed.

Spring 1969 - WD's will meet in Hawaii the week of February 16, 1969. RRC will meet February 16-18 and WD's February 19-21.

Resolutions and Appreciations

Resolution No. 1

WHEREAS, the Western Directors are firm in their conviction that the Experiment Station Directors have the authority and legal responsibility for management of Hatch and State funds in their respective states and unanimously reiterate their support of the principle of self-determination contained in the Hatch Act; and

WHEREAS, the potentially productive guides established in connection with both long and short range planning are limited to assumptions understood during such planning; and

WHEREAS, the Western Directors Association, at their meeting in Las Cruces, New Mexico, in February 1968, express their concern with the manner in which the Hatch fund reduction under HJR 888 was administered by the Secretary of Agriculture, a procedure which was contrary to the wording and the spirit of the Hatch Act and the principle that "the varying conditions in the states" must be met;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that ESCOP be requested to transmit these concerns and convictions to the Secretary of Agriculture, and to the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, and to such Congressmen as it feels may be appropriate.

Resolution No. 2

WHEREAS, Director Emeritus Paul S. Burgess passed away at the age of 82 in Kingston, Rhode Island, on February 12, 1968; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Burgess served as Head of the Agricultural Chemistry and Soils Department, Dean of Agriculture and Director of the Agricultural Experiment Station, and President of the University of Arizona, and also as Dean and Director at the University of Rhode Island;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Association extend to Mrs. Burgess the deep sympathy of its members and express to her their sincere regret at his passing.

Resolution No. 3

WHEREAS, the Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors, including Cooperative State Research Service representatives, have completed a very successful and enjoyable spring meeting; and

WHEREAS, the arrangements made for the group and their wives were excellent, including hospitality at the home of Dr. and Mrs. Wilson, dinners at La Posta and La Fiesta (Juarez), and special trips for the ladies; as well as the luncheon sponsored by the local experiment station administration; and

WHEREAS, the transportation arranged for the members and their wives from El Paso to Las Cruces and return was considerably beyond what the members should expect;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Western Association of Experiment Station Directors, the Cooperative State Research Service representatives, and their guests, at their meetings of February 26-March 1, 1968 at Las Cruces, express their sincere appreciation to: Dr. P. J. Leyendecker, Dean and Director, New Mexico College of Agriculture and Agricultural Experiment Station; Dr. M. Wilson, Associate Director; and Dr. Wm. Stephens, Assistant Director; and their staffs, for their special efforts, hospitality, and planning of the splendid meetings and making our stay a memorable occasion.

Adjournment

Ronningen - We aren't asking you to keep the peace, but that you do keep the faith. CSRS does wish to maintain favorable cooperative relationships with SAES.

Chairman Hervey adjourned the meeting at 12:20 p.m. on March 1, 1968.

Respectfully submitted,



Leo R. Gray
Recording Secretary

APPENDIX A

January 31, 1968

MEMORANDUM TO THE WESTERN ASSOCIATION OF
AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION DIRECTORS,
AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF STATE UNIVERSITIES AND
LAND GRANT COLLEGES

Your Executive Committee, as instructed by the Western Association, has reviewed the performance of Mark T. Buchanan, Director-at-Large, Western Region, during the period since his initial appointment in April 1967. It is our conclusion that he has served the Region in a truly outstanding manner and that this service should be recognized by a merit salary increase of \$2400 effective July 1, 1968.

In making the above recommendation, the Executive Committee has taken into account the original assignment to the Director-at-Large which was as follows:

- (a) Gathering, analyzing, interpreting and utilizing on behalf of the Association information on research allocations, programs, and facilities within and between regions, and developing alternative proposals and recommendations for consolidation, improvement, opportunities, future direction, and cooperation.
- (b) Compiling, recasting, supplying, evaluating and utilizing on behalf of the Association data and other pertinent information for special uses such as for legislative and executive committees and bodies of government, farm organizations and commodity groups, trade organizations, and review panels.
- (c) Encouraging the development of criteria, measurements, and uniform methods of accumulation, retrieval, summarization, and dissemination of research information.
- (d) Maintaining such liaison with Directors of other regional associations and external bodies as may be required to facilitate the execution of his responsibilities.
- (e) Carrying out all other assignments made by the Association, or its representatives.

It is the judgment of the Executive Committee that he has undertaken this assignment with vigor, enthusiasm and dedication. We have been particularly impressed with his efforts, and those of his counterparts in the other regions, toward the improvement of federal-state relationships in joint budget and research planning. He has kept the Directors informed on vital matters by means of a series of nearly thirty formal Communications (see Appendix to this memorandum), including data of value in a wide variety of our operations. Between April 1, 1967 and January 1, 1968, these averaged about three per month. Some

of these were sizable documents. Communications number zero and 2 through 19 were bound and distributed in booklet form with the cover title, Information for Use by Directors, August 1967.

In addition to the Communications, Director Buchanan sent us a series of tables pertaining to the distribution of Scientific man years (SMY's) among state experiment stations and USDA research agencies, computations designed to facilitate analysis of these on a state-by-state basis for the western region, and a calculated "par" for each state's projection of SMY's in total, to 1977. "Par" data also were provided for SMY totals for the state experiment stations of the western region on a research problem area-commodity basis. These were designed to aid in the development of programs and related physical facilities projections. Later, tables summarizing the outcome of our special meeting, October 3-5, 1967, were distributed on both a research problem area-commodity basis (these were developed at the meeting) and on a goal, research problem area basis. After receiving modifications made subsequent to the meeting, there were distributed with the minutes "final" tables depicting the breakdown by states, and for the region.

Finally, Director Buchanan, in addition to contacts with individual directors about local state problems, met with the Executive Committee on January 26, 1968, to discuss recent developments of special import to the Western Directors, policy issues of which the Region should be informed, special projects and other matters which will be placed before you on the Agenda for the Spring Meeting in Las Cruces.

We repeat, that it is our considered judgment that Director-at-Large Buchanan has performed with distinction and request the endorsement of this letter by the Western Experiment Station Directors with instruction that it be transmitted by the Chairman of the Association to appropriate officials at the University of California for implementation.

/s/ E. G. Linsley

E. Gorton Linsley, Secretary

Appendix

PRINCIPAL ITEMS SENT TO WESTERN DIRECTORS

by

Mark T. Buchanan
Director-at-Large

April 1, 1967 - January 1, 1968

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
OWDAL - 0	PLANNING-PROGRAMMING-BUDGETING SYSTEM
1	PROJECTIONS - PROGRAM AND PHYSICAL FACILITIES
2	CASH RECEIPTS FOR IMPORTANT COMMODITIES AND COMMODITY GROUPS, UNITED STATES AND EXPERIMENT STATION REGIONS, 1965
3	CASH RECEIPTS BY COMMODITIES AND COMMODITY GROUPS BY STATES AND EXPERIMENT STATION REGIONS, 1965
4	CASH RECEIPTS BY COMMODITIES AND COMMODITY GROUPS WITHIN THE WESTERN STATES, 1965
5	CASH RECEIPTS FROM FARM MARKETINGS AND NON-FEDERAL FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH, YEARS ENDING JUNE 30, 1956, 1961 AND 1965-66
6	TOTAL AND FARM POPULATION ESTIMATES AND FAMILY WORKERS ON FARMS, 1966
7	AVERAGE VALUE OF FARMLAND AND BUILDINGS PER ACRE, TOTAL VALUE AND AVERAGE VALUE PER FARM, SELECTED YEARS
8	STATE TAX REVENUE, BY TYPE OF TAX: 1966
9	TAXES LEVIED ON FARM REAL ESTATE: TOTAL TAXES BY STATES, SELECTED YEARS, 1930 to 1965
10	TOTAL PERSONAL INCOME BY STATE AND REGION, 1948-1966
11	RELATION OF SELECTED ITEMS OF STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT FINANCES TO PERSONAL INCOME: 1964-1965
12-A	SUMMARY BY ACTIVITY OF 1966 SMY, WESTERN REGION
12-B	SUMMARY BY COMMODITY OF 1966 SMY, WESTERN REGION
12-C	SUMMARY BY FIELD OF SCIENCE OF 1966 SMY, WESTERN REGION
13	LAND UTILIZATION: LAND IN FARMS AND LAND NOT IN FARMS BY STATES, 1964 (1,000 ACRES)

II

- 14 HARVESTED ACREAGE OF 59 PRINCIPAL CROPS, RESEARCH
EXPENDITURES AND SCIENCE MAN YEARS BY REGIONS, 1965
- 15 EXPENDITURES BY STATES PER CAPITA AND PER \$1,000 OF
PERSONAL INCOME FOR SELECTED ITEMS OF STATE AND LOCAL
GOVERNMENT, WESTERN STATES, 1964-65
- 16 DATA ON CROP YIELDS AND RANKINGS BY STATE
- 17 DATA ON CASH RECEIPTS AND RANKINGS BY STATES FOR
SELECTED COMMODITIES
- 18 RANKING OF STATES BY EXPENDITURES FOR AGRICULTURAL
RESEARCH, BY SOURCE OF FUNDS, 1966
- 19 RANKING OF STATES BY EXPENDITURES FOR AGRICULTURAL
RESEARCH, BY SOURCE OF FUNDS, 1966, PER \$1,000 OF
CASH FARM INCOME
- 21 RESEARCH CLASSIFICATION
- 22 FURTHER INFORMATION FOR AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH PLANNING
- 23 OUTLINE FOR USE IN PREPARING MATERIALS ON CONTRIBUTIONS
OF AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH
- 24 USE OF CRIS IN RESEARCH MANAGEMENT
- 25 PROJECTION OF PROGRAM FOLLOWING OCTOBER 3-5, 1967
MEETING AT BERKELEY
- 26 PHYSICAL FACILITIES INFORMATION, APPROPRIATIONS,
TASK FORCES
- 27 PRIORITIES FOR RESEARCH PROGRAM AND FOR PHYSICAL
FACILITIES ASSOCIATED THEREWITH
- 28 CURRENT TASK FORCE MEMBERSHIP
- 29 COPY OF INSTRUCTIONS CONCERNING PROJECT PROPOSALS
BY H. R. FORTMANN, PENN STATE AND COMMENTS ON
"GETTING HOLD OF" MARK BUCHANAN

APPENDIX B

ESTIMATED BUDGET

July 1, 1968 - June 30, 1969

DIRECTOR-AT-LARGE

WESTERN ASSOCIATION OF AGRICULTURAL

EXPERIMENT STATION DIRECTORS

SUPPLIES AND EXPENSE

COST PER MONTH

Travel	\$ 300.00
Central Steno and Printing	120.00
Telephone	50.00
Equipment	25.00
Mailing Charges	20.00
Office Supplies	15.00
Other	50.00

Sub-total

\$1,080.00

Escrow

\$ 150.00

Secretary and benefits

565.00

\$1,795.00

\$60,000. minus
(1795 x 12) = \$38,460 for salary
and benefits of DAL and for
special projects

APPENDIX C

TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY
College of Agriculture

College Station, Texas 77843

Office of
Dean of Agriculture
Director, Texas Agricultural
Experiment Station

December 15, 1967

C
O
P
Y

Dr. Don F. Hervey
Chairman of Western Directors
Agricultural Experiment Station
Fort Collins, Colorado

Dear Dr. Hervey:

Dr. C. Peairs Wilson has sent me a copy of the Policy Statement on Participation on Western Advisory Committees by Stations Outside the Western Region. The copy was sent to me because of a request by our Department of Agricultural Economics and Sociology to obtain membership on the Western Agricultural Economics Research Council.

I had known of the interest of the Department in joining the WAERC. They had my approval in making the informal request for membership. I appreciate the action of the WAERC and of the Western Directors in providing a framework within which a formal request for membership can be registered.

As Acting Director of the Texas Agricultural Experiment Station, I am requesting membership on the Western Agricultural Economics Research Council for the Department of Agricultural Economics and Sociology of this Station. I am agreeable to the policies and procedures established by the Western Directors for such membership.

If this request is approved, Texas will be represented at the WAERC meeting at Las Vegas, Nevada on January 10-11, 1968.

Sincerely yours,

/s/ H. O. Kunkel

H. O. Kunkel
Acting Dean and Director

cc: Dr. C. Peairs Wilson
Dr. T. R. Timm
Dr. J. G. McNeely

C
O
P
Y

APPENDIX D

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

College of Agriculture
Agricultural Experiment Station
Office of the Dean and
Associate Director

February 7, 1968

C
O
P
Y

TO : Members of the RRC and Other Western Directors

FROM : E. G. Linsley

SUBJECT: Codling Moth Control Program

You will recall that at the October, 1967 meetings of the Directors held at Berkeley, Director Robins described a USDA proposal for control of the codling moth by means of sterile males to be produced at a facility to be built at Yakima, Washington. After considerable discussion, Robins was authorized to call a conference to look into the matter and, subsequently, I was asked to attend as an observer for the Western Directors.

The conference was called by Director Robins through Horace Telford, Chairman, Department of Entomology, Washington State University, for January 12, 1968, in Portland. Twenty-nine researchers and administrators attended, including, seventeen from the states, ten from the USDA, one from the Canada Department of Agriculture, and an Idaho grower, J. R. Dewey, President of the Western Apple Growers of America. Minutes of this meeting are attached. You will note that one of the outcomes of the discussion was the possibility of a regional research project on population variation and physiological adaptations of the codling moth in the states where the moth is a problem, and I was asked to discuss this possibility with the Western Directors.

Background. One of the earliest pest problems facing entomologists in the Agricultural Experiment Stations of apple and pear growing states was the control of the larval codling moth.

It was first successfully suppressed by a lead arsenate spray applied shortly after the blossoms dropped, but in areas where more than one generation of moths occurred during the growing season, this single spray would not protect the fruit and more than one was required. Also, since arsenic is toxic to humans this created the first residue problem, and washing techniques had to be developed to remove the residue. However, the codling moth became resistant to arsenic and more and more applications were required to control it. By the 1930's, millions of pounds of lead arsenate were being used throughout the country each year. Drip from the sprays contaminated the soil in apple and pear orchards, and the cost of the many spray applications and washing made alternative control methods imperative. In the 1940's DDT became a promising substitute but in many areas the moths developed resistance and mite problems were aggravated.

In the 1950's and 1960's phosphate and carbamate insecticides had to be substituted, and these also created mite problems. Furthermore, there is no reason to believe the moths will not develop resistance to these and when that occurs we will have to be a jump ahead of them with something else. In California, we are now experimenting with a virus which has shown promise in small scale experiments but needs to be tried out on a large scale before industry will step in and make supplies commercially available.

To further complicate the problem of control, the codling moth has developed a large number of strains with different physiological and behavioral characteristics. In California, one moved over from apples and pears to walnuts, and has become a serious pest of this crop. Unfortunately, control procedures which work well in northern California do not work well in southern California, and the walnut strains develop resistance and mite problems as do the apple and pear strains. Other strains attack plums, prunes and certain other fruits, each with their own special problems of timing of applications, dosages, etc.

USDA Sterile Male Program. The USDA program described in the attached minutes proposes to produce sterile male codling moths for initial release in Washington, and if successful there, in other western states. In theory, the sterile males, mating with females, will drastically suppress or eliminate the population. This technique was successfully tested last year on a 93 acre orchard and gave control equivalent to chemical control in adjoining blocks. Before going into large scale production, the USDA plans a two-year test on a plot of 5,000 acres at a cost of \$1.6 million, including staff and facilities. This would give the interested western states from 3-to-5 years lead time to get ready for the program in their areas. In California alone there are dozens of strains of the codling moth known and doubtless many others exist. How many exist in the western region is anyone's guess. This lead time is scarcely enough to study the variation in mating habits, especially time of mating and other factors affecting the sterile male technique in these different strains with their variable number of annual generations. Also, experiments must be designed and carried out to determine whether the total elimination of the codling moth by non-chemical means will aggravate other pest problems, as is so often the case when we are forced to switch from one method of chemical control to another because of the development of resistance to a pesticide.

Prospects for a Regional Codling Moth Project. It is clear that one of our oldest problems is still with us because of the great evolutionary capacity of the pest, the obligation of scientists to use chemicals that do not leave toxic residues, economic factors, and side effects upon other pest populations.

Time did not permit discussion of details of a possible regional project at the Portland meeting. Discussants agreed on a basic need for a much better understanding of codling moth populations than is now available, regardless of what control procedure ultimately proves to be the most feasible. Such information needs to be comparative and technical approaches coordinated. Identification of strains and transshipment for studies of mating behavior, susceptibility to disease and other factors argue strongly for a regional effort.

It is my recommendation to the Directors, through RRC, that authorization be given to interested states to send representatives to a meeting to explore the feasibility of a regional research project on population ecology, physiology and behavior of the codling moth, and that if this is deemed by the representatives to be an appropriate area for cooperative regional research, that they be authorized to draw up a project under the emergency clause in the RRC statement of procedures.

(Note: Enclosure is not attached.)

C
O
P
Y

APPENDIX E-1

FY '69 Trust Fund Needs

Project	State	FY 68	FY 69 Funds	
		Allotment	Requested	Recommended
W-6	Arizona	\$ 1,000	\$ 1,000	\$ 1,000
	Hawaii	2,250	2,000	2,000
	Montana	1,000	1,000	1,000
	Oregon	500	500	500
	Washington	<u>49,476</u>	<u>52,513</u>	<u>52,500</u>
	Subtotal	\$ 54,226	\$ 57,013	\$ 57,000
W-45	Arizona	\$ 5,125	\$ 5,125	\$ 5,125
	Colorado	5,120	5,120	5,120
	Hawaii	5,120	5,120	5,120
	Montana	5,120	5,120	5,120
	Nevada	5,120	5,120	5,120
	Oregon	5,120	5,120	5,120
	Utah	5,120	5,120	5,120
	Washington	5,120	5,120	5,120
	California	<u>10,240</u>	<u>10,240</u>	<u>10,240</u>
	Subtotal	\$ 51,205	\$ 51,205	\$ 51,205
W-57	Arizona	\$ 500	\$ 500	\$ 500
W-84 <u>1/</u>	California	\$ 18,000	\$ 18,000	\$ 18,000
WM-48 <u>2/</u>	Montana	\$ 10,000	\$ 14,000	\$ 14,000
RRF Admin. <u>3/</u>	Montana	<u>\$ 9,940</u>	<u>\$ 14,500</u>	<u>\$ 14,500</u>
	TOTAL	\$143,871	\$155,218	\$155,205

1/ Special "off-the-top" allocation to be continued through FY 69 (WD Minutes, November 1964, p. 9)

2/ \$4,000 increase requested to cover the Region's share of costs for the coordination of the WM-48 project.

3/ \$4,560 increase requested to cover the Region's share of increased costs for support of the WD Recording Secretary position (see APPENDIX E-2)

APPENDIX E-2

Estimated expenses, for WAERC Secretary and WD Recording Secretary positions,
due for funds transfer from SAES in Western Region to ERS in FY 68 and FY 69,
and sources of financial support to cover expenses

Item	: FY 68	: FY 69
	:(dollars)	:(dollars)
Compensation ^{1/} : Gray @ .6185 FTE	: 9,469	: 10,521 ^{2/}
Nicoletto @ .55 FTE	: 4,065	: 4,419
Subtotal	: 13,534	: 14,940
Gray's travel to WAERC, WD Affairs	: 1,900	: 2,400
Communications	: 350	: 350
Supplies	: 150	: 150
Total fund transfer due from SAES in Western Region to ERS ^{3/}	: 15,934	: 17,840
Less: California salary payments	: 2,100	: 2,100
Montana fund transfer	: 13,834	: 15,740
Less: RRF Trust	: 9,940	: 9,940
Less: Special WAERC fund	: 3,894	: 5,800
	: 1,200	: 1,200
Balance (Deficit to be made up by ERS)	: - 2,694	: - 4,600

^{1/} Total compensation, includes salary and fringe benefits that approximate 7.5 percent of salary. Assume FTE as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Gray} & - \text{WD} (.25) + \text{WAERC} (.3685) = .6185 \text{ a/} \\ \text{Nicoletto} & - \text{WD} (.40) + \text{WAERC} (.15) = .55 \text{ b/} \end{aligned}$$

a/ FTE on WAERC = .55 of which WAERC pays 2/3-3/4. Balance of FTE covered by ERS.


b/ FTE on WAERC = .45 of which financial support from the region covers 1/3. Balance of FTE covered by ERS.

^{2/} FY 69 compensation assume within-grade step increases, and general pay scale increases of 6.5 and 5.3 percent respectively.

^{3/} Last year, when this budget was estimated, no allowance was made for fringe benefits, increased pay, or travel to other than WD meetings.

APPENDIX E-3

Summary of RRF Allotment Recommendations for Trust Funds, and Estimated Travel Costs for FY '69 Made by Western Directors February 28-March 1, 1968

<u>State</u>	<u>Trusts</u>	<u>Travel</u>		
		<u>Average Regional Trip Cost (Estimate)</u>	<u>Number of Authorized Travelers^{1/} (Estimate)</u>	<u>Total Travel Costs (Estimate)</u>
Arizona	\$ 6,625	\$165	55	\$ 9,075
California	28,240	150	70	10,500
Colorado	5,120	130	65	8,450
Hawaii	7,120	435	28	12,180
Idaho	---	165	44	7,260
Montana	34,620	180	38	6,840
Nevada	5,120	130	38	4,940
New Mexico	---	175	28	4,900
Oregon	5,620	150	56	8,400
Utah	5,120	140	39	5,460
Washington	57,620	175	33	5,775
Wyoming	---	<u>150</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>4,650</u>
TOTAL	\$155,205		525	\$88,430
<div style="text-align: center;">  <p>\$243,635</p> </div>				

^{1/} Authorized administrative advisers, technical committee members and planning and coordination travelers associated with the regional research program.

Agricultural Experiment Station
New Mexico State University
Las Cruces, New Mexico 88001
January 23, 1968

To: M. T. Buchanan, Director-at-Large
From: Marvin L. Wilson *mlw*
Subject: Western Directors Meeting at Las Cruces, New Mexico,
February 28, 29, March 1, 1968

I am enclosing information on lodging facilities in Las Cruces and a form which will provide me with your transportation schedules. For those who need it, we will be glad to provide transportation to Las Cruces from the El Paso Airport.

Please make your own motel reservations. For those requiring transportation between the motels and campus, the Mission Inn has complete facilities and is conveniently located for us.

On the transportation form under "Remarks," it would be helpful if you would designate the name of the motel where you plan to stay.

Sightseeing and shopping excursions will be arranged for the wives.

Information on additional "activities" will be sent to you soon.

MLW:ch

enclosures