

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 4, 1969

TO : Western Directors

FROM : Leo R. Gray, Recording Secretary

SUBJECT: Minutes of: I. the Regular Spring Meetings of Western  
Directors; and II. the Special March meetings of Select  
Western Directors' Committees

I. Minutes of the Regular Spring Meetings are attached.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Item</u>	<u>Page</u>
Call to Order and Attendance . . . . .	1
Introductions and Announcements. . . . .	1
November 1968 Minutes. . . . .	2
Comments of CSRS Representatives . . . . .	2
Report on Position of WDAL . . . . .	10
Report of WDAL . . . . .	10
ARPC/ARPAC . . . . .	12
ESCOP. . . . .	13
Forward Planning Committee . . . . .	17
ESCOP Legislative Subcommittee . . . . .	17
Ad Hoc Committee on Regional Research Philosophy . . . . .	18
Committee of Nine. . . . .	24
WAERC. . . . .	24
WSWRC. . . . .	25
WHERAC . . . . .	25
WSRAC. . . . .	25
RRC Report . . . . .	27
Miscellaneous	
1. Suggestions for 1969 LGC Meetings. . . . .	40
2. Mechanical Harvesting of Cherries. . . . .	41
3. Plant Patents. . . . .	41
4. Maintenance of Agricultural Production Capacity. . . . .	41
Treasurer's Report . . . . .	43
Future Meetings. . . . .	43
Resolutions. . . . .	43
Adjournment. . . . .	45
APPENDIX A - Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Regional Research Philosophy . . . . .	46
APPENDIX B - Financial Statement . . . . .	48

11. Minutes of the Special March Meetings of Select Western Directors' Committees are also enclosed.

#### TABLE OF CONTENTS

Attendance . . . . .	1
General Recommendation . . . . .	1
Committee of Administrative Advisers to the Six tentative Task Forces. . . . .	1
Subcommittee on Criteria for Western Coordinating Committees . . . .	3
Forward Planning Committee . . . . .	5

Items listed below are for your specific attention:

<u>For Specific Attention of</u>	<u>Page No.</u>	<u>Sidehead or Other Identification</u>
All Directors	1	Introductions and Announcements
	2	November 1968 Minutes
	2 - 10	Comments of CSRS Representatives
	10	Report on Position of WDAL
	10 - 12	Report of WDAL
	12 - 13	ARPC/ARPAC
	13 - 17	ESCOP
	17	Forward Planning Committee
	17 - 18	ESCOP Legislative Subcommittee
	18 - 24	Ad Hoc Committee on Regional Research Philosophy
	27 - 40	RRC Report
	43	Treasurer's Report
	43 - 45	Resolutions
Alexander	36	RRC Report, Item VI B.
Asleson	33	RRC Report, Item IV F.
Ayres	33	RRC Report, Item IV H.
Buchanan	17	Forward Planning Committee

<u>For Specific Attention of</u>	<u>Page No.</u>	<u>Sidehead or Other Identification</u>
Day	34	RRC Report, Item V A.
Ely	17	Forward Planning Committee
	32	RRC Report, Item IV B.
Ensign	17	Forward Planning Committee
Frevert	12	ARPC/ARPAC
	32	RRC Report, Item IV C.
Hervey	17	Forward Planning Committee
Hill	32	RRC Report, Item IV E.
Kelly	13	ESCAP
Kraus	26	WSRAC (to contact Dr. DeLay)
	32	RRC Report, Item IV D.
Leyendecker	35	RRC Report, Item V E.
Linsley	34	RRC Report, Item V B and V D.
Robins	35	RRC Report, Item V C.
Sierk	17	Forward Planning Committee
Thorne	33	RRC Report, Item IV G.
	36	RRC Report, Item VI A.
C. P. Wilson	36	RRC Report, Item V F.
M. L. Wilson	31 - 32	RRC Report, Item IV A.
Wood	17	Forward Planning Committee
Zivnuska	2	Comments of CSRS Representatives, Item A.

*Le. P. Gray*

MINUTES OF WESTERN DIRECTORS'  
REGULAR SPRING MEETING

Kauai Resort Hotel, Waimea, Kauai, Hawaii  
February 16 - 21, 1969

Call to Order  
and Attendance

Chairman Kraus called the Western Directors' general meeting to order at 9:15 a.m. on Wednesday, February 19, 1969. Those present during all or part of the business meetings included:

R. K. Frevert	Arizona
J. B. Kendrick	California
C. F. Kelly	California
B. E. Day	California
E. G. Linsley	California
J. A. Zivnuska	California
Rue Jensen	Colorado
D. F. Hervey	Colorado
C. P. Wilson	Hawaii
G. D. Sherman	Hawaii
D. L. Plucknett	Hawaii
J. E. Kraus	Idaho
J. A. Asleson	Montana
M. J. Burris	Montana
F. E. Price	Nevada
R. E. Ely	Nevada
P. J. Leyendecker	New Mexico
M. L. Wilson	New Mexico
G. B. Wood	Oregon
W. H. Foote	Oregon
K. W. Hill	Utah
J. S. Robins	Washington
L. W. Rasmussen	Washington
N. W. Hilston	Wyoming
L. C. Ayres	Wyoming
M. T. Buchanan	Director-at-Large
H. C. Knoblauch	CSRS
C. F. Sierk	CSRS

L. R. Gray                      Recording Secretary

Introductions  
and Announcements

Kelly introduced Dr. John A. Zivnuska, Dean of the School of Forestry and Associate Director of the California Agricultural Experiment Station at Berkeley.

Later, after some appropriate tutoring by Ely, neophyte Zivnuska was accepted into the Western Directors' Association by acclamation.

Chairman Kraus appointed the following committees:

Nominating Committee for ARPAC Representative: Hervey, Chairman; Asleson; Kendrick; and Robins.

Resolutions Committee: Day, Chairman; Frevert; and Hill.

Later, a Supplemental Nominating Committee was appointed by Kraus to serve as required prior to the next meeting of Western Directors. This committee consisted of: Hervey, Chairman; Asleson; Kelly; and Robins.

November 1968  
Minutes

Kelly suggested the WD Minutes of November 1968 be amended to indicate the modified action taken by ESCOP pertaining to the Report of the Joint Ad Hoc Task Force on Federal-State Experiment Station Relations. The WD Minutes should be revised with the following amendment inserted on page 6, just before the next to last paragraph beginning with "Ensign," to read:

"At a later meeting, on November 12, 1968, ESCOP modified its action and passed a motion indicating 'its approval of the general intent of the report.' There was a dissenting vote by Sierk 'on the assumption that this action rescinded the November 10 ESCOP action.'"

*Hervey moved, Asleson seconded, that the November 1968 WD Minutes be approved as distributed with the above revision as amended. PASSED.*

Comments of CSRS  
Representatives

Knoblauch - 1. Budget - 1970 Estimates

A. SAES, Forestry Schools, Facilities and Special Grants

Project	1968	1969 Estimated	Increases & Decreases	1970 Estimated
1. <u>Payments to SAES under the</u>				
<u>Hatch Act:</u>				
a. Research program.....	\$49,795,352	\$51,580,261	+\$2,176,680	\$53,756,941
b. Set-aside for Federal				
administration (3% of				
increase).....	1,309,779	1,309,779	a/ + 122,280	1,432,059
Total under Hatch Act:	\$51,105,131	\$52,890,040	+\$2,298,960(1)	\$55,189,000
2. <u>Grants for cooperative</u>				
<u>forestry research</u> .....	\$ 3,370,000	\$ 3,485,000	+\$ 300,000(2)	\$ 3,785,000
3. <u>Contracts and grants for</u>				
<u>scientific research</u> .....	1,800,000	2,000,000	+ 150,000(3)	2,150,000
4. <u>Grants for facilities</u> .....	2,000,000	--	+ 2,000,000(4)	2,000,000
5. <u>Penalty Mail</u> .....	310,000	160,000	--	160,000
6. <u>Federal administration</u>				
(direct appropriation)....	300,341	375,960	+ 70,040(5)	446,000
Unobligated balance.....	72,528	194,000	- 194,000(6)	--
Total available or estimate...	\$58,958,000	\$59,105,000	+\$4,625,000	\$63,730,000

a/ Includes restoration of the 3% set-aside \$54,960 for Federal Administration which was placed in reserve pursuant to P. L. 90-364.

- B. The proposed Budget includes \$4,150,000 for USDA under Foreign Agricultural Research and Development which "provides a new program to stimulate the growth of agriculture in developing nations by building institutions that will provide a continuous flow of technology." It is contemplated that this program will be supported, to a large extent, by American farm production and that its success is contingent on significant self-help, plus the full participation of U. S. Land-Grant Institutions and agribusiness.

The Secretary of Agriculture is directed to ". . . assist friendly developing countries to become self-sufficient in food production . . ." and to develop programs to:

- (1) ". . . help farmers in such countries in the practical aspects of increasing food production and distribution and improving the effectiveness of their farming operations;
- (2) ". . . to recruit persons who by reason of training, education or practical experience are knowledgeable in the practical arts and sciences of agriculture and home economics and to train such persons on the practical techniques of transmitting to farmers in such countries improved practices . . . ; and
- (3) ". . . conduct research in tropical and subtropical agriculture for the improvement and development of tropical and subtropical food products for dissemination and cultivation in friendly countries."

C. P. Wilson raised a question regarding the allocation of the \$4.15 million for foreign agricultural research and development, which is authorized under Section 406 of the Food for Peace Act of 1966 for research in tropical agriculture. He suggested the allocations should be made to institutions that have a natural outdoor tropical environment for conducting such research.

Knoblauch indicated no commitments have been made at this time.

Frevert reported that H. Meyers commented that the Agriculture Division of LGC is preparing a letter which NASU&LGC will hopefully send to President Nixon recommending that the Hannah Committee Report be implemented.

#### C. Budget Outlook

1. A careful re-evaluation of present budgets, expenditures and estimates to bring about maximum efficiency in fund use.
2. Current exploratory studies on agriculture research budget organization, presentation and justification include the following areas:
  - a. Research and USDA missions
  - b. PPBS and the research budget

- c. Research packages and task force reports
- d. Research progress and problems of SAES

D. Support of Research in Colleges and Universities 1968-1970  
by Federal Agencies:

SUPPORT OF RESEARCH IN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES  
(in millions of dollars)

Department or Agency	Obligations			Expenditures		
	1968	1969	1970	1968	1969	1970
	actual	estimate	estimate	actual	estimate	estimate
Health, Education & Welfare...	700	713	705	653	592	666
Defense.....	219	247	274	235	252	275
National Science Foundation...	221	210	255	207	224	243
National Aeronautics & Space Administration.....	130	119	101	151	130	109
Atomic Energy Commission.....	93	94	96	93	94	96
Agriculture.....	62	62	64	61	62	64
All Other.....	60	63	76	56	60	66
Total.....	1,485	1,508	1,571	1,456	1,414	1,519

- E. Audit - Within the Federal structure, plans are underway to have one cognizant agency do all of the audit of Federal funds at a University. However, some of the details have yet to be worked out.

## II. LEGISLATIVE DEVELOPMENTS

The 91st Congress is receiving legislative proposals at a record-breaking rate. During the first month, over 5,000 bills were introduced. Many are "repeaters" from the previous session. Here is a sampling of those having special interest to CSRS. Brief descriptions appear in the Green Hornet, or Digest of Congressional Proceedings, which we send out regularly with the Pink Sheet.

National Institutional Grants Program (H. R. 35, the "Miller Bill").

Establish Land-Grant Colleges on Guam (H. R. 106-Aspinall-Colo.) and the Virgin Islands (H. R. 105-Aspinall-Colo.).

Research and Promotion Acts for honey (H. R. 349-Teague-Texas) and potatoes (H. R. 2777-Jones-N. Car.).

Improve Laboratory Animal Research Facilities (H. R. 419-Cramer-Fla.).

Establish a Department of Science, Research and Technology (H. R. 464-Fulton-Pa.).

Retirement Credit for State Service (H. R. 1266-Natcher-Ky.).

Reorganize the Legislative Branch (S. 844-Mundt-S. Dak.).

The last mentioned bill, you may recall, would transfer CSRS programs from the House Committee on Agriculture to a new House Committee on Education, in effect labeling the SAES programs as essentially "educational." The bill passed the Senate last year, but did not get through the House. The new bill contains the same provision.

Another bill of somewhat less direct concern to us is S. 1 by Mr. Muskie, relating to relocation assistance for people displaced in land acquisition activities. We reported that our records did not indicate any problems at the State Stations, in response to an inquiry from the Senator. If you know of any instances that should be brought to our attention, let us have a letter describing any associated costs.

### III. PROGRAM PLANNING AND BUDGETING SYSTEM (PPBS)

Preliminary consideration is being given by the Department to possible improvements that might be made in the PPBS process and organization, to find better ways of doing the job. The following major areas are being considered:

1. Alternative planning targets. It is recommended that single planning targets be used and justified.
2. PPBS areas where special analytical studies might be made during the coming year. Increasing attention will be directed to demonstrating areas of program emphasis and new areas needing research.
3. Various techniques in the PPBS. Exploratory studies are being made to determine if research budgets can be developed and presented as separate items within the Department budget structure.
4. Modification of program structure. The general objective is to determine possible structures under which the PPBS goals, categories and missions can be simplified.

### IV. STATUS OF CRIS - February 11, 1969

Final acceptance of the design of CRIS from the contractor was made on January 28, 1969. The delay in acceptance was the result of some inconsistencies in the design of the system and its subsequent modification to meet revised operating requirements. These were imposed by the Washington Data Processing Center in conjunction with its conversion to IBM System 369 - Model 50 operation.

Over 24,000 projects have now been entered into CRIS, with over 21,000 now meeting all machine edit requirements for listing on the Master File. Less than 3,000 projects remain on the Error Suspense



File and corrections to about 500 of these are now on tape and ready for entry to the system. This leaves only 2,500 projects which have not yet been satisfactorily resolved. This compares with approximately 12,000 projects which have been listed initially on the Error Suspense File during the period of development of CRIS, a reduction of 9,500.

Procedures for removal of this remaining 2,500 projects from the Error Suspense File have been established as follows:

1. Pages 1 and 2 of the CRIS form together with appropriate error messages will be printed out for all projects remaining on the Error Suspense File.
2. These will be provided to CSRS for prompt correction of all projects which CSRS staff can correct. Many corrections will involve only classification errors - Activity, Commodity, Field of Science, PPB Code, or RPA. It is expected that CSRS will make all necessary classification corrections.
3. Remaining projects will be discussed with the SAES Regional Representatives who will either discuss the problems involved directly with the individual stations or will advise CRIS as to the most expeditious procedure for making the necessary corrections.

All projects should be cleared from the Error Suspense File by April or May.

When CRIS becomes fully operational, it will likely serve mostly a management function.

Meanwhile CRIS is providing limited service to both scientists and administrators. A printout of the RPDES Inventory for 1967-68 has been prepared for all USDA agencies. A complete printout of the RPDES Inventory for all 1967-68 SAES-USDA research is scheduled for completion by February 20. A similar printout of Inventory data for 1968-69 is scheduled for May. The 1968-69 Inventory will be printed in a form similar to that used in the 1965-66 Inventory (green and yellow books).

A number of scientific queries have been answered but the submission of these to the system has been rather difficult because of the unwieldiness of the Keyword Index. This index has been materially simplified and condensed from 22,000 to 9,700 terms, and these are being reviewed further in an effort to improve the index. Each research worker will have the opportunity to review any changes in his assignment of key words when the next progress report is sent out for completion.

Operating personnel will be able to provide faster and more complete responses to inquiries when the problems of clearing projects from the Error Suspense File have been resolved. At that time, entry of

relatively stable and constant flow of changes which can be properly scheduled. Search analysts and programmers will be able to devote their time more fully to providing service to respondents.

Kelly raised a question as to the accountability for use of the tax dollar with regard to CRIS. We have been careful to tell CSRS where and how the money is being used, but in the last year or so we find that the machine has rejected many of our programs that have been sent in on CRIS forms. Regional research has at least adhered to the old Form 30's. It has been difficult to say where the recent small increases in funds will be spent, except through CRIS forms that went in several months ago. Here is a gap that needs to be plugged. Maybe we should go back to the old system parallel with CRIS for a while until it is operationally proficient. Kelly was concerned about using CRIS alone for bookkeeping because of the bugs that are still in the system.

## V. SAES RESEARCH ACCOMPLISHMENTS

### A. Agenda for the Nation

The importance of each State Agricultural Experiment Station selecting the areas of major research accomplishment is illustrated by the following statement by Clark Kerr on New Challenges to the College and the University in the publication by the Brookings Institution, AGENDA FOR THE NATION:

"The first type was for agricultural research (with extension also provided for), employing a formula that gave each land-grant university its proportionate share for clearly defined purposes. This has been more effective for extension work, because of its geographical aspect, than for research. Extension must reach the farmers wherever they are, and they are widely distributed. Research is most effective when concentrated in a few large centers which are themselves parts of distinguished institutions. Most of the important research results in agriculture have, in fact, come from a relatively small number of universities. The formula has been politically effective in getting congressional support from all states; it has been effective in giving service everywhere through extension; it has been less effective in research except for the successes at a few great centers --less money more highly concentrated would have been even more productive in actual results."

Kendrick indicated Kerr's statement is a sign of the times, and we ought to read what he has to say in regard to where we are going, but we ought not be too disturbed about his comments regarding concentration. We should take Kerr's statement as a challenge to us to be sure that we can justify our programs.

### B. SAES Examples of Research Accomplishments

There has been opportunity recently to re-examine research story examples submitted by several Directors of the Western Region. You

will recall that the examples were requested in March 1966, in connection with the preparation of a book that might be a sequel to M. P. 904, but would be specifically oriented to the significant research accomplishments of the stations. The examples submitted and the potential stories that could be developed impressed me as representing major contributions from most of the stations of the Western Region. The examples should provide an excellent beginning point for the development of meaningful stories for a possible book.

In some instances the examples do cover cooperative station-USDA research. These would, of course, be included when they are essential to completing the research story on a particular problem, commodity or area.

Up to the present time no statements have been received from Arizona, New Mexico or Utah. The preliminary review suggests that some States may wish to reconsider their initial submissions. For example, there are instances where only a brief statement on one line of work or a few research accomplishments were sent to us that do not appear to reflect the major longtime contribution of the stations.

To illustrate, Montana submitted a brief statement on grasshopper population dynamics; Oregon sent a brief writeup on the liver fluke; and Washington submitted statements on Gaines Wheat and controlled storage for apples.

A letter will be sent to the Directors of the above stations as a reminder as well as to make suggestions on other areas of research accomplishment.

#### VI. CSRS RESEARCH REVIEW AND EVALUATION PROCEDURES

- A. Need to mutually examine all current review procedures and consider alternative plans with the objective of improved procedures.
- B. Desire SAES involvement in innovation on research evaluation to meet station and CSRS needs.

#### VII. PUBLICATION STATUS OF RESULTS OF RESEARCH FROM W-80

Terminated June 30, 1967. The research was timely and of great interest to consumers, Extension specialists, textile researchers and industry. Industry had made identical washing machines and portions of the same batch of detergent available. The Technical Committee decided (and the Administrative Adviser and CSRS Representative concurred) to publish the results of the regional effort in a technical journal. While this was being prepared by California and Oregon, the other participants prepared a short consumer bulletin to be printed as soon as the technical paper was accepted.

For reasons not fully understood the technical paper has never been completed. The workers at the other stations, as well as industry and the Extension specialists, continue to be much concerned about this.

Have the Western Directors considered having the results published in the consumer bulletin preceding the technical paper?

#### VIII. REPORT OF SIGNIFICANT ITEMS TO WHITE HOUSE

In a memorandum of February 10, 1969, all Agency Heads of the Department of Agriculture were asked to provide, twice a week, items of possible interest to the White House relating to daily business and any problems within the agency officials' sphere of responsibility which the President and his staff should be aware of.

We greatly appreciate the cooperation that we have received from the State Agricultural Experiment Stations in sending information on research as well as other happenings at the SAES, to Dr. Beacher.

In addition to communicating the findings of research, the SAES might consider reporting new problems, adjustments in programs and institutional arrangements related to SAES programs.

-----

Sierk noted RRF and C/9 had a particularly good year under the Chairmanship of R. E. Ely. Particularly noteworthy were: the Conference on Philosophy of Regional Research held in Washington, D. C., in June 1968 that was conceived and called by CSRS with the concurrence of the Chairmen of C/9 and ESCOP; and the recommendation by C/9, and adopted by CSRS, of a format for a regional research project outline.

Sierk - \$2,000,000 are available this current fiscal year for Special Grants, of which \$1,000,000 is for cotton; \$400,000 for soybean research; \$200,000 for human resource development; \$300,000 for problems of the livestock industry; and \$100,000 for plant proteins. These grant monies are available on a competitive basis, and the final decision is made by the Administrator of CSRS. The first Grant letters were sent out last week. \$283,000 of this Fund does go to support research at the colleges of 1890. Here again these projects must fall within these same five categories even though these are not on a competitive basis. Each of these institutions does have a set figure as to the amount of money that they receive, and if their proposal does fall into one of these categories then it is almost automatically accepted as a research grant project for those institutions.

Sierk also commented on the Goal Setting Conference that was held at the National 4-H Center in Washington, February 12-15, 1969. The purpose of the set of meetings was threefold: 1) To have the top management of USDA agencies engaged in science and education activities participate in the setting of goals for the years ahead. These goals relate to program, personnel development, budgetary procedures, relations with industry and the science community, etc.; 2) To stimulate new thinking in the agencies regarding the role of top management in science and education in implementing goals, personnel development, work decision-making, and staff work; 3) To bring the top management of science and education and their spouses

together socially for the first time. The program participants included 36 Federal and 13 University people, and they were divided into 16 work groups. All participants were involved in four of the work groups.

Kraus questioned whether this is an indication of the unilateral goals of USDA.

Knoblauch - It was initially a unilateral action, but as it evolved, it was restructured, after comments were received from Buchanan and other State people, to become a meeting that involved participation of representatives from the States.

Buchanan commented on his communications with Knoblauch and MacClay relative to possible participation of State representatives at the Conference.

As far as the Conference was concerned, Buchanan recommended that WD consider having such a conference to help understand problems and ask the right questions.

Sierk noted the Conference de-emphasized Science and Education in Agriculture, per se, in deference to science and education in its broader aspects and its application to Agriculture.

Regarding the current status of ARPAC, Kraus read a letter from Harold Meyers, dated 2/8/69, that was sent to the four regional chairmen regarding recommendations for regional representatives to serve on ARPAC.

Knoblauch - ARPAC is a replacement for a legally authorized Department Committee. Details as to the legality of the establishment of ARPAC have to be worked out.

Report on  
Position of  
WDAL

WD discussed matters pertaining to the WDAL budget and salary.

*Leyendecker moved, Robins seconded, that the WDAL position be continued, and that the WD Executive Committee's recommendation for a salary increase for Buchanan be approved. PASSED.*

There was also some discussion as to the role of the regional Directors-at-Large in general, particularly with respect to their relationships with USDA.

Report of  
WDAL

Buchanan made reference to the WDAL handout on "New Legislation" dated 12/30/68. The paper suggests that it is possible to undertake research, on problems directed to people who live in cities and the rural-urban fringe, etc., under the Hatch Act, but the framework of the Act doesn't suggest it. Do we want to suggest new legislation

like the Morrill Act or Hatch Act that could send us off in a new direction? There is a wide area voided where there apparently is no authority for funds for work. Buchanan welcomed comments.

Knoblauch advised against proposing any amendments to Hatch lest it be amended out of existence.

Buchanan gave some background information concerning the 40% of the budget of the regional research program that comes from RRF and related matters. The question was discussed at the last meeting of ARPC and after considerable discussion the 40% figure was reaffirmed as an on-going principle.

Buchanan - In the case of ARS recissions, \$6.7 million was cut - \$2.5 for research, and \$4.2 million for regulatory and service activities. For those instances in which cuts were made in any of the States, Dr. Shaw indicated that some form of communication went to SAES Directors concerned to inform them of the impingement of these cuts on their operations.

- In the case of CSRS, we wound up with more Hatch money than we would have, because there is this \$2,000,000 item of Special Grants.

- A usually reliable source indicates all 32 task force reports will be available by April 1, 1969.

- The program of facilities participation by SAES and USDA has gone well up to the point as to what should be done by each.

- The outcome of the total adjustments in regional tables will be substantial changes in LRS projections themselves. The general direction of the adjustments by RPA's and by goals will be in favor of the increase in five areas outlined by the Regional Research Philosophy Committee, and the reductions to permit this came out of the production efficiency, feeding efficiency and related items of the Long Range Study.

- A good question is - How do we decide which RPA's to push in the West and by how much?

Buchanan read excerpts of a letter received from George Browning during this meeting - "We decided it would strengthen our hands in FY '71 budget conferences with CSRS and USDA if we asked our Directors in each region if, in FY '71, we got the 232 SNY or \$11.6 million increase that was requested of the Executive Committee, where would we use it in each state by RPA."

Knoblauch - As to a time table, it was recommended that appropriate materials reflecting what WD feel are their needs should be in the hands of CSRS by June 1, 1969 to allow ample lead time to get the materials into the FY '71 budget.

- You may prefer to update your old October 1967 projections categories so as to take into consideration some of the current topics of interest. This will enable you to more likely be in a position to exercise your influence.

Buchanan suggested Western representatives on the ESCOP Legislative Subcommittee take some position on this. He stated the advantages of limiting allocations to one or a few RPA's.

Wood requested some instructions on this matter from WD.

Buchanan - W. Paul (California) indicated editors in the Region have asked that in the review of manuscript materials, reviews of which have been limited largely to your own institution, a mechanism be set up whereby an editor in one station can send such manuscript materials to another station for review and have the originating station pay for the services of outside station efforts.

- Is there a desire among WD for such a procedure? If so, what is recommendation of WD?

Discussion indicated that it would be possible now to handle such matters informally.

After asking for an indication of interest on the part of WD, Kraus indicated that since no one has shown any great enthusiasm for such a procedure it can be interpreted as meaning the WD are not in favor of a formal procedure.

#### ARPC/ARPAC

Frevert - Secretary Hardin spent some time at the last ARPC meeting. Some of the critical items he mentioned were:

1. The necessity of getting land out of production for long periods of time instead of having an annual take out program and the consequent high expenses to the Department.
2. He emphasized the development of quality for rural living.
3. The need for agriculture to do what it could in order to help the cities' problems in hoping that population

would go into new areas and that we might have new population centers thereby relieving increased population pressures on existing urban centers.

4. He stressed human nutrition.
5. He commented that food distribution possibilities in the Department must be correlated in the future with balanced diets.
6. He stressed the need for expanded exports.
7. He stressed the need to look ahead for about 10 years on needs.

He recognized that many of these positions were those of the former Administration.

- The reorganization of ARS is now underway. They are moving forward to eliminate the dual system of controls in management and research administration. Management reports from field locations will go direct to Beltsville.

- A major job was the review of task force reports - all were approved with due comments.

Buchanan made some favorable comments on SAES projections for SMY's and facilities.

Hervey - The Nominating Committee recommends Frevert continue as WD representative on ARPC's replacement committee to be known as ARPAC for an additional year, thus extending his term to three years - through 1971. (NOTE: In the 1968 elections, Frevert was approved for a two year term on ARPC.)

*Leyendecker moved that nominations cease, and that the recommendation of the Nominating Committee be approved by unanimous vote. Asleson seconded. PASSED.*

#### ESCOPE

Kelly - ESCOP met November 10 and 12, 1968. The purpose and action of the November 12 meeting is indicated in the revision of our WD Minutes for November 1968.

- The Interim Subcommittee of ESCOP was resurrected. It consists of H. A. Keener, Chairman; R. J. Aldrich, G. M. Browning, D. Chambers, J. D. Horsfall, G. B. Wood, and C. F. Kelly.

- There was considerable discussion on USDA grants contracts and cooperative agreements. The committee working on this is Aldrich, Chairman; Browning, and Coyt Wilson.



Kelly read a letter from Aldrich to the members of ESCOP concerning Hatch Funds and overhead charges.

Kelly then read a letter in response from J. A. Zivnuska, noting that CSRS administers funds under two programs (McIntire-Stennis, as well as Hatch), and indicating concern that the truly cooperative nature of the agreement with the Forest Service be recognized.

Kelly expressed concern about prospects for overhead charges on Hatch, RRF, and cooperative agreements with USDA.

Jensen noted that if BOB Circular A88 is invoked, all agencies would get involved, unless there are ways to circumvent it. (Circular A88 says all Federal agencies shall act uniformly on auditing and indirect costs. USDA requested to be excused from the requirements of A88 but the request was denied.) Whether or not overhead would be levied would be an internal matter within each institution.

Kendrick indicated the whole picture of overhead funds will be of interest to Congress as it becomes more apparent that private institutions charge for overhead and it becomes more clear as to what are the costs for doing research. For example, the interpretation of the U. C. Business Office is that when an outside agency funds a contract grant with the University of California they are contracting with U. C. for a specific piece of research, the same as they would with a private institution. They regard that as buying from the University a particular package of research, and in that context it is subject to overhead charges to adjust supporting the ongoing expenses of the institution.

He further expressed the hope that formula-type funds, such as Hatch and McIntire-Stennis, would be excluded from such overhead charges since the philosophy of that kind of funding differs from that of contract grants operations. Kendrick noted, however, that some people would argue that this is not subject to that type of interpretation.

Knoblauch concurred with Kendrick's interpretation. He noted that BOB has listened, with considerable attention, to the argument that under the Hatch and McIntire-Stennis Acts, the freedom of choice is yours as to whether or not you decide to levy overhead charges. Thus, what logic is there in charging yourself overhead for a job that you want to do? The Federal Government is just assisting you with money for the job you elect to do. Policies on such overhead charges vary among institutions.

Buchanan recommended that cooperative agreements not be included in the same wording with Hatch and McIntire-Stennis funds. He noted also that it was not the original

intent of the business managers of the universities that Hatch and McIntire-Stennis funds be encompassed under the provisions of BOB Circular A88.

WD wound up the discussion on this subject with the following motion by Leyendecker, seconded by Wood:

*"That Western Directors affirm the policy that overhead charges are not appropriate on Hatch and McIntire-Stennis Funds."* PASSED.

Kelly - ESCOP also discussed the matter pertaining to research on human subjects. ESCOP assigned two people (including Buchanan) to a committee set up under ARPC to study this problem.

Kelly then read excerpts from the report of this committee, and noted that the three Western representatives to ESCOP voted to approve the report, but did not get together on their response. One voted for approval of the report as it stood, while two approved it with modifications.

Buchanan elaborated on considerations made by the committee and sought to clarify the intent of the wording in the report.

Frevert noted that ARPC considered this report, and also recommended that thought continue to be given to this matter.

Buchanan noted CSRS will follow up with a revision of their letter, SL 24-4.

Asleson - ESCOP spent most of its time on the SAES-USDA Research Relations Task Force Report.

- Keener reported on the difficulty agriculture has in competing for grants within NSF and NIH. His pitch was that we need to get more resources into something outside of agricultural production, and so on.

Buchanan noted in effect, that to date there has been a lot of lip service given to the matter of SAES getting more involved in people-oriented research problems. He asked if we want to go in this direction, and, if so, should we move along the lines of new legislation or attempt to do it under our existing authority.

Kelly noted that opinions on this matter vary among the group, and urged that each WD let him know how they feel so that he can more appropriately represent them.

Wood concurred with Kelly and stressed the need for some kind of a consensus from the group. He later noted the

last part of the Long Range Study is concerned with problems of people.

Knoblauch - In President Nixon's comments at a USDA meeting on February 3, 1969, he pointed out that Secretary Hardin was a member of the Urban Affairs Council, and in his comments he establishes an interrelationship between rural and urban America.

- You have recognized the problem in your October '67 projections, but the basic question is authority for funding work on the problem, specifically insofar as Hatch Funds are concerned.

Sierk - Research problems can be classified in various ways. Much of the criticism is on production efficiency research - that too much money is being put into this area. Who else is concerned with food production efficiency? There are many agencies with the concern and responsibility for social science research.

Kraus - There appears to be a real conflict between the majority of the people we serve and what we do in comparison with what our goals say we ought to do.

Sierk - The basic thing we are struggling with is support for your SAES...There is a difference in the needs and responsibilities of SAES as compared with those of USDA as a whole.

Day raised the question that if we divert more of our resources to urban affairs, will we get sufficient compensating support and recognition from the urban population to offset the support we will lose from our rural agricultural oriented supporters. ... He noted we are naturally attracted to those people who will respond to us.

Recognizing that situations vary among states, Robins commented in response that rural Washington did not carry recommendations in recent bond issues affecting the WSU program. The three metropolitan counties carried these issues. We must be careful as to how we relate support to what we are doing.

Kraus noted that in order to move in this direction, it may almost have to be a directive to our staff. If such directives are issued and our staffs are not too willing to do the work, the results may not be too desirable.

Wood commented on efforts in Oregon to identify missions by RPA and prospects for the reallocation of funds. He noted that of the six people on the State Ways and Means Subcommittee on Appropriations, there are no agricultural

people. The current issue of the Oregon SAES quarterly is devoted to the work the SAES is doing specifically that relates to the welfare of the people of Oregon.

Asleson recognized there are state problems and national problems.

Kraus suggested we should approach state problems as they relate to national goals.

Buchanan - If existing legislative authority is not adequate we may want to give further consideration to prospects for the need for supplemental legislation.

Kraus noted there had been a recommendation that we set up a forward planning committee. He asked if the WD wanted such a committee, and recommended that if so, then the study of this matter could be assigned to the forward planning committee.

Forward  
Planning  
Committee

*"Price moved, Frevert seconded, and WD unanimously concurred in the establishment of a standing Forward Planning Committee (FPC) to consider policy matters. The FPC would be comprised of the following people:*

<u>Composition of FPC</u>	<u>FPC Members 1969</u>
FPC Chairman - Outgoing Chairman of WD	- Hervey
FPC Executive Secretary - WDAL	- Buchanan
FPC Members - WD Representatives on ESCOP Legislative Subcommittee	- (Ensign &) Wood
FPC Member - Outgoing Senior WD Representative on ESCOP	- Ensign
FPC Member - Outgoing Senior WD Representative on Committee of Nine	- Ely
FPC Ex-officio Member - A designated CSRS Representative	- Sierk

*"The committee members will rotate annually as individuals in these positions change. The term of office will be on a calendar year basis."*

ESCOP Legislative  
Subcommittee

Wood - The Legislative Subcommittee met a couple of weeks ago with the Executive Committee of NASU&LGC to present the FY '71 legislative budget. Some budget materials presented include:

<u>Item</u>	<u>Hatch (000)</u>	<u>Facilities (000)</u>
Funds available FY '69	52,945	000
Executive budget FY '70	55,189	2,000
Requested & approved FY '70	75,099	24,000
Requested & approved FY '71	70,473	24,000

Ad Hoc Committee  
on Regional  
Research  
Philosophy

Zivnуска - ASCUFRO is asking for \$7,285,000 in FY '71 compared with \$3,785,000 in FY '70.

Hervey read the report of the committee - see APPENDIX A. With respect to Paragraph II of the report, some figures prepared by Ely indicated that for each regional research dollar there goes with it about another \$1.50 from non-RRF.

In the Western Region, RRF makes up about 40 percent of the total of more than \$6 million for the 62 projects in the regional research program. If the region were to aim for an arbitrary goal of about 30 regional research projects, the program would end up with about half the number of projects, thus doubling the available funds per project.

Sierk noted that in the other regions, the approximate number of regional research projects are: 40 each in the South and North Central, and 48 in the Northeast. Hervey noted the North Central Region is making a concerted effort to reduce the number of their projects.

Regarding Paragraph III, Kelly raised a question as to whether there would be one project per task force group. Hervey indicated this was not necessarily so, but he also noted there are 32 task forces and these could possibly be consolidated down to about 24 as far as the West is concerned.

Hill questioned the degree of satisfaction with the task forces. Hervey indicated the committee is not endorsing the task force reports as they stand but is suggesting that they may be a good source material.

Buchanan commented the task force reports are useful with respect to perspectives, and as benchmarks, but they may not be particularly useful as to assignment of manpower resources or dollars. As to major goals, these task force reports are national in scope, and what we have to do is extract from them that which is adaptable to the Western Region and build on this for our purposes.

Hervey indicated that if Paragraph V is followed, it would in effect put each SAES in a position of declaring their hands in areas for which they have particular interests.

Hervey - Paragraph VI simply suggests that somewhere fairly early in the process we try to assess the magnitude of the research job.

- We would want to consider the possibility for involvement of the "right" Federal people on the regional task forces.

In response to Frevert's question as to the status of our current advisory committees, Hervey indicated that if this plan was to be adopted, you would in effect probably expect a disbandment maybe or replacement of them. WAERC, however, because of its special historical background in relation to the Western Directors is a little different and it perhaps could continue in existence, but its relationship to the WD might change if we have a task force. We could, however, draw some of our task force people from WAERC or from some of the other advisory committees. At any rate, it is apparently assumed that if we go this route, we would probably just replace most of our advisory committees. As to whether or not these would be continuing task forces, Hervey noted that when the committee first started talking about the task forces, it seemed that we were talking about ad hoc groups. As we talked more about our plans, however, there appeared to be a need to keep the groups together a little while longer than to just file its initial report. This may be something we will want to think about as we go along.

Hervey - The concept of Paragraph VIII is that we would in effect be starting over in our regional research program; that we would identify this whole thing as a package area, and pull out what appeared to be time sequenced regional research programs; and that we would ask RRC to recommend a time-table for implementation. This whole thing would be put in the hands of RRC to facilitate the operational transition problem of phasing out and phasing in regional research projects.

- Paragraph IX gets back to our current procedure. The time-table is desirable because you would have the proposed commitment of interest expressed before any technical committee is established. Then, once the technical committee is called to meet, they would in effect have been told the extent of state participation and anticipated level of funding that is being considered, and what the Directors want them to do.

- RRC will make some recommendations for implementation of projects effective 7/1/69, but the moratorium would apply thereafter. RRC, in effect, would not receive any new project proposals until this procedure is implemented. This would give RRC some time this summer to do the job requested of them in this proposed report.

Hervey also distributed, for discussion purposes, an additional paragraph that might serve as a tentative guideline that may be a natural outcome of this report. This paragraph read as follows:

"In recognition of the possible need for coordinating non-RRF research in the region, it is proposed that a new category of technical committees be authorized, to be known as Western Coordinating Committees (WC). A WC committee would be authorized only upon written recommendation and justification presented to and accepted by the Western Directors. The justification must include (1) the nature of the research to be coordinated; and (2) the need for coordination. Upon authorization of a WC committee an administrative adviser would be designated. The committee would meet normally once a year upon call by the administrative adviser. RRF may be used for travel and subsistence of the designated Station representative attending the meeting."

*This last paragraph, however, was not a concrete recommendation of the committee, nor was it adopted by the Western Directors.*

Hervey noted that if we were to evolve a program goal of 30 regional research projects, we would not likely want to exceed a total of 30 WC committees. In our guidelines, we would also want to decide on how long a life would we want to give to any such WCC.

Sierk noted the NCR committees are not set up on a continuing basis.

The committee size of eight is not a sacred figure. It was thought that there would probably be five or six state people and perhaps a couple of Federal people on each committee.

*Frevert moved, M. Wilson seconded, that we thank the ad hoc Regional Research Philosophy Committee for their carefully thought-out report, that the committee be continued to give guidance to their efforts, and that we Western Directors accept in principle and proceed methodically to implement the program in this general direction as recommended by this committee. PASSED, with one dissent (Robins).*

Discussion of this motion brought out the following:

Kelly commented that one of the main reasons for having regional research projects is to give the scientists an opportunity to meet to discuss matters and exchange ideas with one another. He suggested that we might consider putting our WDAL in a better position so that he could have some RRF to use in conducting symposia and such things. This might possibly be in addition to the meetings now available to the technical committees.

Hervey noted the committee considered the matter of sponsoring symposia and concluded that WD have this authority

at any time. Whenever there is a need to bring a group together for some workshop or symposium, any Director can bring such a request to this group and get some action on it.

Re: the paragraph on moratorium, Linsley interpreted it as meaning RRC would consider no proposals of any kind for activation as of 7/1/70 except such proposals that might come through the new procedure in the task force areas recommended by the committee. RRC actions at this meeting would be limited to a review of new and revised projects that were before us in project outline form.

Kendrick - You can stimulate proposals by placing before scientists an umbrella problem to be covered by an interdisciplinary approach, rather than sitting around waiting for proposals to come from the grass roots. WC projects would have a big multiplier effect as far as regional effort is concerned, since they would enable already funded projects to get together. Criteria for WC projects under the regional research aegis would have to be determined. There is no reason for us not to identify some critical problem areas facing agriculture, even though we know they won't be easy to solve.

Questions were raised regarding related problems involved in conducting regional research on forestry without involving forestry schools that are outside SAES.

Sierk reminded WD there is a regional project, W-106, that says RRF can be used for planning and coordination type meetings. C/9 will be facing the question as to how much of these funds can be used for travel expenses only. CSRS would look with favor on the use of such funds on projects approved by WD or other regional SAES Director groups for regional or interregional travel. RRF funds can be shifted from projects toward travel.

Rasmussen noted we need to establish some limits as to how much of our total RRF we wish to put into travel and what we are going to approve as non-RRF projects for which we will permit coordination and travel.

Hill noted the lack of alternative suggestions to help resolve a problem we all recognize. He suggested as an alternative, that we might take the 62 committees we have and select out 30W and 30WC committees, or even delete some if that was what we wanted. W-1, for example, is one project that we might want to give serious consideration as to whether or not we want to keep.

*Hervey suggested that one of the task forces be on a commodity, and recommended that beef cattle be added as a sixth task force to be implemented immediately. Western Directors concurred.*



Linsley noted that from the standpoint of RRC it was critical whether the motion to approve the committee report included approval of Paragraph X pertaining to the moratorium.

*Robins moved to recommend that WD approve an amendment to Frevert's motion to the effect that Paragraph X (on the moratorium) be deleted from the motion. Hilston seconded. This amendment was defeated - 3 for and 9 against.*

Hervey noted the subcommittee on Western Coordinating Committees should continue its consideration of criteria for WC projects (NOTE: The Subcommittee on WCC consists of: Rasmussen, Chairman; Ely, and Kendrick.)

Linsley, regarding FY '70 terminations, proposed that the subcommittee considering criteria for WCC projects come up with some tentative recommendation that might be applied at the coming July meeting, and circulate this among the WD before the July meeting if possible. The WD could respond by mail as to whether they want to move in this direction, and as to whether they approve of the tentative recommendations of this Subcommittee on WC Committees. Then the recommendations, if approved, could be applied to some of the FY '70 terminations where an Administrative Adviser feels that the importance of this area of work should be coordinated and not abruptly terminated automatically in FY '70. This would allow RRC a basis to review formal proposals from the AA under the criteria that would be set tentatively by the Subcommittee on WCC. This would add one more cushion and possible solution to some of the arbitrariness of the cutting off of the projects due to terminate in FY '70.

These criteria would be tentative ones that RRC could use in July solely for projects that were due to terminate in FY '70 where the AA wanted to propose this WCC system. This would allow at the July meeting for a discussion about such criteria that might be applied on a more permanent basis, assuming that we are going to move in this direction.

What would be required is that the letter that would go out from the Subcommittee on WCC would have to ask the questions:

1. Do you favor establishment of a WC series of committees?
2. Do you favor application of the following temporary criteria for the evaluation of any requests that might come from AA of projects that are automatically terminating in FY '70 for consideration for the WC series?

The whole question of whether these tentative criteria are the ones we want on a permanent basis can be decided at the July meeting.

*WD concurred that this charge be given to the WC Subcommittee as proposed by Linsley.*

Hervey requested "volunteers" to serve as Administrative Advisers for the six tentative task forces recommended by Western Directors. The "volunteers" were:

<u>Task Force</u>	<u>Administrative Adviser</u>
Food and Nutrition	P. J. Leyendecker
Pollution	J. A. Robins
Water and Watersheds	K. W. Hill
Market Structure, Foreign Aid and Market Development (Wood volunteered to assist Wilson)	C. P. Wilson
Forestry	J. A. Zivnuska
Beef Cattle	M. J. Burris

Kraus was concerned about how to work with Forestry Schools in regional research efforts where SAES is not involved with McIntire-Stennis money. How can you avoid involving some of these people if you expect to look at some of the major problems in forestry?

Hervey noted that McIntire-Stennis money can't be mixed with Hatch Funds and thus is not involved in forestry regional research projects. Therefore, this group need not be concerned with McIntire-Stennis as such.

Day suggested a particular responsibility of this Forestry Task Force Group should be to see how coordination with McIntire-Stennis money can be accomplished.

It was noted that this was a problem to be worked out with the Director at each Station to see what could be done.

Knoblauch, in response to a question from Kelly, indicated RRF that might be available for travel could be used to cover expenses of a representative to one of the task forces who may come from a small school that may not have funds to cover such expenses.

Hervey, as Chairman of the Regional Research Philosophy and Forward Planning Committees called for a joint meeting of these committees along with a "select" committee consisting of those six "volunteers" who agreed to serve as Administrative Advisers to the tentative task forces. The purposes of such a meeting will be to: Select task force committees, formulate guidelines for these task forces, as

well as formulating some criteria for the proposed Western Coordinating Committees (WCC), and consider matters relating to SMY projections. The consensus of Western Directors was that such a meeting be held in Berkeley, California, March 13-14, 1969. \*/

Chairman Kraus instructed that these task forces come up with something for RRC to consider by July 1, 1969.

Committee of  
Nine

Leyendecker called WD attention to the C/9 Minutes, and noted the change in representatives from the West on the Committee of Nine.

Leyendecker noted the action of WD regarding regional research philosophy will be of interest to C/9. The next C/9 meeting will be in Washington, D. C., April 21, 1969.

WAERC

C. P. Wilson - WAERC has scheduled its next meeting for July 17 and 18, 1969, and will meet in joint session with its three new standing committees in Corvallis, Oregon the afternoon of July 18. The committees will meet separately on the 19th. The agenda for the joint meetings will focus on the functions and subject matter responsibilities of the committees.

- Dr. John W. Malone, Nevada, is a member of both WAERC and WSRAC, and he will serve as liaison between the two groups. WAERC does not want to be written out of this area of work because they feel that this should be multidisciplinary including both the economists and the social science group.

- ERS has been a part of WAERC from the beginning. Representation on the Council has been at the Division level. Louis Upchurch attended the meeting, and indicated that hereafter, representation on WAERC will be from the ERS Administrator's Office. Representation on the Council's committees will be at the ERS Division level.

- There was some discussion about the reluctance of some good research scientists to take on regional research projects because of the red tape involved. The problem permeates the whole system. (Wilson illustrated this point diagrammatically by showing the imposed superstructure between the WAERC Committees and the Secretary of Agriculture.)

Hervey - This problem will be considered by the Regional Research Philosophy Committee.

---

\*/ NOTE: Minutes of the March 13-14, 1969 meeting accompany these Minutes.

With regard to one of the Council Committees - Community and Human Resource Development - there was some discussion among the Directors about the relatively low priority heretofore that apparently has been given to communications with our Extension people.

#### WSWRC

Frevert - Generally speaking, WSWRC is still trying to feel its way toward an effective organization, as regards to its former method of meeting along with its large group of related technical committees. Its meetings now consist of representatives who are administratively responsible for work in soils and agricultural engineering in general.

*Frevert moved, Wood seconded, that the Western Directors approve the request for an annual meeting of the Phosphorous Work Group to be held at Riverside, California the third or fourth week of March 1970. PASSED. This meeting will be paid for by funds from the phosphate industry. Western Directors have already approved a meeting of this group at Bozeman, Montana during the third week of March 1969.)*

*Frevert moved, Asleson seconded, that the Western Directors approve the request for the Work Group on Soil Fertility and Diagnostic Techniques to meet during the annual meeting of the Western Society of Soil Science at Pullman, Washington in August 1969. PASSED. (The members, or alternates, are expected to be attending the soils meetings, and the work group meetings can be held at this time and place with no additional funds requested.)*

Frevert suggested that WD take no action on the WSWRC request for a meeting of a newly-formed work group to study the Role of Soil and Water in the Disposal of Agricultural, Industrial and Municipal Wastes as Applied to the Western Region; and that Robins take into consideration the recommendations of WSWRC in the activities of the task force on pollution. Frevert will furnish Robins a copy of the agenda proposed for the requested meeting.

#### WHERAC

Leyendecker suggested WHERAC should have a part in the development of the task force on Food and Nutrition. WHERAC will meet March 5-6, 1969.

#### WSRAC

Wood - WSRAC, which is a group financed by the Farm Foundation, met in Bozeman, Montana October 24-25, 1968. Two major things emerged:

1. Took steps to establish liaison with WAERC via Dr. John Malone. This should be very helpful as WSRAC carries on its work of trying to evaluate the impact of technology on rural-urban problem situations, particularly the social problems that emerge.

2. Identified some critical emerging problems that are arising from the impact of technology on rural-urban living and all of the social relationships involved. This group has appointed a special task force committee which is scheduled to meet at University of California, Davis Campus, March 14, 1969. This task force is to draft a statement on the emerging problems and to identify some research priorities, and then to indicate some possible ways by which these priorities might be implemented.

- Following the development of this task force report, WSRAC would like WD to make about 1½ hours available at its summer meeting to enable this small committee (of possibly three people) to discuss with WD what some of these emerging problem areas are that have been identified by WSRAC. They will also indicate what ought to be done by us, as the Western Region, about some of these emerging problems, how we can tool up to undertake them, and what some of the costs are that may be involved. Joe Ackerman, and the other members of this committee would like about one-half to three-fourths of an hour to present some areas that have research possibilities, and then allow the remainder of the time for discussion.

Western Directors agreed to have the WSRAC representatives on the program agenda for the summer meeting. Details of the program will be worked out with Wood.

Hill - Indications, at a national meeting called by the Rural Sociological Society last year, were that rural sociologists did not see themselves as being outside the SAES. They appear to want to be under the umbrella of the SAES.

Buchanan - Dr. Paul D. DeLay, Director of the Animal Disease and Parasite Research Division of ARS expressed a desire to meet with WD to consider some combination of research interests with respect to USDA and SAES programs.

Rasmussen suggested it might be well to invite Dr. DeLay to come to the summer meetings.

Jensen indicated his comments may well have a strong input into some of the task force efforts.

Kraus noted we used to have a system where we invited various USDA Administrators of ARS and ERS to our summer meeting where we visited with them.

*Frevert moved, Jensen seconded, that we invite Dr. Paul D. DeLay and representatives of a subcommittee of WSRAC to appear on the Western Directors' summer program. PASSED.*

Kraus will contact Dr. DeLay.

RRC Report

REPORT OF THE WESTERN REGIONAL RESEARCH COMMITTEE  
to  
WESTERN DIRECTORS

Kauai Resort Hotel, Kauai, Hawaii  
February 16-18, 1969

Chairman E. G. Linsley called the RRC meeting to order at 1:35 p.m. on February 16, 1969. Those in attendance during all or part of the meeting were:

E. G. Linsley, Chairman  
L. C. Ayres  
M. J. Burris  
M. L. Wilson  
C. F. Sierk, CSRS  
M. T. Buchanan, WDAL  
L. R. Gray, Recording Secretary

I. PERSONNEL ASSIGNMENTS (as of 2/21/69)

Alexander	W-97, WM-33, WM-47, and WM-55
Asleson	W-48, W-68, W-85, and W-87
Ayres	W-56, W-83, and WM-59
Burris	W-78, WM-48, and Task Force on Beef Cattle
Clark	W-103
Day	W-52, W-77, and Ad Hoc, "Response of Plants to Herbicides"
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-38, W-81, W-89, W-90, and Ad Hoc Water Quality
Hill	W-45, W-67, W-86, WM-53, IR-4, and Task Force on Water and Watersheds
Hilston	W-57, W-91, W-94, and W-95
Jensen	W-102
Kelly	W-50, W-99, and WM-51

Kraus	W-64, W-106, IR-1, and IR-2
Leyendecker	W-79, WHERAC, Task Force on Food and Nutrition, and Ad Hoc Rangeland Management
Linsley	W-84, W-92, and Ad Hoc Codling Moth
Meyer	W-1
Pritchard	W-88, and W-100
Rasmussen	W-104, and WM-56
Robins	Task Force on Pollution, and Ad Hoc Salinity Control
Thorne	W-66, and W-82
Wilson (C.P.)	W-54, WAERC, Ad Hoc Factor Markets, and Task Force on Marketing
Wilson (M.L.)	W-6, and WM-54
Wood	WM-35, WM-52, WM-58, W-105, and WSRAC
Zivnуска	W-71, WM-60, and Task Force on Forestry

## II. GENERAL COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

- A. RRC, at its meetings of February 16 and 17, 1969, in addition to other business, reviewed 17 outlines for new or revised projects which had previously received tentative approval from the Western Directors as appropriate areas of work and authorization to develop formal outlines. Although, in general, these had met the review schedule prescribed by Western Directors in their policy statement of July 1967, more than half were received too late for study by RRC members prior to the Committee meeting. This fact greatly increased the workload at the meeting in terms of meeting the requirements of adequate review and the development of meaningful recommendations to the Western Directors. RRC urges that all project outlines be in the hands of the Committee at least 30 days ahead of the meeting at which they are to be considered.
- B. Many of the outlines considered had not been prepared in the format adopted by the Committee of Nine and CSRS which became effective July 1, 1968, and of those that complied, very few, in the judgment of RRC, appeared to meet the specifications

of the format outline. RRC attributes this to certain ambiguities in the specifications and the fact that, as yet, Administrative Advisers have had no experience with Committee of Nine response to proposals submitted in the new format which could serve as a basis for judging conformity of ad hoc and technical committee proposals. Based upon RRC's interpretation of the intent of the new outline format, and in the absence of specific interpretations from the Committee of Nine, technical committees preparing revisions almost uniformly treated item (8) of the outline format, which calls for a brief review of previous research on the problem, as synonymous with, or covered by, the required attachment entitled "Critical Review." RRC assumes that item (8) is intended to provide a broad statement which puts the new or revised project in proper historical research perspective, documented by appropriate literature citations, which, in the case of revisions, will likely include some reference to work accomplished by the Technical Committee of the antecedent project or projects but will rarely be limited to these. On the other hand, the critical review required of revised projects, should be limited to a summary of work and accomplishments of the original project, including a list of the principal publications. RRC's recommendations to the Western Directors reflect this interpretation. However, in order to minimize the effort required of Administrative Advisers or Technical Committee personnel in modifying project outlines to conform to those RRC recommendations that receive approval of the Western Directors, and to facilitate meeting the deadline for April 1969 Committee of Nine review, RRC suggests that, where appropriate, recommendations for modification might be met by addenda pages attached to the outline. If this procedure is followed, as an alternative to rewriting the outline, a copy of each addendum page should be sent by the Administrative Adviser to the Chairman of RRC for attachment to the project outline, which will then be forwarded as a single document to the Chairman of the Western Directors for signature and transmittal to CSRS for Committee of Nine review. Additional copies of addenda pages, properly identified, should be sent to all recipients of copies of the outline. The same procedure should be followed with substitute pages and rewritten outlines.

- C. As a result of the adoption by Western Directors of Part I of the Report of the ad hoc Committee



on Regional Research Philosophy, RRC has reviewed its charge in relation to the implementation of the trial program recommended for the remainder of fiscal 1968-69. RRC believes that the timetable for review of task force reports, the recommendation of high priority research programs, the establishment of ad hoc regional project committees, and review of project outlines can be met if (1) the trial task force areas are selected by Western Directors during the present meeting; (2) the states to assume leadership in these areas are agreed upon; (3) Administrative Advisers are designated by these states; (4) each Administrative Adviser agrees to meet with the appropriate task force during its deliberations; (5) the task force reports are in the hands of RRC members by July 1, 1969; and (6) that project outlines in the priority areas recommended by RRC and approved by the Western Directors are submitted to RRC two weeks in advance of the 1970 spring meeting for the normal regional and Committee of Nine reviews necessary to permit activation of approved projects on July 1, 1970.

- D. Sixteen Western Regional Projects were scheduled for review for termination July 1, 1969, of which Western Directors had authorized 8 for outline development for possible revision. Of these 16 projects, RRC is recommending termination of eight. One project scheduled for termination in 1970 has also been reviewed and recommended for termination. Five new project outlines previously authorized have been considered, of which two are recommended for approval and activation on July 1, 1969. If RRC recommendations are endorsed by Western Directors, the net result will be the addition of only one regional project to the present total, in spite of the heavy prior commitments in terms of authorized project outlines submitted for review.

### III. SPECIAL REVIEW

#### W-1, "The Improvement of Beef Cattle through the Application of Breeding Methods."

In July 1968, Western Directors requested a review of W-1, and in November 1968 clarified their intent as follows: "The Western Directors request that the W-1 project be revised or terminated as of June 30, 1970. If the W-1 Committee feels that termination is not desirable, they shall prepare, for the Western Directors' spring meeting, a

summary of ten years' accomplishments with special reference to the attainment of current objectives and a syllabus containing justification and objectives of a proposed project revision. The Western Directors will consider this syllabus at their Spring 1969 meeting and ask for either a June 30, 1970 termination of W-1 or instruct the W-1 Technical Committee to prepare a revised project outline for further consideration by the Western Directors at their Spring 1970 meeting."

The W-1 Committee responded with a critical review, an impressive list of publications which have emanated from the project, and the designation of seven areas of work which were regarded as needing further investigation and were interpreted by RRC as the emphasis which would be given if authorization were given to W-1 to develop a revised outline. The Administrative Adviser, J. H. Meyer, recommended that W-1 be replaced by two projects, one an extension of the traditional program, the other a "bold, imaginative" departure from past programs.

RRC, with full recognition of the past productivity of the project and the future potential of the present program, careful consideration of the recommendations of the Technical Committee, and without excluding the possibility of a new project with a different emphasis, recommends (a) that the Technical Committee of W-1 be complimented on the fine record of accomplishment documented in their comprehensive review; (b) that the Committee be assured of support of the cooperative Arizona program through June 1970; (c) that the Committee be urged to complete the four regional publications now in preparation; and (d) that W-1 be terminated June 30, 1970.

*Linsley moved, Leyendecker seconded, that WD approve the above recommendations. PASSED.*

(RRC took into consideration the possibility that the position of ARS coordinator may be deleted.)

#### IV. PROPOSALS FOR REVISED PROJECTS

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

RRC considered the excellent comprehensive review and revised project outline submitted by W-6 and recommends that the revised outline for W-6 be

approved for the period July 1, 1969 through June 30, 1974 with the expectation of continuance thereafter. Administrative Adviser: M. L. Wilson.

*Linsley moved, Hill seconded, approval of the above recommendation. PASSED.*

B. W-46, "Improving Productivity of Livestock Under Environmental Stresses."

RRC commends the Technical Committee for a particularly clear and straightforward critical review and recommends approval of the revised W-46 outline for activation July 1, 1969, subject to the rewriting of the procedural section to indicate state inputs, rather than treating these separately state by state (pp. 1-3), and the presentation of resource data (p. 13) in terms of SMY's. Administrative Adviser: R. E. Ely.

*Linsley moved, Asleson seconded, approval of the above recommendation. PASSED.*

C. W-51, "Dynamics of Flow into Drainage Facilities."

RRC recommends approval of the revised W-51 outline for activation July 1, 1969, subject to the presentation of the material now included in item (8) (p. 6) as a critical review and the preparation of of a new item (8) which puts the work proposed in a broader historical perspective. Administrative Adviser: R. K. Frevert.

*Linsley moved, Wood seconded, approval of the above recommendations. PASSED.*

D. W-64, "Characterization, Ecology, and Control of Fruit Tree Viruses and Virus Diseases."

RRC recommends approval of the revised outline for W-64 for activation July 1, 1969, subject to the rewriting of item (8) (p. 4) to place the project in broader historical context and the appending of a table of state inputs in terms of SMY's. Administrative Adviser: J. E. Kraus.

*Linsley moved, Frevert seconded, approval of the above recommendations. PASSED.*

E. W-67, "Water-Soil-Plant Relations."

RRC recommends approval of the revised outline for W-67 for activation July 1, 1969, subject to the

inclusion of a separate item (8) placing the program in historical context. Administrative Adviser: K. W. Hill.

*Linsley moved, Leyendecker seconded, approval of the above recommendation. PASSED.*

F. W-68, "Measurement, Prediction and Control of Soil Water Movement."

No request for revision of this project was received and RRC recommends that it be terminated as of June 30, 1969. Administrative Adviser: J. A. Asleson.

*Linsley moved that WD approve this RRC recommendation. The motion was not seconded and after some discussion Linsley suggested that Asleson propose a substitute motion. Asleson moved, Frevert seconded that RRC and WD make W-68 an exception to the moratorium, voted yesterday by WD, on revised project outlines to be considered for activation that are not now in the hands of RRC, and that RRC be authorized to review this revised outline for W-68 by mail and, if found acceptable, to refer it to the Chairman of WD for his signature, and transmittal to CSRS and the Committee of Nine without reference back to WD. PASSED.*

G. W-82, "Pesticide Mobility and Degradation in Soil-Water Systems."

RRC commends the W-82 Technical Committee for an excellent revised project outline and more descriptive title and recommends approval of the revision of W-82 for activation July 1, 1969. Administrative Adviser: D. W. Thorne.

*Linsley moved, Wood seconded, approval of the above recommendation. PASSED.*

H. W-83, "The Nature and Inheritance of Fusarium Rot Resistance in Beans."

RRC recommends approval of the revision of W-83 for activation July 1, 1969, through June 30, 1972, subject to a rewritten section on "Procedure" which integrates more adequately inputs of the various states and a modified section (8) with bibliographical citations. Administrative Adviser: L. C. Ayres.

*Linsley moved, Ely seconded, approval of the above recommendations. PASSED.*

- I. W-84, "Environmental Improvement Through Biological Control and Pest Management."

RRC commends the Technical Committee on a well prepared concise revised project outline and critical review and recommends approval of the revised project for activation July 1, 1969, subject to the rewriting of item (8) to place the program in a broader historical perspective. Administrative Adviser: E. G. Linsley.

*Linsley moved, Hill seconded, approval of the above recommendation. PASSED.*

- J. W-91, "Species Differences in Lipid Metabolism of Man and Certain Laboratory Animals."

RRC recommends this title be changed to: "Nutritional Variations in Lipid Metabolism: Man and Certain Laboratory Animals."

*Linsley moved, Wood seconded, that WD approve this recommendation for a title change. PASSED.*

V. PROPOSALS FOR NEW PROJECTS

- A. W- , "Response of Plants and Plant Communities to Sustained Exposure to Herbicides."

RRC reviewed a new project outline presented under the title "Environmental Pollution by Herbicides: Effects on Plants and Their Communities." RRC found the title inconsistent with the objectives and recommends approval of the project under the alternative title suggested, for activation July 1, 1969, provided that the outline be reorganized and rewritten to conform to the presently specified format. Administrative Adviser: B. E. Day.

*Linsley moved, Hill seconded, that WD approve the above recommendation. PASSED.*

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

RRC considered an outline of a project under this title submitted by the ad hoc committee authorized to develop a project in this subject area. RRC regards the stated objectives too broad for attainment in a reasonable period of time and that the interdisciplinary aspects of the problem are not adequately reflected in the make-up of the proposed Technical Committee. RRC recommends that the proposal as reflected in the outline be disapproved.

Administrative Adviser: D. F. Hervey.

*Linsley moved, Hervey seconded, that WD approve the above recommendation. PASSED.*

- C. W- , "Management of Salt Load in Irrigated Agriculture."

In the absence of an affirmative recommendation from WSWRC, RRC recommends that Western Directors take no action at this time on the outline submitted for consideration at this meeting. Administrative Adviser: J. A. Robins.

*Linsley moved, Leyendecker seconded, that WD approve the above recommendation. The Directors did not move on this motion.*

*Further discussion suggested that these last two projects might be brought together as an interdisciplinary problem.*

*Robins then made a substitute motion, seconded by C. P. Wilson, that this ad hoc committee be authorized to submit a revised proposal to RRC for review and subsequent submission to the Committee of Nine in time for its meeting in April 1969. PASSED.*

- D. W- , "Codling Moth Population Management in the Orchard Ecosystem."

RRC recommends approval of this new project effective July 1, 1969, subject to the appending of the summary of SMY's which have been received from Directors of participating states subsequent to the preparation of the outline. Administrative Adviser: E. G. Linsley.

*Linsley moved, Asleson seconded, that WD approve the above recommendation. PASSED.*

- E. W- , "The Economic Impact of Adjustments in Rangeland Management Upon Local and Regional Economics."

RRC considered the project outline for this proposed new project and recommends that it be referred to WAERC for critical review before receiving further consideration by the Western Directors. Administrative Adviser: P. J. Leyendecker.

*Linsley moved, Wood seconded, that WD adopt this recommendation. The motion PASSED with one dissent (Leyendecker). (11 Yes; 1 No.)*

F. WM- , "Agricultural Factor Market Structures and Buyer-Seller Procurement Strategies."

RRC has reviewed the outline of this new project and recommends approval for activation July 1, 1969. Administrative Adviser: C. P. Wilson.

*Linsley moved, Wood seconded, that WD approve the above recommendation. PASSED.*

VI. REQUESTS FOR EXTENSION

A. W-66, "The Formation and Properties of Soil Crusts."

The W-66 Administrative Adviser (D. W. Thorne) sent memoranda to Western Directors dated 1/9/69 and 2/10/69. For some reason, the memoranda were not received by the Chairman of RRC nor by the Recording Secretary prior to the spring meeting in Hawaii; therefore, RRC did not consider them. The memoranda requested approval of W-66 for a one-year extension - to 6/30/70 - in order to complete a regional research publication summarizing the work of the last five years.

After the spring meetings, Linsley sent a ballot by mail to the Western Directors, indicating that RRC subsequently considered the matter and recommended that Western Directors approve the request for a one-year extension of W-66, from 7/1/69 to 6/30/70.

The Western Directors' endorsement of this recommendation was received by mail and forwarded, to J. E. Kraus and C. F. Sierk, for consideration by the Committee of Nine.

B. WM-55, "Consumer Use of Western Fruits and Vegetables: Improving Physical and Chemical Methods for Improving Texture."

The Administrative Adviser submitted a request for approval of a three-year extension of this project. RRC, however, found there was some ambiguity regarding the duration status of WM-55. In order to eliminate this ambiguity, RRC recommends that the Western Directors affirm that the scheduled termination date of WM-55 is June 30, 1971, which will complete the normal five-year period. (NOTE: This recommendation was made in lieu of action on a recommendation regarding the request for a three-year extension.) Administrative Adviser: R. M. Alexander.

*Linsley moved, Robins seconded, that Western Directors accept this affirmation. PASSED.*

- C. IR-1, "Introduction, Preservation, Classification, Distribution, and Preliminary Evaluation of Wild and Cultivated Species of Solanum;" and

IR-2, "Obtaining and Preserving Virus-free Deciduous Tree Fruit Clones."

*Kraus stepped down as WD Chairman and moved that both IR-1 and IR-2 be approved by Western Directors for continuation next year. Leyendecker seconded the motion and it was PASSED.*

VII. SCHEDULED TERMINATIONS ON 6/30/70

Based upon action taken by the Western Directors earlier in this meeting, the following projects will automatically terminate on June 30, 1970:

W-50, "Atmospheric Stresses on the Performance of Chickens."

W-71, "The Effect on Ponderosa Pine Seedling Establishment of Genetical and Environmental Factors Through Their Influence on Root and Top Development."

W-85, "Factors Affecting Nitrogen Availability in Western Soils."

W-86, "A Physiological and Morphological Study of Rest and Hardiness in Fruit Trees."

W-87, "Identification and Characterization of Clay Mineral Species in Soils of the Western Region."

W-88, "Enteric Diseases of Neonatal Calves."

W-98, "The Relationship of Clothing to the Personal and Social Acceptability of Adolescents."

W-103, "Performance of Permanent Press Garments in the Western Region."

WM-47, "Locational and Product Competition Among Selected Horticultural Food Crops."

WM-48, "Livestock Marketing Efficiency and Pricing in the West."

WM-51, "Economic Factors in Sugar Marketing."

WM-52, "Maintaining Marketability of Stored Grain and Cereal Products Through Insect Control by Methods Leaving No, or a Minimum of, Pesticide Residues."



WM-53, "Advertising and Pricing Practices of Food Retailers."

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

Rasmussen, the Administrative Adviser, indicated that we can't seem to generate much enthusiasm for this project at this time. There have been a number of changes in personnel in some of the states, and the current level of interest is such that it appears unwise to attempt to go ahead with this project at this stage. In view of Western Directors' actions at this meeting for study groups, Rasmussen moved to recommend that WM-56 be removed from the listing of regional research projects and that we start over at some future time. Wood seconded. The motion PASSED.

WM-58, "The Demand for Selected Western Fruits and Vegetables."

WM-60, "The Market for Pine Lumber in the Millwork Industry in the Western Region."

Under the time schedule adopted by the Western Directors in July 1967, syllabi or requests for revision or extension of any of these projects should have been in the hands of RRC at its recent meeting. RRC acknowledges receipt of proposals to revise W-50, W-85, and W-86. Under the moratorium adopted by the Western Directors, these requests cannot be responded to by RRC. However, in the event that the Administrative Advisers of these, or other projects automatically terminated by the moratorium, certify that the termination of the project on June 30, 1970 will prevent an orderly phasing out of the program, RRC requests permission to receive requests for brief extensions, adequately documented, as a basis for recommending limited extensions to the Western Directors.

*Linsley moved, C. P. Wilson seconded, that RRC be given this authorization. PASSED with one dissent (Hill). (11 yes, 1 no.)*

Discussion of this motion brought out the following comments:

1. Hill - Rather than arbitrarily throw out all projects terminating 6/30/70, we ought to consider and keep those projects we feel are worth retaining.
2. Kelly expressed concern about the pending loss of half of the Region's marketing (WM) projects.

3. Rasmussen - This motion doesn't mean we won't be approving some projects. Our task forces are to determine and make recommendations as to what projects ought to be propagated, continued, or initiated. One of the task forces is specifically concerned with marketing. Maybe some of those projects will be outgrowths of some of the existing projects, and maybe some will be completely new ones.
4. Regarding the pending loss of WM projects, Sierk noted there is not the specific requirement that there must be 20 percent of RRF spent for regional research projects on marketing. The 20 percent marketing requirement is for all Hatch Funds, but it does not say that the regional projects have to be 20 percent marketing.

#### VIII. PROPOSALS FOR NEW AREAS OF WORK

RRC acknowledges receipt of syllabi for two proposals for new areas of work:

1. "Study of the Impact of Certain Innovations and Structural Changes in the Marketing of Livestock and Meats."
2. "An Economic Analysis of the Implications of Structural Change in Agriculture."

Under the moratorium imposed by the Western Directors, no action on these was taken by RRC.

#### IX. REGIONAL ALLOCATIONS TO SPECIAL PROJECTS

<u>Project &amp; State</u>	<u>FY 69 Allotment</u>	<u>FY 70 Funds Requested</u>	<u>FY 70 Funds Recommended</u>
W-1 Arizona <u>1/</u>	\$25,000	\$21,900	\$21,900
W-6 Arizona	1,000	1,000	1,000
Hawaii	2,000	2,000	2,000
Montana	1,000	500	500
Oregon	500	500	500
Washington	<u>52,500</u>	<u>56,145</u>	<u>56,145</u>
Subtotal	\$57,000	\$60,145	\$60,145
Washington <u>1/</u>	<u>\$18,150</u>	<u>\$18,400</u>	<u>\$18,400</u>
Total	\$75,150	\$78,545	\$78,545

1/ Special allocations for W-1 and W-6 -- See WD Minutes of July 1968, p. 25. These special allocations are to terminate 6/30/70.

# IX. REGIONAL ALLOCATIONS TO SPECIAL PROJECTS (Continued)

<u>Project &amp; State</u>	<u>FY 69 Allotment</u>	<u>FY 70 Funds Requested</u>	<u>FY 70 Funds Recommended</u>
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>
Total	\$ 51,205	\$ 51,205	\$ 51,205
W-57 Arizona	\$ 500	\$ 500	\$ 500
W-84 California	\$ 18,000	\$ 18,000	\$ 18,000
WM-48 Montana	\$ 14,000	\$ 14,000	<u>2/</u>
W-106 Montana <u>3/</u>	<u>\$ 11,500</u>	<u>\$ 11,500</u>	<u>\$ 11,500</u>
GRAND TOTAL	\$195,355	\$195,650	\$181,650

2/ WD made no recommendation on WM-48 allocation for FY 70. If there is approval of a proposed syllabus and follow-up project recommended for replacement of WM-48, the WD can then consider the need for a regional coordinator and a necessary trust fund recommendation next year.

3/ WD approved an increase of \$4,560 (to \$14,500) for FY 69, however, at the request of ERS, the SAES contribution was adjusted downward to \$11,500.

*Linsley moved, Hill seconded, that Western Directors accept these RRC recommendations. PASSED.*

## Miscellaneous

### Suggestions for 1969 LGC Meetings

Hervey suggested WD go on record as favoring the way Western Directors met at LGC at the 1968 fall meetings--- e.g., allow time at the LGC meeting for regional directors' meetings rather than have all meetings at night. *There was apparent concurrence.*

Asleson requested suggestions for topics for the section meetings.

Kraus suggested maybe the outgrowth of the summer meeting presentation by WSRAC representatives might be an appropriate topic for a LGC section meeting.

Kraus - E. T. York presented some proposed changes in NASU&LGC By-Laws to the Overall Deans at the 1968 Land Grant College Meetings. These proposed changes ought to be reviewed by Experiment Station, Extension, and Resident Instruction Directors, as well as by the Overall Deans prior to the 1969 LGC Meetings. Information on this matter will be circulated to all WD prior to the summer meeting for their review. It will be an agenda item for discussion at the summer WD meeting.

Mechanical  
Harvesting of  
Cherries

Wood - SAES Directors all over the country have been surveyed as to their interest in sponsoring a national symposium to identify problems of the mechanical harvesting of cherries and what might be done about it. A number of Experiment Stations responded, indicating their willingness to host such a symposium. Since most of the activity is concentrated in the Western States, we thought we ought to try to do something about it. A meeting of appropriate representatives from Idaho, Washington and Oregon was held the end of January to review current status of knowledge about the problem, including California and possibly Utah.

- This is the kind of thing that would lend itself to a WCC-type effort in which we could find some mechanism to provide an opportunity for a coordinating committee to get together to coordinate this work among all stations concerned.

Plant Patents

Buchanan observed that the four proposals in Ensign's memorandum are negative. He suggested that the recommendations be reworded so as to assume a positive, creative approach.

After some discussion of this matter, *Hill moved, Wood seconded that the Western Directors go on record as approving in principle the recommendations of Ensign's memorandum, and that he take the comments of Western Directors into account in dealing with other members of ESCOP to seek to take a more positive stand. PASSED.*

Maintenance of  
Agricultural  
Production  
Capacity

Frevert referred to his memorandum and attachments to Western Directors, dated January 2, 1969, on the subject: Issue Paper 1-2-1 -- "Maintenance of Agricultural Production Capacity."

There was considerable discussion of this matter.

Frevert expressed considerable concern lest someone in USDA will assign cost-benefit type relationships to SAES

problems which will essentially give them priorities, and the SAES could be dealt out of the picture on the basis of these priorities.

Wood concurred, particularly where they may try to base the meaningfulness of a productive agriculture on the idea of social costs. Once you try to evaluate the alternatives as to whether you can best put your money into research in agricultural production to maintain efficiency or whether the social benefits would be greater if the money were put elsewhere, you are in a very tentative area and become subject to so much disciplinary arbitrariness.

C. P. Wilson - When you get into the whole area of evaluating social benefits and also social costs of research, and trying to put some value estimates, even subjective value estimates on the research, you can quickly get lost in subjective arbitrariness. Another point is that it is difficult to make valid evaluation of the projected benefits to be derived from a research project before the research project even starts.

Buchanan - Research and education is a major mission of USDA separate and apart from whatever it may contribute to the action programs of the Department.

Buchanan noted that the statement on page 2 of the Issue Paper 1-2-1 - "The probable impacts of innovations from single research projects or programs can be estimated with more precision than aggregate projections developed without specifying the individual innovations" - appears to be 180 degrees off. One may anticipate positive results from one or more of a series of research projects, but it is doubtful if one can specify in advance either from which projects the benefits will be derived or the nature of the payoffs.

Hill indicated he requested a review by the Head of the Department of Agricultural Economics at Utah, and he said essentially the same thing as Wood, Wilson and Buchanan.

[Hill commented these agricultural economists sure stick together. Day noted that we now know that at least two of them agree.]

Sierk - You can't leave SAES out when goals for science and education are being set.

Knoblauch - You have overlooked mentioning one very important part; that is, in your institutional responsibility of training, you do a lot of research that you cannot equate, and you don't see any return from it except for the training of scientists. The use of cost-benefit

ratios can be an inhibiting factor on research. Research should be in a position of leadership and should be used for formulating the principles upon which goals are made, not coming along later and equating costs and benefits of what these goals are going to equal. This is going about it backwards.

#### Treasurer's Report

Asleson - The financial statements for the WDAL Account and the Western Directors' Special Fund appear as APPENDIX B to these Minutes.

- The only firm commitment against the WD Special Fund is the \$1,200 that goes to ERS each year. Otherwise, the fund is set up to help defray expenses to ESCOP meetings.

#### Future Meetings

Summer 1969 - Western Directors will meet at Bozeman, Montana, July 23 - 25, 1969. RRC will meet July 21-22, 1969.

Fall 1969 - NASU&LGC meetings will be at the La Salle Hotel, Chicago, Illinois, November 9 - 12, 1969.

#### Resolutions

##### Resolution No. 1

WHEREAS, the Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors, including CSRS representatives and guests, have completed a successful and enjoyable meeting from February 17 to 21, 1969 at Kauai, Hawaii;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors, and the CSRS representatives, express their sincere appreciation to the staff of the University of Hawaii for their special efforts in providing excellent facilities and services for the business meetings and for the highly enjoyable social activities arranged.

*Day's motion to adopt this resolution was carried by acclamation.*

##### Resolution No. 2

To be transmitted by the Chairman to Mr. Charles Kaneyama, Kekaha Sugar Co., Kekaha, Kauai, Hawaii.

WHEREAS, the members of the Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors, including the CSRS representatives and their guests, were entertained at the Luau at the Kauai Branch Station on the evening of February 19, 1969;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the members of the Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors and the CSRS representatives express their appreciation to Charles Kaneyama and his troupe for their most delightful entertainment.

*Day moved, Hill seconded, that WD adopt this resolution.*  
PASSED.

Resolution No. 3

WHEREAS, the State Agricultural Experiment Stations of the Western Region have made earnest efforts to comply with the procedure of CRIS; and

WHEREAS, the Agricultural Experiment Station, under the requirements of CRIS, have made major changes in their accounting and reporting systems; and

WHEREAS, these disruptive changes have been undertaken in the expectation of achieving benefits of better management practices through the centralized collation and dissemination of information; and

WHEREAS, CRIS does not function as planned and the expected benefits have not been achieved;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors urge the Secretary of Agriculture and the Director of the Office of Science and Education take immediate and strenuous action to fully implement CRIS.

*Day moved, Leyendecker seconded, that WD adopt this resolution.* PASSED.

Resolution No. 4

WHEREAS, Dr. G. Donald Sherman is attending his last meeting of the Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors prior to his forthcoming retirement; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Sherman has served agriculture and agricultural research with distinction for thirty-five years as a soil scientist, and Administrator, including seven years as Associate Director of the Hawaii Agricultural Experiment Station;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the WAAESD express to Dr. Sherman its grateful appreciation for his outstanding contribution to agriculture & agricultural research and direct that an appropriate certificate of recognition be prepared and presented to Dr. Sherman; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the WAAESD express to Dr. and Mrs. Sherman its best wishes for enjoyable and rewarding years ahead.

*Day moved, Burris seconded, that WD adopt this resolution. PASSED with a standing round of applause.*

Resolution No. 5

WHEREAS, Dr. Barnard Joy has rendered competent assistance in program planning over a long period of time. Much of the move toward effective cooperation among the USDA and SAES is due to his efforts. We particularly remember his assistance at the special meeting of Western Directors, October 3-5, 1967.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Western Directors express their sincere appreciation, and extend our best wishes to Dr. Joy for an enjoyable retirement.

*Day moved, Buchanan seconded that WD adopt this resolution. PASSED.*

Adjournment

Chairman Kraus adjourned the meeting at high noon on February 21, 1969.

Respectfully submitted,

*Leo R. Gray*  
Leo R. Gray  
Recording Secretary



## APPENDIX A

### REPORT OF THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON REGIONAL RESEARCH PHILOSOPHY

- I. In accordance with action taken by the Western Directors in their November 1968 meeting, an ad hoc committee on Regional Research Philosophy was appointed. The committee offers this report:
- II. Proposed is a planned program of regional research which would specify high priority areas for regional research. Implicit in the plan would be some arbitrary constraints on the number of funded RRF projects in line with available resources.
- III. Major source material for the plan would be the National Task Force Reports. Target figures would be set specifying tentative SMY's and dollars by Task Force groupings of RPA's.
- IV. Interdisciplinary research on problems would be given priority over single discipline specialization.
- V. Each State Station would accept leadership for a group (two or three) of task force reports in developing for the region a priority listing of most urgent problems which bear upon two or more States in the Western Region.
- VI. Tentative estimates of manpower and dollar requirements for significant research progress on the high priority problems would be set.
- VII. Upon acceptance of this approach by the Western Directors steps would be taken immediately, utilizing the office of the Director-at-Large, to establish regional research task forces of not more than eight persons representing both the State Stations and USDA. The responsibility of each regional research task force would be to develop by January 1, 1970 a regional research report based on the corresponding national task force report. It is suggested that four or five task force areas be selected for early implementation on a trial basis and that for each area selected a regional task force report be requested by the 1969 summer meeting. The following regional research task force groups are suggested:

#### A. Food and Nutrition

RPA 703 Food consumption, habits  
704 Food preparation  
708 Human nutrition

#### B. Pollution

RPA 214 Effects of air pollution  
901 Prevent pollution - soil, water, air

C. Water and Watershed

- RPA 105 Water conservation
- 106 Drainage irrigation
- 107 Watershed technology
- 108 Water economics

D. Market Structure, Foreign Aid and Market Development

- RPA 507 Competitive interrelationships
- 508 Develop domestic markets
- 509 Marketing firm and system efficiency
- 510 Farmer bargaining power
- 601 Expand foreign markets
- 602 Evaluate food and programs
- 603 Technical assistance to developing countries

E. Forestry

- RPA 110 Forest resources
- 111 Timber management
- 201 Forest insects
- 202 Forest diseases
- 203 Forest fire
- 301 Biological efficiency of trees
- 302 Forest engineering
- 303 Forest economics
- 401 Forest product utilization
- 502 Forest product marketing
- 512 Grades and standards - forest products
- 513 Supply, demand, price - forest products
- 902 Outdoor recreation
- 903 Multiple use of forestland
- 904 Wildlife and fish research

VIII. Upon review of the regional research task force reports by RRC, which in turn will make recommendations to the Western Directors, areas of high priority would be identified and approximate levels of funding required would be agreed upon. RRC would then recommend a time-sequence for formation of ad hoc technical committee for drafting regional project outlines within each priority area.

IX. State Stations would be asked to express (1) possible interest in assuming leadership for each proposed project area, and (2) tentative commitment of resources to participate in regional research in the proposed project area.

X. It is proposed that a moratorium be declared on any new or revised regional project outlines that are not now in the hands of RRC until this new procedure is established and also that further consideration of any syllabi now on hand would be deferred.

(WD concurred in the addition of a sixth task force on Beef Cattle. See page 21.)

APPENDIX B  
FINANCIAL STATEMENT

Director-at-Large Account  
(Montana Station Only)

CASH BALANCE AT LAST REPORT, 6/30/68 . . . . . \$ 6,358.89 1/

Receipts:

From Stations:

Arizona	\$ 3,956.96	
California	7,770.90	
Colorado	5,387.20	
Hawaii	1,954.65	
Idaho	3,241.85	
Montana	3,623.25	
Nevada	1,954.65	
New Mexico	2,193.02	
Oregon	5,244.17	
Utah	3,861.62	
Washington	5,387.19	
Wyoming <u>2/</u>	<u>3,900.00</u>	
		\$48,475.46

Expenditures:

U. Ca. 7/12/68	\$10,000.00	
" 9/19/68	5,000.00	
" 11/4/68	5,000.00	
" 1/8/69	10,000.00	
" 2/11/69	<u>5,000.00</u>	
		\$35,000.00
		<u>\$13,475.46</u>

CASH BALANCE 2/15/69 . . . . . \$19,834.35

1/ (ESCROW.....\$2,456.24) not included.

Total fund.....\$22,290.59

2/ Wyoming paid full allotment rather than a portion as prorated among WAAESD.

## APPENDIX B

(Page 2)

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

## Western Directors' Special Fund

CARRYOVER July 1, 1968 . . . . . \$ 832.48

Receipts:

## From Stations:

Alaska	\$ 55.00	
Arizona	302.50	
Colorado	550.00	
Hawaii	55.00	
Idaho	385.00	
Montana	330.00	
Nevada	55.00	
New Mexico	302.50	
Oregon	550.00	
Utah	220.00	
Washington	770.00	
Wyoming	<u>165.00</u>	
		\$3,740.00

Expenditures:

Econ. Res. Service	\$1,200.00	
R. D. Ensign, ESCOP	<u>287.30</u>	
		<u>\$1,487.30</u>
		<u>\$2,252.70</u>

CASH BALANCE 2/15/69 . . . . . \$3,085.18