

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

September 12, 1969

TO : Western Directors

FROM : Leo R. Gray, Recording Secretary *LRG*

SUBJECT: Minutes of the July 1969 Meeting of Western Directors

Minutes of the July 1969 Meetings are attached.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Item</u>	<u>Page</u>
Call to Order and Attendance . . . . .	1
Introductions, Announcements, and Report of Chairman . . . . .	2
Spring 1969 Minutes. . . . .	2
Comments of CSRS Representatives . . . . .	3
Report of WDAL . . . . .	6
Forward Planning Committee . . . . .	7
ESCOP. . . . .	9
ESCOP Legislative Subcommittee . . . . .	10
ARPAC. . . . .	14
Committee of Nine. . . . .	18
Ad Hoc Committee on Regional Research Philosophy . . . . .	19
Ad Hoc Arid Lands Committee. . . . .	28
WAERC. . . . .	28
WSWRC. . . . .	30
WHERAC . . . . .	31
WSRAC. . . . .	31
RRC Report . . . . .	34
Combination of Research Interests - USDA and SAES. . . . .	44
Miscellaneous	
1. Tolerances of Pesticides and Outlawing of Pesticides . . . . .	44
2. National Coordinating Committee for New Plants . . . . .	45
3. Proposed Changes in NASU&LGC By-Laws . . . . .	45
4. Topic for 1970 Collaborators' Conference . . . . .	46
5. Use of Western Directors' Special Fund . . . . .	47
Nominations for 1969 Elections . . . . .	47
Future Meetings. . . . .	48
Resolutions. . . . .	48
Adjournment. . . . .	50
APPENDIX A, ESCOP Letter to Secretary of Agriculture . . . . .	51
APPENDIX B, Release of Information from CRIS . . . . .	53
APPENDIX C, Functions and Composition of ESCOP . . . . .	55
APPENDIX D, Membership of ARPAC. . . . .	56
APPENDIX E, Guidelines for WAERC Committees. . . . .	58
APPENDIX F, Problems for Research in the Western Region. . . . .	60
APPENDIX G, Financial Statements . . . . .	63 & 64

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	2	Spring 1969 Minutes
	3 - 6	Comments of CSRS Representatives
	6 - 7	Report of WDAL
	7 - 9	Forward Planning Committee
	9 - 14	ESCOP and ESCOP Legislative Subcommittee
	14 - 18	ARPAC
	18 - 19	Committee of Nine
	19 - 28	Ad Hoc Committee on Regional Research Philosophy
	28 - 30	WAERC
	31 - 33	WSRAC
	34 - 43	RRC Report
	45	Proposed Changes in NASU&LGC By-Laws
	46	Topic for 1970 Collaborators' Conference
	47	Nominations for 1969 Elections
	48	Future Meetings
	48 - 50	Resolutions
	51 - 64	APPENDICES
Asleson	14	ARPAC
	50	Resolution No. 5
Ayres	49	Resolution No. 4
Bohmont	41	Item 3, second paragraph
Buchanan	6 - 7	Report of WDAL
Burris	35	RRC Report, Item III
	49	Resolution No. 4
	50	Resolution No. 5

<u>For Specific Attention of</u>	<u>Page No.</u>	<u>Sidehead or Other Identification</u>
Carter	50	Resolution No. 5
Clark	2	Spring 1969 Minutes
Ely	48	Resolution No. 1
Ensign	10 - 14	ESCOP Legislative Subcommittee
Frevert	25 - 26	Item II
Hervey	7 - 9	Forward Planning Committee
	19 - 28	Ad Hoc Committee on Regional Research Philosophy
Hill	44	Miscellaneous, Item I
Kelly	9 - 10	ESCOP
Kendrick	25 - 26	Item II
Leyendecker	18	Committee of Nine
	41	Item 3, Food and Nutrition
Linsley	43	Last paragraph on page
	49	Resolution No. 4
Rasmussen	41	Item 4 a, Forestry
Robins	40	RRC Report, Item 2
M. L. Wilson	49	Resolution No. 4
C. P. Wilson	25 - 26	Item II
	28 - 30	WAERC
	43	Addendum to RRC Report
Wood	25 - 26	Item II
	31 - 33	WSRAC
	48	<u>*/</u> Under Nominations
	60	APPENDIX F
Zivnuska	42	Item 4 b, Forestry

Introductions,  
Announcements,  
and Report of  
Chairman

Kraus introduced Dr. Roy E. Huffman, Vice President for Research, Montana State University; Dr. Lark P. Carter, Assistant Dean of Agriculture and Assistant Director of the Montana Agricultural Experiment Station, Bozeman; and Dr. Roy L. Lovvorn, the new Administrator of CSRS.

Hervey introduced Dr. Norman A. Evans, Director of the Natural Resources Center and Associate Director of the Colorado Agricultural Experiment Station.

Kraus welcomed Bohmont back to the group.

Neophytes Carter, Evans, and Lovvorn, after some diligent schooling by Kelly, were duly accepted into the Western Directors' Association by acclamation.

Kraus called WD attention to a letter of appreciation received from Mr. Charles Kaneyama (from Kauai).

Huffman welcomed WD to Montana, and made a few comments concerning the relative status of the organization of research in the Agricultural Experiment Stations compared with the organization of research in other areas of the University.

Later, Kraus introduced Dr. Paul DeLay, Director of the Animal Disease and Parasite Research Division, ARS, USDA.

Kelly introduced Dr. Arthur Morgan, the new Director of the Western Utilization Research and Development Division (WURDD) ARS, at Albany, California.

Kraus noted that matters pertaining to Interim Actions have been distributed, namely: The Minutes of the Special Meetings held in March and April 1969; Reports of Task Forces; and Actions of C/9 and CSRS Re: WD Regional Research Project Recommendations.

Chairman Kraus appointed a Nominating Committee, consisting of: Hervey, Chairman; Asleson, Kelly and Robins, to designate a slate of officers for the 1969 elections at the LGC Meetings.

Kraus also appointed a Resolutions Committee, consisting of: Day, Chairman; Foote, Hill, and Gray.

Spring 1969  
Minutes

Gray noted a correction on page 37 of the February 1969 Minutes. W-103, "Performance of Permanent Press Garments in the Western Region," was listed as due for automatic termination on June 30, 1970. This is incorrect. W-103 is scheduled to terminate June 30, 1971. Thus, delete this item from the listing.

*Frevert moved, Wood seconded, that the February 1969 WD Minutes be corrected as indicated above, and approved as distributed. PASSED.*

Thereafter, the OIG will not have the responsibility for performing these audits as such; therefore, it will no longer be responsible for auditing the financial records of Experiment Stations at Land Grant Institutions. After a cognizant agency assumes the audit responsibility, OIG will continue to maintain the liaison with CSRS on audits performed and on reports on audits of agricultural programs as it has done in the past."

Lovvorn - OIG will make fiscal, not program reviews. Ultimately, there will be one agency performing all audits at your institution. Presumably, the audit will be only financial.

Sierk - The auditors' primary function will be checking on CSRS. They report back to CSRS and in turn CSRS reports back to you.

In response to a request from Kraus, Lovvorn assured WD that CSRS would furnish the Directors with copies of all the information regarding the types of administrative things the auditors from the OIG will be reviewing. This will enable the Directors to know what to expect, and it will assure that the Directors will be able to have all of the relevant guideline materials in one place.

It was acknowledged that upon request, station auditors can get all the information CSRS has, but as a matter of routine action, such information is not voluntarily furnished.

Lovvorn called attention to those stations that have not sent in their 1969-70 travel and noted the summaries can't be sent out until all inputs are received. He also noted those stations that have not sent in all of their 1968 progress reports for Hatch projects.

Regarding the possibility of a downward adjustment made in the overall Federal budget, Lovvorn indicated it was his understanding that the research budget will be about the same.

Kraus raised a question about the revised agricultural census. Ackerman, Chairman of the Agricultural Advisory Committee for the Census, indicated the problems are partly resolved but that there is a lot of opposition. The Census will need a lot of support from its users. The Census provides the factual materials, but does not provide analyses of the data.

Sierk - There is a mechanism through the regional program for joint planning of the regional research effort. This hasn't been very well documented. CSRS-OD-1001 shows regional programs for FY '69. USDA agencies were participating in 151 of the roughly 190 regional projects in FY '69.

- A little over \$7 million is being put into regional research by USDA agencies. Currently this information can't be obtained from CRIS. Some Divisions have it spelled out in CRIS forms, others don't.

- CSRS is the primary coordinating agency for regional research planning.

Ensign - Bayley, at the Legislative Subcommittee meeting, indicated states should look at their budget requests with the idea of emphasizing things that are distinctive as far as their SAES research program is concerned. Has anyone, C/9 or the Department, reviewed or emphasized those areas that might be more appropriate for the SAES to undertake and those that might be more appropriate for USDA?

Lovvorn indicated he feels Bayley really wants to involve SAES in planning, rather than give lip-service to their involvement in the Department's planning. However, the mechanism for achieving this is something for which we are all groping.

Kendrick - The appropriateness of given agencies to pursue particular lines of research was a primary subject of consideration of the task force a year ago.

- At the Fresno "Listening Conference," the Secretary indicated he wanted to strengthen the Federal-State relationships in every way possible. Now is the time to plan and decide which are the more appropriate agencies to get involved with and do work in given areas of research.

Lovvorn - Bayley and a team of USDA and SAES people are meeting with R. Neufeldt (Director of the Athens Regional Laboratory) to see if they can come to an agreement as to how that facility can best be used.

Kraus noted that the Extension Directors met with the Secretary and his staff recently and asked why the SAES Directors don't move to have a similar type meeting with the Secretary and his staff.

Lovvorn - If SAES Directors so desire we can seek to set up such a meeting. Comments along this line would be appreciated.

Kendrick - The issue we are considering is broader than regional - it involves overall planning where we plan together. If we plan together we probably will cooperate and work it out together.

Myers suggested such a meeting might be held in Washington, D. C. in September or October, ahead of the Land Grant meetings in Chicago. This would give the Secretary a

chance at the Land Grant meetings to react to both the Extension and Experiment Station Directors' meetings. No action was taken.

Report of  
WDAL

1. Buchanan commented on the WDAL financial report. He also noted that the DAL's have office and secretarial assistance provided by CSRS in Washington, D. C.

2. Buchanan, on the subject of the citation of regional research results in journals, noted that a question raised at a meeting of the Western Agricultural Experiment Station Editors, was: Is it appropriate to publish the results of regional research in journals, or should they be reported only in station bulletins? There is no consistency regarding line credit for research activity supported with regional research funds.

*Bohmert moved, Wood seconded, that our publications policy be amended to indicate that we try and get a byline for giving credit for research on all journal articles as well as other publications resulting from those studies that have been financially supported with regional research funds. PASSED.*

3. WD might consider the thought of a management workshop as far as the WD are concerned, but he took the liberty of suggesting this proposal go to the FPC for their consideration before it comes back to the WD as a whole.

4. Buchanan distributed copies of a speech he made at the WAEA meetings in Corvallis.

5. Regarding the matter of people research, Buchanan distributed a progress report that is a proposal in the form of the second draft of "AN ACT" dated 7/18/69. This was prepared as a follow-up to the mimeograph statement, "New Legislation?" passed out at the WD Spring meetings in Hawaii.

Buchanan - The WD discussion at Hawaii was concerned partly with whether we now have legislative authority to work in some of these people-oriented types of activities. A variety of these types of activities are now encompassed under the general headings of human and community development.

- The first draft of this proposed "ACT" was reviewed by some people in CSRS and others. This matter was discussed in a general way at the last meeting of the ESCOP Legislative Subcommittee, but no action was taken to say what should be done about it, nor was it pushed up to ESCOP as a whole, nor has ESCOP pushed it to ARPAC.

Lovvorn noted that CSRS as an agency, or USDA in general, is not at this time sponsoring this proposal as an Act.

CSRS is pleased to have been able to have an input to the draft, but the efforts of CSRS or other USDA people have been in response to SAES proposals, not at the request of USDA.

Buchanan - Maclay made it quite clear that the position of USDA is that there is adequate legislative authority to do anything the Department wants to do in this area.

Kendrick - If USDA feels they have adequate legislative authority to work in this area now, we will need some motivation to get this proposal through.

Ensign - This proposal was fielded by the ESCOP Legislative Subcommittee, and they were asked to get reactions from the regions on the desires to explore this matter.

- In addition to Buchanan's comments, there was a comment in the committee that there was some concern about the possibility of setting up a new division or a new administrative agency outside the experiment station, such as water research centers, or Mc-Intire-Stennis funded forestry research. There was a suggestion for having this conducted within the Agricultural Experiment Station.

This proposed new legislation is discussed further under the Forward Planning Committee.

#### Forward Planning Committee

Hervey - New legislation is an item that was on the agenda for the March Meeting of the FPC, but the Committee did not have time to give it much attention. Consideration of this matter is already underway on a national level. Some of the additional points brought out by WD during the discussion at this meeting of the proposed new legislation, "AN ACT," were:

Myers - As the proposed ACT now stands a second Agricultural Experiment Station could easily develop to handle people research in rural America. In some institutions this could essentially be divorced from the SAES. This should not be. The ACT should tie such people research back to the Colleges of Agriculture and thereby eliminate any possibility of establishing a second agricultural experiment station in the state or even within the same institution. The ACT might say the Director of such research will be the Director of SAES or Cooperative Extension.

Kraus noted that when the Extension Directors met in Logan, they had a report on "Quality of Environment," and then they discussed how to implement the recommendations in this area. It was suggested that the Extension and SAES Directors make a joint request for a lump sum appropriation from Congress to do a job in this area together.

Kraus then noted the proposed ACT has Extension in it, and suggested there would be merit in having SAES and Extension get together more than they have in the past.

Leyendecker - Since the proposed ACT involves Extension, there should also be some input from the Extension Directors.

Buchanan raised a question as to whether the ACT should be limited to research. Among other things he noted some arguments against specifying that the institute be placed in the Agricultural Experiment Station as a mandatory requirement of the law. He requested some reaction from WD or FPC as to what ought to be done with this proposed ACT.

Hervey - Since the proposed ACT does indicate a joint effort involving SAES and Cooperative Extension, maybe it ought to be given consideration by a joint body of both ESCOP and ECOP representatives, or by the Administrative Heads of Agriculture Group.

Kraus suggested we request that the overall Deans group consider this an appropriate item of business.

Thorne questioned the expressed interest in putting this "institute" entirely under the Colleges of Agriculture even under the most preferred structure that we have. He hoped it wouldn't be restricted so as to limit the "institute" to considerations of agriculture in the rural areas.

Buchanan reviewed five points made to the ESCOP Legislative Subcommittee, but on which no action has been taken. They were:

1. There has been evidence of considerable interest in and discussion of so-called "people" research -- Glenn Pound, Earl Heady, et al.
2. The "thrust" of existing authority under which publicly funded agricultural research is currently supported is toward other, more traditional areas and problems.
3. Whether or not the new research could be supported under existing authority, it is possible that proposing new legislation would:
  - a. dramatize the need;
  - b. result in new resources for funding and/or additional funds for this purpose;
  - c. clarify existing authority.
4. A draft has been prepared as a means of sharpening our focus on the matter of new legislation should it be decided to pursue it.

5. Negative considerations include

- a. possible competition with Hatch and related funding; and
- b. possible undesirable amendments to existing authority as a result of "raising the question."

*Hervey moved, Kelly seconded, that we refer the matter of the proposed new legislation, including a record of comments of the Western Directors group at this meeting, to the Administrative Heads of Agriculture for their consideration. PASSED.*

ESCOP

Kelly reviewed briefly the Minutes of the last ESCOP meeting - April 29-May 1, 1969. He noted the Western Region's representatives went to the meeting with three charges, namely:

1. To get ESCOP's answer to Secretary Hardin's question "What do the SAES want from CSRS?"
2. To get passed by ESCOP a resolution regarding the role of the Regional Directors as a standing committee for communications; and
3. To try to get discussion started on the role of the Regional Directors.

Kelly was appointed chairman of an ad hoc subcommittee to consider the consolidation of all information available to ESCOP as to what CSRS should be, and report back to ESCOP at this meeting.

Kelly - Our objective number 3 was knocked out by Hawkins' statement.

- Regarding our objective 2, a motion passed that the four regional directors and the chairman of ESCOP serve as a standing subcommittee of ESCOP for the following functions:

1. Facilitate communications on behalf of ESCOP and the regional associations with CSRS; and
2. Facilitate liaison between ESCOP, the chairmen of the regional associations of SAES Directors, and CSRS, and ARPAC in relevant policy and programming inter-relationships.

- Regarding our objective 1, there was a wide range of information available for ESCOP to consider.

Ensign - It was recommended by the Subcommittee that the marketing type research requirements be allocated among these areas.

- The 6 percent cost of doing research was also mentioned. Dr. Bayley suggested we should continue to emphasize this cost of doing research factor. This was pulled out separately, but it does not show in the above figures.

Buchanan - The reason this 6 percent item is so important is because USDA relies on special deficit appropriations for making this up, whereas such appropriations are not available to SAES.

Ensign - It was pointed out that some of the best research in certain areas might be done best under SAES rather than USDA programs.

- There were projected increases for utilizing contracts and grants for FY '71. The general philosophy and the emphasis on contracts and grants legislation was that it would be secondary to regular Hatch appropriations. Possible commodities mentioned for the contract and grants program elements were: cotton, soybeans, nutrition, livestock production, milk, corn, and wheat.

Buchanan mentioned that rural development research was also discussed.

Ensign - McIntire-Stennis was \$3.78 million for forestry research. The increase for this year (FY '70) is \$.227 million. The request for FY '71 is \$1.673 million.

- The physical facilities request is \$24.0 million.

- Most of the Subcommittee's time was spent on the budget for FY '72.

Lovvorn questioned WD as to their reaction to the proposed FY '71 and projected FY '72 budgets, since the WD thinking is not necessarily reflected in the figures presented.

The Western Directors recommended increases be allocated among areas as follows:

Food and Nutrition	19 percent
Pollution	24 "
Human and Community Development	22 "
Resource Development	7 "
All Other - Including	28 "
Production efficiency - 17	
Animal Disease - 7	
Marketing Efficiency - 2	
Maintenance and Measure of	
Quality during Marketing - 1	

Thus, WD agreed 72 percent with the Subcommittee's recommendation.

Bohmont expressed concern about the basic issue of the ESCOP Legislative Subcommittee making a proposal that is not consistent with the recommendations of SAES Directors.

Buchanan noted the kind of program package proposed by the Legislative Subcommittee was deemed to be more salable than the sum total of the packages recommended by the SAES Directors throughout the U. S.

Buchanan - A key question has been pinpointed, namely: Are we really going to continue the philosophy that SAES Directors in each state decides for his own state exactly how the Hatch Funds are going to be spent within his state, or are we going to cooperate and try to put together a program that will be appealing with respect to available money?

Wood - A major concern of the Legislative Subcommittee was that if we asked Congress for increases in funds for what we are already doing we wouldn't get much reaction. The Committee had some sense of direction, in the form of alternative proposals from SAES Directors from all of the regions, but it was the Committee's collective judgment that the approach taken would yield optimum results. The HEW has shown growing interest and concern in the area of foods and nutrition. The Committee thought it would be most appropriate to be on record as pointing out to Congress the fact that the Land Grant Universities were interested, prepared and capable of developing a strong program of research in the area of Foods and Nutrition. The decision was made, therefore, to pick items to emphasize that would be sensitive to Congress.

Further discussion indicated some concern over the fact that these type problems were not stressed by most of the people who met with the Secretary when he held his "Listening Conference" hearings. It was noted that farmers are interested primarily in how they can improve their income position so they can stay in business.

Myers suggested WD congratulate our representatives for their role in developing the Legislative Subcommittee's proposal, and that we support the Subcommittee's request for \$11.6 million for FY '71.

Robins questioned the desirability of using the word pollution rather than quality of environment.

Ensign - The Legislative Subcommittee recommends a budget request for FY '72 of \$12 million increase.

- Most of the meeting centered around the FY '72 projection. The Committee, as a working base, continued to refer to the Long Range Projection as far as developing justification for resources. The 1966 base level was 6149 SMY's. The project increase to FY '77 is 4515 SMY's -- for a total of 10,654 SMY's in FY '77. The projection for FY '72 is 2525 SMY's if we try to reach the goal projected for FY '77.

- The Subcommittee recommended that we use \$50,000 as a budget level per SMY. The Committee felt we should not allocate less than \$25,000 or  $\frac{1}{2}$  SMY per RPA.

Buchanan noted the average dollar figure per SMY for each of the 96 RPA's ranged roughly from about \$25,000 to \$150,000.

Ensign - The Subcommittee is recommending the FY '72 budget be presented on three levels, namely:

<u>Hatch</u>			<u>McIntire-Stennis</u>		
\$12 million increase	252 SMY:	\$1.75 million increase	35 SMY:		
	:		:		
6 million "	126 SMY:	.90 million "	18 SMY		
	:		:		
3 million "	63 SMY:	.45 million "	9 SMY		

- The physical facilities request would be presented on three levels, \$24, \$12, and \$6 million so as to correspond with the Hatch requests.

- The special grants and contracts would be on the same basis as in FY'71, namely: \$10 million, \$5.5 million and \$2.15 million.

- As far as program packages to recommend in FY '72, the Committee felt we should continue with the four areas recommended for FY '71, namely: Food and Nutrition, Pollution, Human and Community Development, and Resource Development. In addition, possible packages were discussed.

- The Subcommittee proposed that the FY '72 budget be built around the following research area packages:

1. Reducing Costs of Meat, Milk, and Eggs.
2. Food and Nutrition.
3. Pollution.
4. Natural Resources Development.
5. Community Development.
6. Fruits and Vegetables.
7. Field and Forage Crops.

- In developing FY '72 budget, each SAES Director will be asked to allocate his funds to RPA's. It was

suggested, as a guideline, that each station limit their allocation to not more than five Research Problem Areas.

- Among Bayley's comments to the Committee were: More support from the grass roots level is needed; we are not getting very strong proposals for people-oriented research; we should have better information about the pesticides situation and the kind of research we are doing in agriculture to live with this problem.

- An attachment to the Committee's Minutes will include a study by Dr. Knoblauch on marketing research. It indicates maybe we are not putting a proper classification on what we are doing in marketing. Maybe we should think about greater flexibility in our interpretation of what is marketing research.

- In the Western Region, our moratorium on new regional research project proposals may affect our position a couple of years from now in regard to utilizing marketing research as a percentage of our RRF allocation.

Lovvorn - When you submit a project and ask that it be considered as marketing, it is; If you do not make such a request, it is not considered as a marketing project. The Department will likely come up with a definition of marketing for all agencies.

Buchanan noted there are some slight differences of position as to what is marketing. There is some support within the agricultural economics profession for the position that essentially there is no difference anymore between what constitutes marketing as opposed to non-marketing research.

#### ARPAC

Asleson distributed a chart entitled "Agricultural Research - Appropriations and Scientist Man-Years 1960-1970." In his discussion he noted the chart includes USDA and Hatch supported state programs, and SMY on contracts and grants. The chart indicated 5585 SMY's for 1969, and 5635 for 1970. The data indicate that in 1960 appropriations for the support was \$24,900/SMY. The 1969 support, \$46,100/SMY, takes into account a 7 percent annual cost escalation.

Asleson - The thought in ARPAC at this point was to ask for 1/7 of projected FY '77 SMY goal for FY '72, assuming we got 1/7 for FY '71.

- ARPAC was concerned with how can we convince Congress that agriculture is best equipped to do work in key areas of high public concern. ARPAC is giving its Subcommittee on Financing (ARPF) much latitude in planning. Six key areas given ARPF to consider in planning, but not listed in order of priority, are:

1. Food and Nutrition.
2. Foreign Trade and Development.
3. Environmental Resources: Land, Water, and People.
4. Human and Community Development.
5. Pollution: Pesticides, Animal Wastes, Air, and Water.
6. Livestock Prices and Quality (Production Costs).

These areas are comparable to those listed by the ESCOP Legislative Subcommittee.

Asleson - Basically, what is behind this list is the fact that this is a consumer oriented country, and the attitude of the consumer is being expressed.

- Some questions raised at the ARPAC meeting were: Are 1966 projections valid today in light of advances in technology? Have increases in technology increased productivity per SMY?

Russell McGregor (of the Bureau of the Budget) indicated that the Long Range Plan was great when it was prepared, but today it is obsolete.

Lovvorn - McGregor said in effect, its nice to plan with a larger budget, but we ought to give more thought to planning with existing or reduced budgets or SMY's.

- ARPAC is a joint committee to advise the Land Grant College Association and the Secretary of Agriculture. The presiding chairman will alternate between the State and Federal co-chairmen.

- Regarding the situation on facilities, RPDES has in its books about 1700 vacancies in facilities for which bodies are lacking to fill them. This 1700 covers both state and federal facilities, but it may not be a realistic figure. However, this influences chances of getting increases when such requests are made to legislative bodies. SAES Directors will be asked to reconsider their assessments as to new facilities needs.

Buchanan indicated he would distribute blank forms by mail that are uniform for all of the U. S.

Subsequent discussion indicated there was some feeling among WD that SAES Directors, nationwide, ought to work out a plan to go directly to Congress for support of facilities needs.

Ensign invited recommendations for the ESCOP Legislative Subcommittee.

Thorne raised a question as to how far could one go in regional research under the package heading "Foreign Trade

and Development?" Among the comments was Buchanan's note that three RPA's are listed under that heading, namely: 601, Foreign Markets; 602, Evaluation of Food Aid Programs; and 603, Foreign Technical Assistance. RPA 603 is the one that is not to be handled under Hatch.

Kraus raised a question as to what is meant to be the SAES role in research package area: "Reducing Costs for Food." He cautioned the SAES ought to go slow in this area lest they do a disservice to agriculture.

Kendrick, concurring with Kraus, indicated it is inconsistent with everything else in our economy to stress the need for reducing costs for food while costs for other things are increased.

Ensign - Bayley and other USDA people have been contacted by the cotton people regarding the idea of increasing research on cotton. It has been suggested that possibly the FY '71 appropriations might reflect this interest. The cotton people have indicated they would like to see the possibility of some production payments being reduced and an equivalent amount turned over to research agencies and put into the support of research on cotton. This is an idea that might be considered for increased support of research on other commodities.

Lovvorn - If such funds for increased research on cotton should become available to CSRS, say in the amount of \$10 million, then the CSRS position would be to make \$3 million available to SAES for research.

The Western Directors concerned (Frevort, Kelly, and Leyendecker) concurred with this position proposed by Lovvorn.

Hervey raised a question as to the wisdom of setting in motion a plan to begin personal contacts with people on our agricultural appropriations subcommittees to generate more understanding from the grass roots level for the support of research in agriculture.

Kraus suggested the regional directors might follow up on this matter.

Buchanan noted this was to be brought up by the Legislative Subcommittee. Names of organizations were distributed, but no assignments for contact have been made.

*Bohnont moved, C. P. Wilson seconded, that the ESCOP Legislative Subcommittee representatives from the Western Region be directed to work with the overall Legislative Subcommittee in developing a plan of procedure for the development and execution of legislative programs of interest to the Experiment Stations. PASSED.*

Two suggested points of procedure that emerged from the discussion of this motion were:

1. Personal contacts with our delegates in Congress are very desirable. However, contacts with Congress should be made on a continuing basis, but we should have specific contacts and specific purposes in mind; and
2. Not only should our Legislative Subcommittee keep us informed, but we should also keep them informed as to what we do in contacting our Congressmen and the results thereof.

Regarding the facilities program, the request for \$24 million has been quite well documented as to the purposes for which the money would be used. This has been submitted to the members of the various appropriations committees, but it hasn't been included in the Executive Budget. This is where our case has been weak.

Asleson - There was some consideration of the relationship of ARPAC to other advisory committees.

- There was discussion as to how realistic we should be in being prepared to adjust to possible cutbacks in our budget in contrast to increases projected in the Long Range Plan.

- There was some discussion as to how do we implement the recommendations beyond the 32 task force reports. One suggestion was to continue the task forces. Another one was to appoint committees made up of scientists. The Subcommittee recommended we try on a limited basis to take about four of the task force report areas - cotton, swine, food and nutrition, and community and human development. Ultimately an amended motion passed that a working group consider ways of implementing the recommendations, but limit its scope to Food and Nutrition (under program element 646). The working group would consist of the permanent staff of RPDES and analysts, as needed, from USDA and the States.

- An idea discussed was to invite representatives - industry, consumers, or others - to talk about problems in a seminar-type arrangement to University and USDA research and extension people. It was proposed that an ad hoc group be established for each category - whether task force or some other category. Such groups would last about three or four meetings and then be dissolved. These would replace the 14 commodity advisory groups we now have.

-ARPAC discussed an attachment on implementation of ESCOP recommendation on CRIS - see APPENDIX B.

- A statement was distributed concerning ESCOP - its functions and composition. See APPENDIX C.

Frevert indicated he was under the impression the regional directors would be ex-officio, non-voting members of ARPAC, but it turns out the appointment includes only the chairman of the regional directors (George Browning). Kelly's report indicates ESCOP is looking to the regional directors as a liaison between ESCOP and ARPAC. How can this be done very effectively if they aren't invited to attend the meetings?

Asleson - There was a feeling that many SAES Directors are abdicating their responsibilities to regional directors. It was felt, also, from the standpoint of voting membership, as well as for non-voting, ex-officio members, that the group is big enough.

- It was left that unless or until the regional associations request additional action, the current membership roster would constitute the ex-officio, non-voting members - see APPENDIX D.

Kraus favored WD taking action that regional directors be designated ex-officio members.

Kendrick - The intent of the task force recommending ARPAC was not to have a committee of say 35, but rather to limit its membership to about 12 or so. There is state representation on ARPAC as indicated.

*Hervey moved, Frevert seconded, that the Western Directors seek to have our WDAL invited to attend ARPAC meetings as a resource person to our elected representative and that our ESCOP members present this to ESCOP so that they will be aware as to what the Western Directors are interested in doing. PASSED unanimously.*

Committee of  
Nine

Leyendecker - The Committee of Nine has been concerned with new projects. A number of projects in the Western Region have relatively few SMY's assigned to them. C/9 has asked that in the future, CSRS send the SMY's that are committed to the regional research project directly to the Administrative Adviser so that he will know which stations are meeting their commitments to the regional effort.

- C/9 directed Beacher to come up with a format for an annual regional report. The Committee appointed an ad hoc committee to work with Beacher on the format.

- C/9 has been very interested in the task force endeavor taken on by the Western Directors.

- The North Central group is also trying to look at their regional research effort and trying to find ways to make it more effective. They are talking in terms of general umbrella-type projects.

- C/9 went on record requesting that printing of the new CSRS Manual of Procedures be placed as a high priority item for publication in FY '70.

- C/9 voted to transfer travel funds left over from the FY '69 C/9 travel allotment to the Western Region to help cover our task force costs. Such surplus funds were assigned to the Montana Station for allocation to regional research projects under their control.

- The remainder of the C/9 actions are in the Minutes.

Hill noted the North Central Region is seeking to come up with a very broad regional research proposal in the area of food and nutrition. He asked for and received considerable support of his contention that WD are not enthusiastic about this broad type of approach to regional research.

Hill - There was discussion about travel priorities of CSRS representatives to meetings of regional research technical committees. A number of such meetings were held last year without CSRS representation. The excuse was that the men had to be sent out on station reviews. C/9 contends that attendance at regional research technical committee meetings ought to take precedence over reviews.

Ad Hoc Committee  
on Regional  
Research  
Philosophy

Hervey reviewed the WD charge to the task forces; what took place at the Hawaii, Berkeley, and San Francisco meetings of 1969; and noted that reports of five of the six task forces were distributed to WD prior to these meetings.

Hervey - The Committee on Regional Research Philosophy (CRRP) met with task force Administrative Advisers in Denver July 9-10, 1969 to review the procedures undertaken, and the committee agreed on three recommendations as their report for Western Directors, namely:

- "1. The policy for selecting new regional research projects adopted at the 1969 spring meeting of the Western Directors in Hawaii on a trial basis be continued;
- "2. The Western Directors establish a mechanism for proceeding at a reasonable pace to establish new Task Forces on a priority basis;
- "3. The statement of policy regarding the establishment of Western Regional Coordinating Committees (WRCC) be adopted as set forth below:

"State boundaries do not limit the nature of problems, nor the usefulness of research results, and scientists in different states often engage in closely related research on problems of regional concern. Unwarranted duplication of research should be avoided, while complementary work is desired. To facilitate the coordination of research and to stimulate the team approach to problem solving, the formation of coordinating committees is proposed.

"Western Directors will authorize the creation of Western Regional Coordinating Committees and state station Directors may authorize expenditures from regional project W-106 to cover travel and per diem expenses incident to committee members' attendance at authorized committee meetings. Authorization for a WRCC shall be based upon written petition (one to two pages) by the scientists so interested and evaluated by the RRC on the following points:

- "1. Nature and significance of the problem on which research is being done, or on which research may be proposed and definition of its regional scope.
- "2. Recognition of, and provision for, interdisciplinary involvement in the research.
- "3. Anticipated benefit of being approved as a Western Regional Coordinating Committee--the objectives.
- "4. Extent of participation, specialization, and number of scientists involved.
- "5. Duration anticipated for accomplishing the objectives.

"Approval of a WRC Committee will carry with it the designation by Western Directors of an administrative adviser who will authorize each meeting of the committee. Normally, annual or biannual meetings will be scheduled. For each approved WRCC, a firm terminal date will be specified. Minutes of each committee meeting are to be compiled and distributed among the Western Experiment Station Directors. At the time of the final meeting of any such coordinating committee, a concise statement of benefits and accomplishments of the committee is to be prepared and distributed among the Directors."

Hervey, providing some background for the second recommendation, noted that at the Hawaii meeting, CRRP had recommended that all of the task forces be set up and be asked to report back to WD by January 1, 1970. However, at the Denver meeting, CRRP reconsidered, and felt that rather than set all of them up this year, some of the task forces ought to be set up on the next go-round, and eventually WD could set up all of the groups over a period of about four years.

Hervey provided some elaboration on the first three points enumerated in paragraph 2 of the WRCC policy statement, namely:

1. Some ongoing research, or some new or emerging problem might come under this.
2. Through professional meetings, most of our researchers can get together with others to talk about things of common interest. We do not, however, have a mechanism here in the West for interdisciplinary groups to get together. This WRCC approach would provide a mechanism for the latter.
3. This would indicate the objectives or payoff as to why the group thinks it should get together, and for how long or how many times. The point here is that the duration would be short-termed. It would not be open-ended. Item 5 indicates the duration anticipated; thus, the committee would be suggesting a term.

*Hervey moved, C. P. Wilson seconded, that WD adopt the recommendations as presented in the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Regional Research Philosophy. PASSED unanimously.*

#### DISCUSSION

Linsley, based upon the thinking and discussion of RRC, preferred provision be made on an individual case basis, to provide for Administrative Advisers to submit arguments for continuation, orderly phase-out, or revision of existing projects, as exceptions to the automatic terminations. There ought to be provisions also for new proposals that might fall outside the areas covered by the task force reports. He commented that the task force reports have turned out to be a workable procedure for developing regional research projects - most of RRC's problems are purely procedural. RRC will make some recommendations that they feel will make their role more effective in this procedure - (see RRC Report Item IV).

Kendrick - It was heartening to see that the approach of the task forces was as good as it was. What we in the CRRP sought to advise you to do by way of the interdisciplinary approach is just what has been done by these task forces. They were widely representative of different disciplines, and they looked at overall problems without any axes to grind. They evaluated what has been done and what needs to be done, and proposed that work be done on those problems that they considered to be priority areas of research. These priority areas can be sliced off into workable segments, and research teams assigned to work on them. The task force could come back in a year or two and review, from an overview, again what is their assignment and what has been done to accomplish their recommendations.

- The interdisciplinary approach to research and the task of administrators is to see that all the forces necessary are brought to bear upon a particular problem. This doesn't mean that you put together a working team composed of researchers from cross-discipline areas, or that you put a working team together so that they are in constant communication. You will be influenced by the level where you are standing as to how broad a view you take on problems you are faced with in the organization of which you are a part.

- The interdisciplinary approach can be a hang up, especially when we recognize there are practical difficulties that face all of us when we talk in terms of putting an engineer, social scientist, economist, and biologist all working on the same problem at the same time. This is not the type of thing we were thinking about in the committee when we talked about using the interdisciplinary approach to research.

Buchanan - An interdisciplinary group in its combined form is able, from several different points of view, to identify what are the major problems and to develop the approach that would be appropriate from different points of view to the particular problem chosen. The problem is then chopped up into pieces and each representative of particular disciplines proceeds with his work. Then you reconvene the group in a year or so for a reassessment of the situation.

- The objective is to aid our judgment in developing for the group as a whole what are the most important problems to all of us and to agriculture in the West by doing some assessment work in advance rather than just review proposals as they come in. Rather than proceed as we have done in the past, we could do some assessment in advance to pick out some of the areas that seem important, challenge our groups with these, review their responses on an overall basis without having yet gone to the development of the project stage, then asking them to go to the project development stage. This way we get a better idea as to the significance of the problems than we did in the earlier method.

- The technical committee would not necessarily remain at the mono-disciplinary level. It, too, could be interdisciplinary if appropriate.

Linsley - The RRC Report makes certain assumptions to differentiate between "interdisciplinary" as applied to task forces and technical committees - (see RRC Report Item IV 5).

#### Report by Administrative Advisers of Task Forces

Robins - There were certain similarities as to how the different task forces ultimately functioned. They all

started out with rather diverse groups representing several disciplines, and they had to get to know each other first. It soon became more apparent that they had discarded their disciplinary interests and were looking at a broader overview of the total problem. Then, attempts were made to identify broader areas they felt would lead to a regional approach. For the interdisciplinary approach to work, these people need to continue to communicate with each other periodically.

Burris noted the task forces, and later RRC, had to select priority projects from among numerous alternatives. The kinds of projects that came out of this system differ from those we are used to thinking about. Most of Burris' comments related to essentially procedural problems.

Ensign raised a question regarding how much interdisciplinary planning there is among the many kinds of committees we now have.

Kendrick - There is a real and important challenge facing WD in administering regional research, namely, getting in touch with other people who can give an overview to the total problem. In addition to getting these task forces together for an interdisciplinary approach to problems, there is also the opportunity to focus available attention and funds on problems common to the West. They may not be the most important problems nationally, but they should be the most important ones to be faced as far as the West is concerned.

- After defining the most important areas for the West, we can then plug in those areas considered most important from the viewpoint of individual states or sub-regions of the West. A challenge to administering a master plan for achieving particular research is to provide a desirable working environment so as to motivate your researchers to want to become more involved.

Robins commented on the commendable attitude taken by Dr. S. Hart (U. C., Davis) during the meeting of the Task Force on Pollution, in recognizing the need for interdisciplinary research.

Robins noted the task force had little difficulty setting forth problem areas, but they differed as to priorities. There was insufficient criteria and direction from WD for arriving at such priorities.

Hill conceded he wasn't very enthusiastic at Hawaii about this task force approach; however, he now feels that the approach will work. He suggested a possible alternative approach that might be considered later, namely, that each WD might indicate how he would reduce by, say, one-half, the number of projects in which his station will participate. The Recording Secretary could tabulate this and report back to the WD group. (No motion was made.)

Hill noted one thing that came out of all the task forces is that everybody saw a need for economics. With some reconstitution, and some additions to some of the existing task forces, they will likely continue. The virtue of the interdisciplinary approach was in the overview. The people who were on these task forces did not see themselves as a technical committee. They were of the opinion that an interdisciplinary committee is a good thing to take a look at what should be done, but personnel on such a committee are not necessarily the ones that should do the work.

Leyendecker noted the CSRS and ARS representatives on his committee did a good job helping to broaden the visions of task force members to think on a regional level. The final report of the group was encouraging.

C. P. Wilson commented that we wouldn't have had a Committee on Regional Research Philosophy if we had all been comfortable with the program we had. He urged that the next step be carried out for authorization of additional task forces and dealing with some of the transitional problems that have been mentioned and that many of us see.

Jensen suggested the WD should assure that the intent of the motion is that there would be enough flexibility to enable us to take care of unanticipated problems, (including the handling of termination problems associated with existing projects). Kraus and Hervey commented that the motion does not preclude such flexibility.

Buchanan - At Denver, the Committee on Regional Research Philosophy suggested, with two members of RRC present, that RRC should proceed to examine and select project area proposals appropriate for recommendation to WD, not only from the new task force reports, but also from the list of projects scheduled for termination with the thought that some of those might be included, and also to provide for the input of proposals that might come from outside the system of task forces or existing projects.

Rasmussen, commenting on the concept of Western Regional Coordinating Committees, noted that WD will have to keep WRCC under control so as not to overspend available funds. There are about three different ways in which these WRCC's might come about:

1. Motivation for the creation of WRCC might be petitioned from among the scientists themselves who know they are engaged in a problem of regional concern that needs coordination and who can see a need for a mechanism for getting together that might not otherwise be available to them - such as through scientific or regional society meetings.

2. Occasionally the funding of some regional research projects might be terminated, but there may be some unfinished business that could be finished if we permitted them to meet a time or two to phase out the work they have going. It is not intended, however, that WRCC be made a dumping ground or palliative for old projects.
3. WD might see areas that need further consideration, and it is our prerogative to suggest the creation of appropriate WRCC's so as to bring people together to improve the work they are doing. Out of such committees might come suggested proposals that will lead to funded regional research projects.

M. L. Wilson commented that we, as a group, can make WRCC work. Regional coordinating committees are working in the Great Plains Council and have been for years. There are some real good regional research projects set up by the Great Plains Council, and they are not using regional research funds. A lot of good information has come out of these projects, just as good as from regular regionally funded research projects. This type of mechanism, if we want to consider it, might well work with the WRCC. Decisions will be made as you go along as to what types of projects and which ones we will have as WRCC.

\*\*\*\*\*

*Linsley moved, Wood seconded, that WD authorize the present Ad Hoc Committee on Regional Research Philosophy to follow through with the selection of appropriate new task force areas and administrative advisers. PASSED.*

Supplemental Report of Ad Hoc Committee on Regional Research Philosophy, July 25, 1969

Hervey - The Ad Hoc Committee on Regional Research Philosophy recommends that:

- "I. Regional research projects for recommended areas of work approved at this meeting should be ready for activation July 1, 1970.
- "II. The following additional task forces should be activated as soon as possible in FY '70, and they should submit their reports to the Western Directors by January 15, 1970. In making this recommendation, the Committee assumes that favorable action by the Western Directors in their 1970 spring meeting, on recommended areas of work contained in the January 15, 1970 reports, will result in regional research project proposals ready for review by RRC and WD at their 1971 spring meeting, and that those projects approved at that time should be ready for activation in the system by July 1, 1971.

Task Force

Administrative Adviser

- "I. Marketing and Competition,  
Foreign Agricultural Trade  
and Economic Development C. P. Wilson

(This task force was approved by WD at their 1969 spring meeting but because the report of the National Task Force was not available earlier, it is just now being activated.)

2. Farm Adjustments, Prices and Income C. O. McCorkle  
3. Farm Labor and Mechanization R. K. Frevert  
4. Rural Development and Family Living G. B. Wood

- "III. The Committee believes that the following additional National Task Force areas contain regional research problems of high priority to the West, and recommends that consideration be given by WD at this time next year to the establishment of corresponding Western Regional Task Forces that would be formulated in FY '71:

- A. Food Safety  
B. Forage, Range and Pasture  
C. Soil and Land Use

"Task Forces formulated in FY '71 ought to have regional research projects in the system and ready for activation by July 1, 1972.

- "IV. The Committee has not yet had opportunity to act upon recommendations of RRC which were referred to it by the Western Directors in actions of July 24, 1969, but will plan to have a report to present at the November meeting. Written procedures will be provided to each Administrative Adviser of Task Forces being initiated, based upon Minutes of the Planning Session held in Berkeley, March 13-14, 1969, and upon recommendations of Administrative Advisers of the initial Task Forces."

*Hervey moved, Wood seconded, that Western Directors approve this report, and authorize the formation in FY '70 of the four Task Forces mentioned under Item II of this report.*  
PASSED.

DISCUSSION

Hervey requested Administrative Advisers of existing task forces to furnish him with recommendations on procedures as to forming a task force, calling meetings, and so on.

Hill questioned the rationale that all of the next four task forces are strong in the areas of agricultural economics and the social sciences. Is it the CRRP opinion that these are the highest priority areas?

Hervey, in response, noted that the Committee was looking at things that seem to be of national and regional concern. This is in contrast to many of our production type of research areas that are not necessarily regional - many of these can be solved on a state by state basis or some other way. The Committee will likely come up with some commodity oriented recommendations at a later date.

Kendrick suggested some topics and various commodity areas and some prospects for their likelihood of support, namely:

Bees and other pollinating insects, and insects affecting man - The thing that might interest us as a possible topic to select would be insects affecting man.

Corn and grain sorghums are not necessarily applicable to the West.

Cotton is of significance in three states, but it is likely to receive support from other sources.

Dairy, Fruits and Vegetable Crops - These commodity areas have important problems of major concern in the West, but the most important problems will probably be covered in the new task forces to be set up this year.

New Crops - Minor oilseeds are important, but they are already being covered in regional research which probably should be continued. USDA is also doing work in this area.

Peanuts, Soybeans, Swine, and Tobacco are not applicable to regional research in the West.

Poultry, Sugar, Sheep and Other Animals - These have relatively low priority as areas for regional research in the West at this time.

Rice probably is only applicable to California.

Wheat and Other Small Grains - USDA conducts a good program of a regional nature in this area.

Weather Modification is pre-empted by other agencies largely by the kind of activity that is taking care of it, although we are engaged also in that type of research.

Kendrick indicated these are some of the reasons why the Committee did not recommend at this time that regional task forces be set up in these areas.

Thorne questioned the adequacy of the task forces, and was concerned lest some areas in need of research might not fit into one of the task forces and might fall through the slats.

Hervey - Proposals for significant emerging problem areas of a special nature that are in need of research can always come forth.

Kendrick - The existing task forces have made some recommendations that are important. The new task forces proposed will make recommendations they feel are important. The Committee on Regional Research Philosophy hopes RRC will not overlook recommendations of prior task forces in relation to recommendations from the new task forces when evaluating those things they will recommend to WD for consideration as possible new areas to be activated as regular regional projects.

Following the RRC Report, Hill raised a question about the prospects for changing the status of the existing four standing advisory committees to WD.

The consensus of the group was to continue them until the CRRP comes up with a recommendation.

Rasmussen - The Administrative Advisers might note whether their advisory committees can perform a productive role once their traditional responsibilities are removed.

Hervey requested that Administrative Advisers of WAERC, WSWRC, WHERAC, and WSRAC prepare written comments regarding their views and recommendations as to the prospects for changing the status of these standing advisory committees, and that copies of these written comments be sent to members of the CRRP as soon as possible.

Chairman Kraus asked the CRRP to come up with a specific report at either the November 1969 meeting or by the 1970 spring meeting. The report should include procedures for working into this new system, where the existing advisory committees fit into this new system in relation to the WRRRC, and related matters regarding the integration of the four standing advisory committees of WD into the new system.

Ad Hoc Arid  
Lands Committee

Hill - The Arid Lands Meeting at Tucson has been held - it was successful. All we were ever asked to do was invite WD to support the conference by sending their personnel to the meetings.

WAERC

C. P. Wilson - As reported in November 1968, WAERC restructured its advisory committees. In recent years the Council has had four committees, namely: Marketing, Farm Management, Water, and Range. The new standing committees are three in number, namely:

1. Commercial Agriculture - This encompasses farm management and marketing, as well as agri-business;
2. Natural Resource Development - This encompasses water and range, as well as forestry and pollution; and
3. Community and Human Resources Development.

- WAERC met in Oregon last week, at which time guidelines to the new committees were distributed - see APPENDIX E. The personnel of the new committees met with WAERC the afternoon of July 18, 1969, for orientation, and then met separately as committees.

- They were somewhat bewildered. Just after the Council reorganized its committees, the Western Directors adopted the recommendations for the regional task forces, and the concept of the Western Regional Coordinating Committees. The greatest single concern of WAERC and the committees was the effect of the action of the Western Directors in accepting and initiating action on the basis of the Committee on Regional Research Philosophy. Their concern stemmed from the following points:

1. Would the role of WAERC and its committees change and, if so, in what way?
2. With the emphasis on interdisciplinary (or interdepartmental) research, would agricultural economists be fragmented among 32 (or 24) task forces and a similar number of projects?
3. If so, would economists be waiting 10 or 15 years for biologists to collect data for economic analyses?
4. If so, would agricultural economists be given roles and resources by their Director with which to also do within-discipline research?
5. Is decision-making on research becoming increasingly centralized?
6. What will be the result of the moratorium on new projects during the interim period as seven existing regional projects terminate?
7. If the new WRCC Committees are formed would the three WAERC Committees be eligible for travel support from RRF so that Farm Foundation funds can be utilized for other purposes?

- WAERC has requested that Western Directors take action on two specific syllabi proposals that were submitted previously (see page 39 of the 1969 spring Minutes), if the moratorium were lifted. The proposals were:

1. "Study of the Impact of Certain Innovations and Structural Changes in the Marketing of Livestock and Meats."

This proposal parallels closely a priority recommendation in the Report of the Task Force on Beef Cattle.

2. "An Economic Analysis of the Implications of Structural Change in Agriculture."

This proposal falls in a category not yet assigned to a regional task force.

Wilson noted that he sat in on the meeting of WAERC's new Committee on Community and Human Resources Development. They reviewed a number of rather new and proposed new State projects. They had a fascinating discussion that showed the Committee has considerable enthusiasm and promise, but Wilson urged them to experiment with their ideas and not attempt to come to a consensus on a regional project proposal too soon.

Wilson - There is very great desire on the part of WAERC to have liaison with WSRAC.

- WAERC will respond to a request for significant accomplishments in Agricultural Experiment Station research in the field of Agricultural Economics for Dr. Knoblauch's book.

#### WSWRC

*Frevert moved, Burris seconded, that Western Directors authorize approval of a WSWRC request for a meeting of a work group on "Disposal of Solid Wastes Through Soils and Waters." The meeting will take place sometime between August 1 and November 30, 1969. PASSED.*

#### DISCUSSION

Robins noted the area this group is looking at has already been up for consideration by RRC and there was no recommendation to Western Directors. A work group of our regional advisory groups would look at things well beyond regional considerations.

Hervey - If this group were to meet they ought to understand what Western Directors think the objectives of such a session should be, namely: They should not meet to try to draw up a regional project outline; their meeting should be for the purpose that we have the WRCC, namely that of coordinating research and the interchange of information, ideas, and so on. As for the future, if they think they would need to get together again in a year or so, they could follow the WRCC plan of submitting a one to two page proposal to become a regular WRCC.

- We still have the authority to set up ad hoc work groups. WRCC was not intended to replace such groups; in fact it was assumed they would more or less come under it.

Kraus - If this group meets an Administrative Adviser ought to meet with them to explain our current situation regarding WRCC and our new technical committees that will arise out of our task force groups.

Kendrick - The above motion was passed with the understanding that if this group wants such a meeting again, they ought to consider becoming a WRCC and ought to request permission to come under the new system as a WRCC.

#### WHERAC

No report.

#### WSRAC

Wood introduced the following subcommittee representatives of WSRAC: Orville Thompson, Chairman (University of California, Davis); Joseph Ackerman (Farm Foundation); Paul Jehlik (CSRS); A'Delbert Samson (Montana State University). This committee presented information regarding "Emerging Social Problem Areas." Ackerman and Jehlik presented two major papers. Thompson and Samson presented some information as to what is going on in their respective states in terms of sociological types of research.

Ackerman's paper was entitled "The Role of Rural Sociology and Other Behavioral Sciences in Social Change." In it he notes among other things:

1. Neglect of the human factor often leads to our failure in projected programs.
2. Change has been instrumental in keeping our rural economy out of balance with the rest of our economy.
3. A brief historical perspective of the growth of sociological research.
4. Employment opportunities in present-day organizations and institutions will rapidly become obsolete due to rapid economic growth and also technological change.
5. We place a high value on change and economic progress, and it is this progress that is changing the basic structure of agriculture. Answers are needed to questions like:
  - a. What are the values, attitudes, and goals of farm people?
  - b. What can be done to facilitate personal adjustments to change? and
  - c. What is an optimum, acceptable rate of change?

Such questions will have an important bearing on the kinds of programs that will be proposed and will be acceptable and the answers to many of these questions will have to come from rural sociological research.

6. We must interpret the new place of rural America in our changing society.
7. Behavioral Scientists no longer should need to work around the fringes of major problems in an attempt to compete for resources with other agricultural scientists. They should obtain recognition through the substantial contributions they can make to the understanding of these problems.

Jehlik's paper was entitled "The Role of Rural Sociology and Other Behavioral Sciences in Social Change with Reference to the Western Region." In it he notes among other things:

1. Some rural areas have problems of increasing population and transition from farming pursuits, while others have problems of decreasing population.
2. Regarding change, the problem is not if we will have change but rather how best to harness change for the optimum benefit to our society.
3. There are several recent reports that seek to indicate a new role or measure the well-being of rural America in our changing society. Two of the numerous reports mentioned were: "Communities of Tomorrow -- Agriculture/2000," - a USDA Task Force Report; and "Toward a Social Report," - a U. S. HEW Committee Report. (This report represents a preliminary step to develop social indicators as a measure of the health and well-being of our society. This could be used as a complement to the economic indicators.)
4. A summary of rural changes in the West during 1960-1966 indicates:
  - a. Growth on the West Coast is largely metropolitan;
  - b. Only 1/3 of rural counties grew much even though major urban and metropolitan areas grew rapidly;
  - c. In the four corners area, above average economic development efforts are needed; and
  - d. Major problem rural areas in the region, as measured by population loss and migration trends are in the Mountain West.

5. Some emerging social problems in the West in need of research are:
- a. More complete information for understanding change as it affects people, institutions, communications, values; and so on;
  - b. We lack a systems approach to rural problems. - Only 1/4 of the rural communities in the U. S. are effectively organized. W-105, "Criteria for Defining Rural Development Areas," is beginning to tackle one aspect of this problem;
  - c. We need to provide more planning information to enable rural people to adjust to the future;
  - d. Analyses of the diffusion and adoption of farm and home practices, on decision processes in general, and in the area of communication, particularly for use among the disadvantaged populations;
  - e. We need more study of the means of motivating desires for higher levels of living, particularly among the disadvantaged segment of our population;
  - f. Serious thought needs to be given to the dynamic impact social changes in the U. S. are having on the use and management of our natural resources;
  - g. There is a need for concentrating more attention to the poverty problem in an effort to obtain a better understanding of the situations, and the means by which such problems may be identified and tackled.

In the broadest sense, sociology can contribute "understanding" to agricultural action and development programs. More narrowly, Jehlik gave some examples of the contributions of sociological research.

Thompson distributed a list of "Problems for Research in the Western Region" that was compiled by WSRAC - see APPENDIX F.

Wood, on behalf of the Western Directors, made some complimentary remarks and presented a special certificate recognizing Dr. Joseph Ackerman. Among other things, Wood called attention to Ackerman's interest and concern in his role, as Managing Director of the Farm Foundation, toward agricultural research in the improvement in the understanding of people, and about problems relating to the social area. Wood noted that Ackerman created a lot of change, opened up new dimensions, and started a lot of things going, including the implementation and support of WAERC and WSRAC. Both of these groups were developed through his working relationships with the Western Directors.

REPORT OF THE WESTERN REGIONAL RESEARCH COMMITTEE  
to  
WESTERN DIRECTORS

Bozeman, Montana  
July 24, 1969

Chairman Linsley called the RRC meeting to order at 8:45 a.m. on July 21, 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 (Alternate)  
C. F. Sierk, CSRS  
C. P. Wilson  
J. S. Robins  
L. R. Gray, Recording Secretary

The Regional Research Committee met on July 21 and 22, 1969, in the Student Union Building, Montana State University. The following matters were considered, although not necessarily in the order here presented:

I. FUNDING LEVELS FOR CERTAIN WESTERN REGIONAL PROJECTS

Dr. Carl F. Sierk, CSRS representative, called attention to the fact that the Committee of Nine had questioned the funding patterns on several projects in the Western Region. RRC agreed to call the problem to the attention of Western Directors and suggested that CSRS also transmit the information to the Administrative Advisers concerned. The projects, number of states participating, and levels of support from all sources reported by the Directors for 1970 are as follows (one terminated project has been omitted):

WM-35, Facilitating the Marketing of Seed Through Improved Assessment of Seed Quality Factors. (States: 2; funding \$42,218)

W-93, Independent Housing for the Elderly. (States: 3; funding \$13,466)

W-97, Assessing Big Game Management Alternatives Through Bioeconomic Models. (States: 3; funding \$28,288)

W-109, Codling Moth Population Management in the Orchard Ecoseystem. (States: 2; funding \$13,593)

RRC recognizes that many factors may have contributed to this situation but suggests that Directors from states currently interested in these projects may wish to examine the extent of their commitments to the programs.

II. USE OF RRF SPECIAL ALLOCATION TO REGIONAL PROJECT W-6

At the February 1969 meeting of the Western Directors, a special allocation of \$18,400 for FY 1970 was made to W-6, The Introduction, Multiplication, Preservation and Determination of the Value of New Plants for Industrial and Other Purposes, for the development of facilities at the Plant Introduction Station in Washington which were being moved to a new site in the state. Director

M. L. Wilson, Administrative Adviser to W-6, reported to RRC that the Washington State Agricultural Experiment Station has agreed to attempt to purchase 8.3 acres immediately adjacent to the new location which contain two residences, an excellent machine shop, two large equipment storage buildings and a two-room bunkhouse, at a price of approximately \$50,000. The Washington Station has offered to make these facilities available to the Plant Introduction Station and to provide the additional funds required to carry out the plan, provided that the \$18,400 previously allocated to the project for FY 1970 can be made available to help out with the purchase. RRC regards this as an appropriate use of the special allocation and recommends that the offer of the Washington State Agricultural Experiment Station be accepted by the Western Directors and that Director Wilson's proposal be endorsed.

*[Linsley moved, C. P. Wilson seconded, that these recommendations be adopted. PASSED.]*

### III. CHANGE IN ASSIGNMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE ADVISER

Newly appointed Chancellor James Meyer of the Davis Campus, University of California, has resigned as Administrative Adviser for W-1, Beef Cattle Breeding. RRC recommends that Director Martin Burris be designated Administrative Adviser of W-1 until project termination on June 30, 1970.

Linsley - Bohmont and other Western Directors have raised the question of continuing W-1.

- RRC recommends this matter be placed in the hands of the new Administrative Adviser (Burris), and that he meet with W-1 and report back to RRC.

*[Linsley moved, Hill seconded, that WD adopt the above recommendations. PASSED.]*

### IV. REVIEW OF WESTERN REGIONAL TASK FORCE REPORTS

The principal assignment of RRC for this meeting was to review the reports of the task forces authorized by the Western Directors at the February 1969 meeting. Five of the six task forces selected submitted their reports prior to the meeting of RRC.

General Comments and Background Information: In attempting to carry out its charge to review the task force reports, identify areas of high priority and make recommendations to the Western Directors concerning them, RRC has proceeded on the basis of a number of assumptions:

- A. That the charge was a general one and not intended to be interpreted literally in the language of the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Regional Research Philosophy (there are some difficulties here that could not have been anticipated until the task force reports had been received);
- B. That each of the broad research areas assigned to a task force had a high priority rating in the Western Region;
- C. That task force recommendations supporting priority programs could, in effect, be regarded as syllabi justifying areas of research but that the details would not be binding on any ad hoc committees authorized to develop project outlines;

- D. That outlines authorized for development by the Western Directors at this meeting will be available for RRC review and recommendation not later than February 1970;
- E. That the broad interdisciplinary nature characteristic of the task force approach should be reflected to the extent feasible in the outlines prepared for regional research projects but that the interdisciplinary test would vary in its nature from project to project (i.e., it is not necessary that biological, physical and social scientists be represented on each project, but if a project, of necessity, is oriented within one or two of the broad disciplines, an appropriate mix of subdisciplines should be involved);
- F. That in selecting areas of work for possible activation as regional research projects, RRC in making recommendations to the Western Directors should take into account termination dates for Western Regional projects which fall within the broad research area assigned to each task force, as well as the possible relation of potential new projects to those currently active in other regions. RRC assembled lists of projects in both categories and, for the benefit of the Directors in passing judgment on RRC recommendations for new projects for FY 1970, we present the following list of Western Regional Projects judged to fall on the whole, or in part, in each task force area, arranged by termination date, with the number of participating Western States and level of western funding for FY 1970 included in parentheses:

#### Beef Cattle

- 1970: WM-48, Livestock Marketing Efficiency and Pricing in the West.  
(States: 12; funding: \$202,000)
- W-1, The Improvement of Beef Cattle Through the Application of Breeding Methods. (States: 10; funding: \$496,285)
- W-88, Enteric Diseases of Neonatal Calves. (States: 10; funding: \$287,155)
- 1971: W-94, Range Livestock Nutrition. (States: 10; funding: \$291,232)
- W-95, Endocrine Mechanisms Controlling Bovine Reproduction. (States: 9; funding: \$202,725)
- 1972: WM-33, Identification and Clarification of Biochemical and Biophysical Factors Related to Beef Quality and Marketability. (States: 6; funding: \$181,516)
- 1973: W-102, Biological Methods of Control of Internal Parasites of Livestock. (States: 9; funding: \$255,849)
- 1974: W-46, The Effects of Environmental Stresses on Beef Cattle and Sheep Production. (States: 6; funding: \$134,499)

#### Environmental Quality

- 1970: W-85, Factors Affecting Nitrogen Availability in Western Soils.  
(States: 7; funding: \$61,652)

- 1973: W-45, Residues of Selected Pesticides - their Nature, Distribution, and Persistence in Plants, Animals, and the Physical Environment. (States: 9; funding: \$327,268)
- 1974: W-82, Soils, Pesticides, and the Quality of Water. (States: 9; funding: \$174,326)
- W-84, Environmental Improvement Through Biological Control and Pest Management. (States: 8; funding: \$135,112)
- W-107, Management of Salt Load in Irrigation Agriculture. (States: 3; funding: \$20,725)
- W-108, Response of Plants and Plant Communities to Sustained Use of Herbicides. (States: 10; funding: \$97,332)

#### Food and Nutrition

- 1971: WM-55, Methods of Measuring Textural Quality of Fruits and Vegetables. (States: 5; funding: \$53,408)
- WM-57, Consumption and Use Patterns for Dairy Products and Their Substitutes. (States: 8; funding: \$65,949)
- W-91, Species Differences in Lipid Metabolism in Man and Certain Laboratory Animals. (States: 8; funding: \$129,869)
- 1973: W-57, Amino Acid Utilization as Affected by Vitamins. (States: 6; funding: \$127,728)

#### Forestry

- 1970: WM-60, The Market for Pine Lumber in the Millwork Industry in the Western Region. (States: 6; funding: \$48,749)
- W-71, The Effect on Ponderosa Pine Seedling Establishment of Genetical and Environmental Factors. (States: 5; funding: \$38,265)
- 1972: WM-59, An Economic Study of the Demand for Outdoor Recreation. (States: 8; funding: \$77,064)
- W-97, Assessing Big Game Management Alternatives Through Bio-Economic Models. (States: 3; funding: \$28,288)

#### Water and Watersheds

- 1971: W-65, Hydraulics of Surface Irrigation. (States: 7; funding: \$100,396)
- 1974: W-51, Dynamics of Flow Into Drainage Facilities. (States: 6; funding: \$118,653)
- W-67, Quantification of Water-Soil-Plant Relations for Efficient Water Use. (States: 7; funding: \$116,677)
- W-68, Soil-Water Movement in Arid and Semi-Arid Soils. (States: 7; funding: \$66,435)

W-82, Soils, Pesticides, and the Quality of Water. (States: 9; funding: \$174,326)

W-107, Management of Salt Load in Irrigation Agriculture. (States: 3; funding: \$20,725)

Related projects in other regions and their termination dates include the following:

Beef Cattle: NC-1 (1972), NE-24 (1971), NE-40 (1970), NE-41 (1970), SM-19 (1970), S-10 (1971), S-45 (1970), and S-67 (1973)

Environmental Quality: NC-85 (1970), NE-36 (1972), NE-39 (1971), NE-53 (1971), NE-56 (1971), NE-63 (1972), NE-62 (1972), S-18 (1971), S-22 (197 ), S-58 (1974) and S-62 (1974).

Food and Nutrition: NC-91 (1973), NE-52 (1972), SM-34 (1971), SM-35 (1971), and S-64 (1972).

Forestry: NC-51 (1970), NC-92 (1972), NE-25 (1971), NE-27 (1970), and S-23 (1971).

Water and Watersheds: NE-48 (1970) and S-53 (1972).

In addition to the assumptions which RRC felt called upon to make in order to try and meet its assignment, several troublesome problems were encountered which for one reason or another could not be met by ad hoc procedures. Among these were:

1. Lack of direct communication with task force administrative advisers during the time when the reports were under review. In the future, it would be extremely helpful to RRC, and we believe in the best interests of the program, if task force advisers were invited to present their reports in person during the RRC meeting at which they are scheduled for consideration. RRC recommends that the Western Directors endorse this procedure.

*[Linsley moved, Frevert seconded, that WD adopt this recommendation. PASSED.]*

2. Absence of guidelines as to the status of task force reports which have been reviewed and responded to once by RRC and the Western Directors but which contain residual high priority items. Instructions are needed as to how to handle this problem in relation to new task force recommendations which will presumably be received annually during the transition period in the years ahead. RRC recommends that the Western Directors request the Regional Research Philosophy Committee to study this question and propose guidelines for consideration by the Directors before the next group of task force reports are to be reviewed.

*[Linsley moved, Wood seconded, that WD adopt this recommendation. PASSED.]*

3. Implications of the termination program initiated at the Spring 1969 meeting for projects which RRC and the Western Directors might regard as viable, high priority projects for extension or revision, but which

have not yet come under the purview of a task force. RRC recommends that the Regional Research Philosophy Committee be asked to propose to the Directors guidelines for meeting this problem within the framework of termination patterns to be implemented during the transition period.

*[Linsley moved, Bohmont seconded, that WD adopt this recommendation. PASSED.]*

4. Unevenness of priority evaluation in task force reports both in quantitative and qualitative terms and an uneasy feeling on the part of RRC that the task forces may have had differing views as to how the Directors would respond to priorities which were proposed in the report, and that some of the priorities were reached by consensus, some by compromise, and some by conviction. RRC recommends that the Committee on Regional Research Philosophy re-examine its task force guidelines to determine whether or not a clarification of the statement regarding the establishment of priorities might be desirable.

*[Linsley moved, Hill seconded, that WD adopt this recommendation. PASSED.]*

5. Uncertainty as to how the interdisciplinary nature of newly activated technical committees can be assured. RRC recommends that Administrative Advisers be authorized to assist in the selection of Technical Committee members, in consultation with each Interested Director and agency in order to maximize the potential for multidisciplinary representation.

*[Linsley moved, Bohmont seconded, that WD adopt this recommendation. PASSED.]*

Burris asked whether there was any admonition among the Western Directors about having more than one representative from a station on a technical committee. Each director would decide whether he wants to fund two or more people. Whoever is the representative on the technical committee should also be involved in the research, and should be interested and committed to work on the project. Some of the type projects emerging from the task force efforts will be quite broad, and will require wider disciplinary representation than those we have had in the past.

Ensign - An action of Western Directors several years ago was that there would be one representative per state supported with regional research funds, unless there were more than one phase of the project.

Kraus indicated this matter could well be covered as part of the Regional Research Philosophy Committee's recommendations on procedures.

Sierk noted that with W-106, each Director can decide how and for what purposes to use his state's RRF.

RRC Recommendations on Task Force Reports. After consideration of each of the Regional Task Force Reports, RRC submits the following comments and recommendations:

1. Beef Cattle. Four broad areas for potential interdisciplinary regional research were identified by this task force without indication of

priorities. While recognizing the importance of all four areas, RRC (with Director Burris, Administrative Adviser to the Task Force abstaining from the vote) recommends that "Reproductive Performance" be approved as an area of work and that an Administrative Adviser be designated to assemble an interdisciplinary technical committee, in consultation with the Director of each state and agency wishing to participate, to develop a regional project outline for review by RRC and Western Directors at the Spring Meeting, 1970. Further, RRC recommends that Vice President Jensen be designated Administrative Adviser.

*[Linsley moved, Wood seconded, that WD adopt these recommendations. PASSED.]*

There was some discussion about having reproductive performance relate to dairy as well as beef. It was noted that the Administrative Adviser will send out a guideline statement to SAES Directors. *No action was taken.*

Burris - The Administrative Adviser should be charged with eliminating anyone from the project who does not make a real contribution. Those not making a real contribution ought not be allowed to participate.

Kraus - In the initial stage, each state ought to participate as they see fit. Once the project is on the way, then Burris' comment may well apply.

Ensign - What is the status of projects on terminations? Is it a specific responsibility of a technical committee or interest group to make a proposal to the Western Directors that they be considered for WRCC?

Rasmussen - No new problems on termination have been created. Proposals for WRCC should be drafted and submitted when propitious and they will be received anytime.

Sierk - There is a problem of perpetuating a committee once it is established. Too many technical committees tend to spend the last year or two developing new projects to perpetuate themselves. The present C/9 policy is that projects will not be approved for more than five years.

2. Environmental Quality. This task force identified six areas of importance to environmental quality in the West but established no priorities among them. RRC recommends that "Nitrogen in the Environment" be approved as an area of work, and that Director Robins be designated Administrative Adviser and authorized to assemble an interdisciplinary technical committee, in consultation with the Directors of each state and agency wishing to participate, to develop a regional project outline for review by RRC and Western Directors at the Spring Meeting, 1970.

*[Linsley moved, C. P. Wilson seconded, that WD adopt this recommendation. PASSED.]*

In addition, RRC recommends that an ad hoc Committee be authorized to examine the area of "Economic and Social Implications of Environmental Pollution" in order to determine what problems are researchable, which of these, if any, are peculiar to the West, and whether or not this is

an area in which the Western Region might wish to take the lead in developing a national regional research effort. Further, RRC recommends that Vice President Kendrick be designated Administrative Adviser to this Committee and authorized to develop its membership in consultation with the Directors of each state and agency wishing to participate, with the understanding that a report will be available for review by RRC and the Western Directors by July 1, 1970.

*[Linsley moved, Robins seconded, that WD adopt these recommendations. PASSED.]*

Finally, RRC shares the view that the activities of W-45, "Residues of Selected Pesticide - Their Nature, Distribution, and Persistence in Plants, Animals and the Physical Environment," and W-82, "Soils, Pesticides, and the Quality of Water," be more closely coordinated. RRC recommends that the statement of the Task Force under the heading "Pesticide" be transmitted to the Administrative Advisers of W-45 and W-82 for their information and consideration.

*[Linsley moved, C. P. Wilson seconded, that WD adopt this recommendation. PASSED.]*

Hervey, regarding W-45 and W-82, suggested the Administrative Advisers may wish to consider possibilities of re-orientation so as to emerge with one new regional research project proposal.

3. Food and Nutrition. This Task Force identified five research problems in the Western Region, three of which were regarded as the most appropriate for regional research. After reviewing current research area emphasis in the West, regional or otherwise, with some consideration of research activity in other Regions, RRC recommends the "Effect of Nutrition on Mental and Physical Development and Behavior" as an appropriate area of work and that Director Leyendecker be designated Administrative Adviser and authorized to assemble an interdisciplinary technical committee, in consultation with the Directors of each state and agency wishing to participate, to develop a regional project outline for review by RRC and the Western Directors at the spring meeting, 1970.

Further, RRC recommends the subject area "Methodology in Food and Nutrition Educational Program" for consideration as a possible Western Regional Coordinating Committee Project and that Director Bohmont be designated Administrative Adviser and authorized to assemble an appropriate committee to formalize a proposal in terms of the WRCC criteria recommended by the Committee on Regional Research Philosophy and adopted by the Western Directors during the present meeting.

*[Linsley moved, Wood seconded, adoption of the above recommendations. PASSED.]*

4. Forestry. The Forestry Task Force identified 17 areas of research, of which 10 were assigned priorities. RRC, after reviewing the Task Force Report believes that Priorities I and II, with some modification are appropriate areas of work for immediate consideration. Consequently,

RRC recommends (a) that "Interrelationships Between Root Disease Fungi, Their Hosts, and Invasion by Bark Beetles" be approved as an area of work and that Director Rasmussen be designated Administrative Adviser and authorized to assemble an interdisciplinary technical committee, in consultation with the Directors of each state and agency wishing to participate, to develop a regional project outline for review by RRC and the Western Directors at the spring meeting, 1970;

*[Linsley moved, Bohmont seconded, adoption of the above recommendation. PASSED.]*

and (b) that "Methodology for Evaluating Alternate and Multiple Uses of Land" (Task Force Priority II), including related aspects of Task Force Priority VII (Appraisal of Resources for Recreational Use) and the last two unclassified priorities ("Income Potential of Private and Public Recreational Areas;" "Intensified Utilization of Game Resources"), be approved as an area of work and that Director Zivnaska be named Administrative Adviser and authorized to assemble an interdisciplinary technical committee, in consultation with the Directors of each state and agency wishing to participate, to develop a regional project outline for review by RRC and the Western Directors at the spring meeting, 1970.

*[Linsley moved, Bohmont seconded, adoption of the above recommendation. PASSED.]*

5. Water and Watersheds. RRC regards the report of this task force as very comprehensive, factual and straightforward in the sense that it related the recommendations and priorities to ongoing regional research. Four high priority research areas were identified and RRC recognizes each of these as important. However, when the present program in water research is evaluated in terms of commitment of SMY's and dollar resources in this broad area, RRC sees no immediate need for new regional projects at this time. Five of the six projects now active have termination dates five years hence and represent one of the largest current research commitments in the Region. (The dollar allocations in FY '70 alone exceed \$1.5 million in the Western Region.) RRC recommends that Administrative Advisers for W-51, W-65, W-67, W-68, W-82 and W-107 review this report with their respective technical committees and give consideration, where appropriate, to altering the makeup of the committees to broaden the disciplinary base of the programs. RRC also recommends that during FY 1971, the Task Force on Water and Watersheds be reconvened to review progress in the interim and to make a report to the Directors through RRC on the state of Western regional research in this area and to make such recommendations as may be deemed appropriate at that time.

*[Linsley moved, Wood seconded, adoption of the above recommendations. PASSED.]*

Robins raised a question about amending and extending the involvement of WSWRC in a review of the water and watershed recommendation, subject to the action of the Committee on Regional Research Philosophy. This idea was put in the form of a motion and later withdrawn.

Final Comment and Recommendation. RRC was greatly impressed with the response of the Task Forces to the charges given to them by the Western Directors. The reports are particularly impressive in view of the time limitation and other constraints. RRC recommends that a suitable statement be included in the report of the Committee on Resolutions recognizing the contribution of the Task Force members and their Administrative Advisers in helping to implement this first step in the development of a new policy for the administration of Regional Research in the Western Region.

[*Linsley moved, Leyendecker seconded, adoption of the above recommendation. PASSED.*]

\* \* \* \* \*

Following the RRC Report, C. P. Wilson explained that as a result of the delay in issuance of the National Task Force Report, the Western Regional Task Force on "Market Structure, Foreign Aid and Market Development" had not been able to develop a program in this area in time for consideration at this meeting and that, as a result, no marketing projects had been recommended by RRC.

*C. P. Wilson moved, and Leyendecker seconded, that RRC be asked to review and make a recommendation at this meeting regarding the proposal on "Market Coordination" in the Report of the Task Force on Beef Cattle as a possible area of work to be included among those approved by the Directors. PASSED.*

\* \* \* \* \*

#### ADDENDUM TO RRC REPORT

Linsley reported that RRC reconsidered the marketing proposal in the Beef Cattle Task Force Report in the light of the C. P. Wilson motion. As a result, RRC recommends that the area "Market Coordination in Producing, Processing and Distribution of Beef" be approved as an area of work, and that Director C. P. Wilson be designated Administrative Adviser and authorized to assemble an interdisciplinary technical committee, in consultation with the Directors of each State and Agency wishing to participate, to develop a regional project outline for review by RRC and Western Directors at the spring meeting, 1970.

[*Linsley moved, Rasmussen seconded, that Western Directors adopt this recommendation. PASSED.*]

NOTE: Administrative Advisers of ad hoc committees are reminded that they should prepare a brief statement as to their concept of what will be involved in the proposed new area of work. The statement can then be circulated, via CSRS, both within and outside of the Western Region, and the information therein will facilitate decisions on the part of Directors as to the extent of their interest in participation.

Sierk indicated that he in all sincerity commends the Western Directors for their efforts to bring some uncumbersomeness into the regional research program. Linsley as Chairman of RRC deserves particular credit.

Combination of  
Research Interests  
- USDA and SAES

Paul DeLay - There are two organizations doing research on animal diseases and parasites in the U. S., namely:

1. The Schools of Veterinary Medicine and Agricultural Experiment Stations; and
2. The Animal Disease and Parasite Research Division of ARS.

These organizations account for 80 to 90 percent of the SMY's and research monies spent on such research in the U. S.

- More dialogue needs to be developed, not so much with scientists but rather with administrative staffs of the two organizations.

- To establish priorities by regions will be helpful in setting long range goals. Much of the planning depends on a good reporting system in order to evaluate the disease problem in each area.

DeLay showed some slides depicting the organization and program of his Division. He noted locations of the Division's field stations, including the National Animal Diseases Research Laboratory at Ames, Iowa, and the Poultry Disease Laboratory at Athens, Georgia; cooperative SAES stations; and research activities by species in terms of SMY's. His Division has about 190 scientific and 1100 support personnel.

He noted his Division has cooperative agreements and contracts that include over 30 projects with non-federal research teams in 16 states. His Division has considerable dialogue with the Animal Health Division.

Miscellaneous

1. Tolerances of  
Pesticides  
and Outlawing  
of Pesticides

Hill - Some states have moved to outlaw the use of DDT and some have gone further than that to include the use of hydrocarbons. Other states have such legislation pending. Several bills have been introduced in Congress, but none of them were passed. It is the considered opinion of people who know and are working in this field - such as those on the W-45 and IR-4 Technical Committees - that times will get tough, and that SAES Directors ought to keep informed about this, and ought to do what they can to provide the kind of information that is going to be necessary to keep some of these things in use if we really need them.

- The IR-4 Technical Committee has done an excellent job in compiling information from all SAES around the country and getting it before the Food and Drug people to get tolerances that are livable and workable among many of the minor crops.

Day expressed concern that the regulations are tending to work into legislation designed to regulate agricultural technical matters. He cautioned that using this approach, we may arrive at decisions that might not be as rational as would be possible were they to be made on the basis of the full knowledge we have on these matters. If the situation warrants, we should even disagree with our regulatory people.

Myers commented on the role of the chemical industry with respect to the pesticides use problem. He suggested the SAES should get out some information indicating how little pesticides we can use and still get along.

*Hill moved, Frevert seconded, that Western Directors ask our ESCOP representatives to take to ESCOP our position that we view with alarm existing and pending legislations regarding the pesticides use problem, and ask that they take under advisement the preparation of a recommendation to the Secretary of Agriculture. PASSED.*

2. National  
Coordinating  
Committee for  
New Plants

Robins reported for M. L. Wilson on the recommendation of the NCC for New Plants.

*Robins moved, Foote seconded, that Western Directors authorize the participation of the W-6 Technical Committee in the assembly of a 20-year report of accomplishments of the National Coordinating Committee for New Plants. PASSED.*

3. Proposed  
Changes in  
NASU&LGC  
By-Laws

Copies of Proposed By-Laws of the Division of Agriculture, NASU&LGC, were distributed to Western Directors. There were mixed reactions to the proposed organization of the Executive Committee, but there was a consensus that there should be an uneven (rather than even) number of members if there is to be a change.

Kelly read a letter from Keener to members of ESCOP in which he indicated three approaches ESCOP could take regarding the proposed changes, namely:

1. Do nothing and accept it in its present form.
2. Attempt to consolidate comments and suggestions of members into a position which can be circulated for your reaction.
3. Call a meeting of the interim Subcommittee of ESCOP to consider the matter.

Kraus indicated that as Chairman of WD he replied to Keener, suggesting that the interim committee of ESCOP should consider the proposed by-laws.

*Hervey moved, Frevert seconded, that Western Directors recommend through our ESCOP or ESCOP Legislative Subcommittee representatives that we favor the Executive Committee in the Division of Agriculture of NASU&LGC total nine members;*

*that it be composed of two members each from the Experiment Station, Extension, and Resident Instruction Sections, plus three from the Administrative Heads of Agriculture group; and that terms of office be staggered to facilitate continuity. PASSED.*

Kraus indicated he would not be in favor of this motion as passed because it would tie the hands of our ESCOP representatives.

Kendrick suggested that rather than specify numbers, the ESCOP Interim Subcommittee might be asked to allow for continuity.

Myers asked if there would be any objection from the Western Directors if he were to propose an agricultural representative in the NASU&LGC Office in Washington.

Buchanan - There have been attempts in the past to obtain such a representative in Washington for research. The position of the Association was that they had no objection to such a person being located in the offices and associated with Russell Thackrey. They indicated that it would be essential, however, for the agricultural part of the Association (in this case the SAES group) to finance the office.

- It would be entirely appropriate and desirable that the first order of priority project of the overall administrative group, assuming that it is established, be to obtain such a representative for the whole activity - teaching, research, and extension. If necessary, this should be financed at our own expense, under some memorandum of agreement arrangement or whatever procedure of that sort is required in order to get it done.

Kraus suggested the group endorse Buchanan's suggestion.

*Frevert moved, Ensign seconded, that WD favor Buchanan's suggestion, and go on record as favoring having a man related to agriculture on the staff of NASU&LGC. PASSED.*

4. Topic for 1970  
Collaborators'  
Conference

Morgan made some introductory comments and then asked WD to indicate their preference from among three possible topics suggested by WURDD for the 1970 Collaborators' Conference, namely:

1. Pollution Problems in the Processing of Agricultural Products.
2. Processing Mechanically Harvested Crops.
3. Textile Production and Process.

On the first round of balloting, the Western Directors indicated their first choice was Number 1, Pollution Problems in the Processing of Agricultural Products.

Morgan indicated WURDD has a special program that involves in effect providing temporary appointments to university professors and to graduate students. He encouraged Western Directors to encourage their people to take advantage of this program arrangement - at the expense of WURDD.

5. Use of  
Western Direc-  
tors' Special  
Fund

Asleson - Some time ago, WD authorized the use of the Western Directors' Special Fund (formerly the WAERC Fund) for the reimbursement of travel expenses of our representatives to ESCOP and ESCOP Legislative Subcommittee meetings, except for those held at the Land Grant College Meetings.

Asleson proposed that this authorization be expanded to cover the expenses of the West's representative to the meetings of ARPAC.

Asleson distributed financial statements for the Western Directors' Special Fund, and the Director-at-Large Account -- see APPENDIX G.

FY '70 billings for the WD Special Fund have not gone out as yet, but when all payments are in, the Fund should be sufficient to cover expenses claimed during FY '70, but it probably won't be sufficient to cover such expenses for FY '71.

*Robins moved, Wood seconded, that Western Directors expand the authorization for the use of the Western Directors' Special Fund to include reimbursement of travel expenses of our representative to ARPAC meetings, except for those held at the Land Grant College Meetings. PASSED.*

Nominations for  
1969 Elections

Asleson - The report of the Nominating Committee is as follows:

WD Chairman, 1 year	Leyendecker
WD Vice Chairman, 1 year	Kraus
WD Secretary, 1 year	Linsley
RRC, 1 year	Ayres */
RRC, 2 years	Burris */
RRC, 3 years	M. L. Wilson
RRC Alternate, 1 year	Day
C/9, 1 year	-
C/9, 2 years	Hill */
C/9, 3 years	C. P. Wilson
C/9 Alternate, 1 year	Linsley
ESCOP, 1 year	Wood */
ESCOP, 2 years	Asleson */
ESCOP, 3 years	Ely
ESCOP Alternate, 1 year	Robins
ESCOP Legislative Subcommittee, 1 year	Wood */
ESCOP Legislative Subcommittee, 2 years	Asleson
ESCOP Legislative Subcommittee, 3 years	Ely
ESCOP Marketing Subcommittee, as needed	Zivnуска

Other Officers of the WAAESD, not subject to the above nominations are:

ARPAC, 2 years  
WDAL, Continuing  
and

Frevert \*/  
Buchanan \*/

Recording Secretary, Continuing

Gray \*/

\*/ Those continuing in office in terms specified from a previous election. (Wood, as Chairman of ESCOP, will be an ex officio member of the ESCOP Legislative Subcommittee.

*Asleson moved, Hill seconded, for unanimous approval of the slate of nominations submitted by the Nominating Committee. PASSED.*

Hervey called WD attention to the fact that Wood would be Chairman of ESCOP in 1970.

#### Future Meetings

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

Spring 1970 - Western Directors will meet in Berkeley, California, February 25-27, 1970. RRC will meet February 23-24, 1970.

Summer 1970 - Burris moved, Rasmussen seconded, that WD accept the invitation to meet in Utah next summer. PASSED.

Tentative dates for the Western Directors' summer meeting will be August 5-7, 1970. RRC will meet August 3-4, 1970.

#### Resolutions

Day read the following five resolutions:

##### Resolution No. 1

WHEREAS, the Western Directors and CSRS Representatives are distressed to know of the illness of Associate Director Raymond Ely;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that we the Western Directors and CSRS Representatives express to Dr. Ely our concern for his welfare and extend to him our good wishes for his early recovery.

*Day moved, Hill seconded, that Western Directors adopt the above resolution. PASSED.*

Resolution No. 2

WHEREAS, Dr. Joseph Ackerman will retire on December 31, 1969 as Managing Director of the Farm Foundation after serving more than 30 years with this organization; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Ackerman has, through the Farm Foundation, contributed to many specific efforts of the Western Directors to advance research in the Western Region;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Western Directors confer upon Joseph Ackerman a special award in recognition of his wise counsel and devoted service; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Western Directors and CSRS Representatives extend to Joseph Ackerman our heartfelt wishes for a rewarding and well-deserved retirement.

*Day moved, Wood seconded, that Western Directors adopt the above resolution. PASSED.*

Resolution No. 3

IN MEMORIAM

WHEREAS, Albert Curry (January 10, 1899--July 15, 1969) devoted a long and productive lifetime to the service of Agriculture, higher education, and to the welfare of his state and nation;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that we the assembled directors of the Western Agricultural Experiment Stations and representatives of the Cooperative State Research Service do express our solemn respect in his memory.

*Day moved, Frevert seconded, that Western Directors adopt the above resolution, and that copies of it be distributed to Dean Leyendecker, family and friends of Mr. Curry, and officials of the state. PASSED.*

Resolution No. 4

WHEREAS, the Regional Research Committee of the Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors, composed of Directors Ayres, Burris, and M. L. Wilson (alternate) under the chairmanship of Director Linsley, has labored diligently to guide us in the implementation of new regional research policies; and

WHEREAS, this committee has advised us courageously and wisely on difficult matters of great importance;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that we the assembled members of the Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors do commend Directors Linsley, Ayres, Burris, and Wilson for their exemplary service.

*Day moved, Frevert seconded, that Western Directors adopt the above resolution. PASSED.*

Resolution No. 5

WHEREAS, the Western Directors and Cooperative State Research Service Representatives have completed a successful and enjoyable summer meeting; and

WHEREAS, the arrangements made for the group, including the wives and families of the members, and including social and recreation events were excellent;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that we the assembled Western Directors and the Cooperative State Research Service Representatives do express our sincere appreciation to President Johnstone, Vice President Huffman, Director Asleson, Associate Director Burris, and Assistant Director Carter and their families and associates at Montana State University for their excellent arrangements and cordial hospitality.

*Day moved, Myers seconded, and Western Directors passed by acclamation the adoption of the above resolution.*

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 12:08 p.m., July 25, 1969

Respectfully submitted,

*Leo R. Gray*

Leo R. Gray  
Recording Secretary

C  
O  
P  
Y

APPENDIX A

EXPERIMENT STATION COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION AND POLICY  
Experiment Station Section  
The Division of Agriculture  
National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges

May 5, 1969

The Honorable Clifford M. Hardin  
United States Department of Agriculture  
Washington, D. C. 20250

Dear Secretary Hardin:

The Experiment Station Committee on Organization and Policy, in response to your recent request, submits the following comments and suggestions pertinent to the functions of the Cooperative State Research Service:

1. State Station Representation - The Congress has chosen to set up two routes to excellence in agricultural research, one centralized through the Department of Agriculture, one spread out over the 53 State Agricultural Experiment Stations of the country. These two can be expected to present somewhat different points of view to the Secretary. We expect that the Administrator of CSRS will represent the Experiment Stations. On negotiable questions of policy he must present and defend the viewpoint of the station directors. This basic concept is consistent with the Hatch Act, revised 1955, and with the report of the Task Force on Federal-State Experiment Station Relations in Agricultural Research (page 12).
2. Responsibility for Funds - The Administrator of CSRS, under authority of the Secretary of Agriculture, should bear the full Federal responsibility for funds and programs within the statutory coverage of the respective authorizing legislation (Hatch, McIntire-Stennis, Special Grants and Facilities.) The Secretary should delegate to the Administrator of CSRS the responsibility for both fiscal and program review of the State Agricultural Experiment Stations and auditing by OIG or agencies other than CSRS should be kept to a minimum. In any event OIG activities in regard to program should be restricted to the investigation of questionable practices. Fiscal audits by OIG or another agency should be primarily to review the effectiveness of CSRS procedures.
3. Research Reviews - CSRS should develop with each State Agricultural Experiment Station a mutually agreeable procedure for review and evaluation of that station's program of research. Comprehensive reviews in service and assistance to the stations should be expanded.
4. Assistance for Research Management - It is proposed that the potential of CSRS for providing assistance to the State Agricultural Experiment Stations in the area of research management be improved. Examples of such assistance that might be provided upon request include help in developing

May 5, 1969

PPB and related systems that meet the local requirements of the station while still remaining compatible with CRIS, and providing consultants for management seminars. We believe the best approach would be to utilize external consultants.

5. Public Information Service - We feel that CSRS should initiate and maintain a public information program - news releases, special reports, etc. - to inform the public of the accomplishments of the State Agricultural Experiment Stations. Liaison with the Department's present information service should be maintained.

6. CRIS - We feel that the contact between the State Agricultural Experiment Station Directors and CRIS should be through CSRS. Consideration should be given to locating CRIS in CSRS.

The Experiment Station Committee on Organization and Policy appreciates the opportunity to submit these suggestions to you.

Very truly yours,

/s/ H. A. Keener

HAK/r

H. A. Keener  
Chairman of ESCOP

cc: Members of ESCOP

College of Agriculture  
Taylor Hall  
University of New Hampshire  
Durham, N. H. 03824

C  
O  
P  
Y

## APPENDIX B

### RELEASE OF INFORMATION FROM CRIS

#### 1. Definitions

- a. Identifying information includes, for each Work Unit Project, the Accession and Work/Unit Project numbers, the name(s) of the principal investigator(s), the name and address of the organizational unit responsible for performance of the research, the name and address of the sponsoring organization, and the Title.
  - b. Scientific information includes, for each project, the Objectives, Approach, Annual Progress, and Publications.
  - c. Financial or management information includes, for each project, the amount of funds by source for the past year and the current year, and the level of manpower support in terms of scientist man-years.
2. Scientific information in CRIS, together with appropriate identifying information, may be released to anyone requesting the information, foreign or domestic, with the following exceptions: Information will not knowingly be released to nationals of countries which are considered "Iron Curtain" or "Bamboo Curtain" countries or to nations of countries with which the United States does not maintain diplomatic relations, until CRIS has consulted with the research organization concerned and/or with the Foreign Agricultural Service and has received approval to release the requested information.
  3. The total scientific or financial programs of any research agency of USDA or of any State Agricultural Experiment Station or Forestry School will be released only after consultation with the research agency concerned. Data may be withheld if the organization determines that the information should not be made available and that such withholding is not in conflict with requirements of the "Freedom of Information" Act.
  4. Requests for scientific and/or financial data on complete segments of research, such as all of the research of one or more Divisions of a USDA agency or of one or more Departments of an SAES or Forestry School will be handled in the same way as requests for information on total programs. (See item 3 above.)
  5. Data on funding and other management information will be provided on an aggregate basis where this will meet the needs of the inquirer. Such data will be cleared through the Office of Budget and Finance to make certain that financial data being released from CRIS is consistent with data being released through the Office of Budget and Finance.

6. Funding of individual projects will be released only with the knowledge and permission of the USDA research agency, SAES, or Forestry School concerned. Permission to release individual project funding data may be withheld if such withholding is not in conflict with requirements of the "Freedom of Information" Act.
7. Directors of State Agricultural Experiment Stations and Administrators of USDA research agencies will be advised of all releases of information from CRIS that pertain to their respective organizations.
8. Science Information Exchange will be requested to refer inquiries for financial and manpower data to CRIS.
9. CRIS will release financial and manpower data only for mutually exclusive categories of research for which the classification system permits identification of funds specifically with the category involved. Funds will not be associated with Key Word searches, since the Key Word classification does not permit identification of mutually exclusive categories. Exceptions will be made for special purpose searches required by USDA, SAES, or Forestry School administrators where the data are for internal use.
10. Information provided through CRIS is made available with the understanding that if it is reproduced, published, or quoted, credit will be given to the project leader and the organization conducting the research. It is provided with the further understanding that if progress report information is reproduced, published, or quoted, a statement will be included to the effect that such information reflects only the results obtained during the period covered by the report unless otherwise specified, and that final results are subject to completion of the investigation and full analysis of the data collected.

## APPENDIX C

Experiment Station Committee on Organization and Policy  
Experiment Station Section  
The Division of Agriculture  
National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges

The Experiment Station Committee on Organization and Policy (ESCOP) was created in 1905 as a permanent committee of the Association of American Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations (a forerunner of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges).

The function of ESCOP is to represent the Experiment Station Section in all basic matters of organization and programs within the Association, and on policy in relationships of the State Agricultural Experiment Stations collectively with agencies of the Federal Government, farm organizations and commodity groups, the Congress of the United States and trade and industry groups.

ESCOP actively participates in the preparation and presentation of budget requests in the Department and before Congress for Federal support of the State Agricultural Experiment Stations.

ESCOP meets twice each year. Issues requiring immediate action between regular meetings are normally handled by an Interim Subcommittee.

Membership in ESCOP is composed of the following:

12 administrators of State Agricultural Experiment Stations  
(3 from each of the 4 regions), the chairman of the ESCOP  
Subcommittee of Home Economics Research, and the administrator  
of CSRS.

## APPENDIX D

### Membership of AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH POLICY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Ned D. Bayley, Cochairman	Director Science and Education, USDA
W. L. Giles, Cochairman	President, Mississippi State University, NASULGC
	<u>Representatives of State Universities and Agricultural Experiment Stations:</u>
E. T. York, Jr.	Provost for Agriculture, University of Florida - Representative of the Division of Agriculture on the Executive Committee of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges
H. A. Keener	Dean of College and Director Agricultural Experiment Station, University of New Hampshire - Chairman, Experiment Station Committee on Organization and Policy
James Bethel	Dean of School of Forestry, University of Washington - Chairman, Assoc. State College and University Forestry Research Organization
T. W. Dowe	Dean of College and Director Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Vermont - Representative, Northeast Experiment Station Directors
R. K. Frevert	Director of Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Arizona - Repre- sentative of Western Agricultural Experiment Station Directors
A. G. Hazen	Dean of Agriculture and Director Agricul- tural Experiment Station, North Dakota State University - Representative of North Central Experiment Station Directors
C. T. Wilson	Associate Dean of Research Division and Director of Agricultural Experiment Station, Virginia Polytechnic Institute - Represen- tative, Southern Experiment Station Directors

Representatives of the U. S. Department of Agriculture

G. W. Irving, Jr.	Administrator, Agricultural Research Service
Roy L. Lovvorn	Administrator, Cooperative State Research Service
M. L. Upchurch	Administrator, Economic Research Service
David W. Angevine	Administrator, Farmer Cooperative Service
Lloyd H. Davis	Administrator, Federal Extension Service
R. Keith Arnold	Deputy Administrator for Research, Forest Service
Harry C. Trelogan	Administrator, Statistical Reporting Service

Ex-Officio Members (non-voting)

George M. Browning	Regional Director, North Central Experiment Stations; Cochairman, Research Programs and Facilities Subcommittee, ARPAC
W. D. Maclay	Director, Research Program Development and Evaluation Staff, USDA; Cochairman, Research Programs and Facilities Subcommittee, ARPAC
Don Paarlberg	Director, Agricultural Economics, USDA
John Sherrod	Director, National Agricultural Library
Howard W. Hjort	Director, Planning, Evaluation and Programming Staff, USDA
J. W. Stiles	National Agricultural Research Advisory Committee
Donald King	Office of Science and Technology
Russell C. McGregor	Bureau of the Budget
Keith C. Barrons	Agricultural Research Institute
M. R. Clarkson	Agricultural Board - National Academy of Sciences

Executive Secretary, W. D. Maclay, Director, RPDES

## WESTERN AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS RESEARCH COUNCIL

Guidelines for Committees

The Council wishes to provide only generalized overall guidance to its committees. Council members believe that generation and communication of new ideas are enhanced by a system in which committees are given maximum freedom and flexibility in carrying out their work.

Functions

The main purposes of WAERC committees are to study research needs that are relevant for agricultural economists in the West, to generate new research ideas, and to communicate this information to fellow staff members, administrators, and others. More specifically, at its meeting in January 1969, the Council specified three functions that committees are expected to perform:

1. To aid in defining important research needs and in developing means for meeting them.
2. To stimulate and develop professional exchange among research personnel in the Western Region.
3. To develop specific research project proposals.

Structure

The structure instituted in 1969 consists of three committees plus provision for the creation of ad hoc committees from time to time at the Council's discretion to study special problems. Committees have the freedom to further refine their subject matter responsibilities. The Council expects to review the committee structure and to make adjustments when needed by changing conditions.

1. Commercial Agriculture

- a. Economics of production and distribution of food and fiber
- b. Growth, organization and management of agricultural firms (farm, marketing and farm supply)
- c. Systems or sub-sector analysis
- d. Policy for commercial agriculture -- production, marketing, price and income

2. Natural Resource Development

- a. Use and management of natural resources -- primarily land and water, but also range and forest
- b. Resource transfer
- c. Institutional aspects of resource use
- d. Resource use policy -- national, regional, and state

### 3. Community and Human Resource Development

- a. Development of human resources
- b. Provision of public services and development of communities
- c. Migration and poverty
- d. Policy related to community development, primarily taxation and local policy

### Operations

Each Council member will appoint one official voting representative to each of the three committees, except that the ERS may have two (2) members on the committee on Commercial Agriculture. The Council will divide the Farm Foundation funds among the three committees and ad hoc committees. Committees may invite non-voting members to participate in their meetings, and department or agency heads may send additional representatives to the meetings at the expense of their institutions.

Oregon State University  
July 1969

## APPENDIX F

### Problems for Research in the Western Region

#### Man and Technology

1. Relationship of industrial - technological to social organizations in "rural" setting.
2. Relationship of extant values and orientations to industrial - technology; its requirements and impact on environment.
3. What kind of social system is most conducive to realization of the dignity of man? (minorities, majorities, etc.)
4. What are the dehumanizing aspects of modernization? (Can we use the concepts of self-identity, self-validation, freedom and integrity of man, convergence toward a closed society and/or divergence toward an open society, etc., as constructs for such investigation?)
- \*5. What are the important elements necessary to enable one to change his self-identity from one image of worthwhileness to another?
6. Can we identify the process(es) by which an individual, group, or society changes its concept of what is an acceptable organization of society--and an acceptable role for the individual therein?
7. What factors (personal attributes, skills, attitudes, etc.) are associated with "successful" and "unsuccessful" mobility (both social and occupational mobility)?

#### Resources

1. Sociological aspects of resource development.
2. Conservation of natural environment: Protection of the values of nature for benefit of all people.
- \*3. Types of economic activity potentially suited to the rural environment - especially "service industries."
4. Regulation of the urbanization of rural land: planning, subdivision control, preservation of natural and esthetic values, and prevention of rural slums.
5. Social implications of change in land use.
6. Impact of public land policy on rural communities.
7. Pollution - impact upon communities and people.

- Community
1. Sociological organizational patterns of rural communities.
  2. Local government: capacity and constraints on the capacity of local governments genuinely to govern under modern conditions.
  - \*3. Types of inducements that will attract and hold population in rural areas (jobs, facilities, cultural, amenities, etc.)
  4. Community organization and development (rural organization and institutions).
  - \*5. Patterns for rejuvenation of community when there has been a change in economic resource base.
  6. Medical services in rural areas.
- Family
1. Family patterns, child rearing practices (ethnic-occupational differences).
  2. Urban-rural differences in families:
    - a. goals - values and needs
    - b. interaction and communication
    - c. power structure
    - d. socialization process
    - e. mobility patterns
    - f. youth aspirations
- Communications
1. Changing role of extension in rural as well as urban community - need for new models for extension education.
  2. Patterns for gaining acceptance of new ideas (analysis of sociological, psychological, cultural barriers), diffusion process.
- Minority Groups
1. Relations of minority groups, particularly Indians and Mexican Americans with the dominant society: (in terms of family structure, social stratification, educational aspirations, value orientation, and political participation).
  2. Community and resource development on Indian reservations.
- Poverty
1. Social and cultural correlates of poverty.
  2. Rural poverty: causes and correlates of poverty, policies for reduction of poverty.
  3. Poverty problems (rural-urban) including nutritional deficiencies, health problems, attitudes toward agencies and instituting success models.
  - \*4. Alternatives for welfare in rural area.

Occupations-  
Employment

1. Career patterns in agriculture and agricultural business.
2. Educational and occupational adjustment of rural youth.
3. Career patterns and decision making of agricultural scientists.
- \*4. Problems of employment in rural areas: types of industry, labor force, training, recruitment.
5. Migrant farm labor.
6. What kind(s) of educational mix will most readily facilitate adjustment to change - economic, sociological and psychological adjustments?

Western Social Research Advisory Committee  
Bozeman, Montana  
7/24/1969

# APPENDIX G

## FINANCIAL STATEMENT

### Western Directors' Special Fund

Cash Balance 6/30/68

\$ 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	165.00
	<u>\$ 3,740.00</u>

\$3,740.00  
\$4,572.48

#### DISBURSEMENTS:

10/25/68 ERS (Leo Gray's Office)	\$1,200.00
11/18/68 R. D. Ensign -ESCOP, Wash., D.C.	287.30
3/26/69 G. B. Wood - " "	253.38
4/14/69 R. D. Ensign - " "	321.87
4/24/69 G. B. Wood - " "	393.36
5/6/69 G. B. Wood - " "	216.24
5/8/69 J. A. Asleson- " "	315.96
	<u>\$2,988.11</u>

- \$2,988.11

Cash Balance 6/30/69

\$1,584.37

# APPENDIX G

## FINANCIAL STATEMENT

Director-at-Large Account  
(Montana Station Only)

	<u>DAL</u>	<u>ESCROW</u>
Cash Balance 6/30/68	\$ 6,358.89	\$2,456.24

### 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	3,900.00	
	<u>\$48,475.46</u>	+\$48,475.46

### DISBURSEMENTS:

Regents, California

7/12/68	\$10,000	
9/19/68	5,000	
11/4/68	5,000	
1/8/69	10,000	
2/11/69	5,000	
4/14/69	5,000	
4/21/69	3,000	
	<u>\$43,000</u>	-\$43,000.00

To ESCROW FY '69	\$ 2,150	-\$ 2,150.00	+\$2,150.00
------------------	----------	--------------	-------------

---

TOTAL CASH BALANCE 6/30/69	\$ 9,684.35	\$4,606.24
----------------------------	-------------	------------

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

July 29, 1969

TO : Western Directors  
FROM : Leo R. Gray, Recording Secretary *L.R.G.*  
SUBJECT: Actions of Western Directors at 1969 Summer Meetings *in.*

I. RRC REPORT

- A. Use of RRF Special Allocation to Regional Project W-6, "The Introduction, Multiplication, Preservation, and Determination of the Value of New Plants for Industrial and Other Purposes."

The Washington SAES has offered to make approximately \$50,000 worth of facilities available to the Plant Introduction Station in Washington and to provide the additional funds required to carry out the plan, provided that the \$18,400 previously approved as a special allocation to the project for FY 1970 can be made available to help out with the purchase. Administrative Adviser M. L. Wilson recommended that the Western Directors accept the offer of the Washington SAES.

RRC regards this as an appropriate use of the special allocation and recommends that Director Wilson's proposal be endorsed. Western Directors adopted a motion to accept the offer of the Washington SAES.

- B. Director Martin Burris was designated to replace Chancellor James Meyer as the Administrative Adviser for W-1, "The Improvement of Beef Cattle Through the Application of Breeding Methods." The project terminates June 30, 1970.
- C. Western Directors passed a motion to endorse the procedure whereby task force advisers will be invited to present their reports in person during the RRC meeting at which they are scheduled for consideration.
- D. Western Directors passed a motion that requested the Regional Research Philosophy Committee to study the question as to the status of task force reports which have been reviewed and responded to once by RRC and the Western Directors but which contain residual high priority items. The Philosophy Committee is also to propose guidelines, as to how to handle this problem in relation to new task force recommendations which will presumably be received annually during the transition period in the years ahead, for consideration by the Directors before the next group of task force reports are to be reviewed.

- E. There are implications of the termination program initiated at the 1969 Spring Meeting for projects which RRC and the Western Directors might regard as viable, high priority projects for extension or revision, but which have not yet come under the purview of a task force. A motion passed requesting the Regional Research Philosophy Committee to propose to the WD guidelines for meeting this problem within the framework of termination patterns to be implemented during the transition period.
- F. Western Directors passed a motion that the Committee on Regional Research Philosophy re-examine its task force guidelines to determine whether or not a clarification of the statement regarding the establishment of priorities might be desirable.
- G. Western Directors adopted a recommendation that Administrative Advisers be authorized to assist in the selection of Technical Committee members, in consultation with each interested Director and Agency in order to maximize the potential for multidisciplinary representation.

NOTE: Administrative Advisers are reminded that they should prepare a brief statement as to their concept of what will be involved in the proposed new area of work. The statement can then be circulated, through CSRS, both within and outside of the Western Region, and the information contained therein will facilitate decisions on the part of Directors as to the extent of their interest in participation.

H. New Areas of Work Approved by Western Directors for FY '70:

- 1. "Reproductive Performance: Beef Cattle" approved as an area of work. Administrative Adviser: Rue Jensen.
- 2. "Nitrogen in the Environment" approved as an area of work. Administrative Adviser: J. Robins.
- 3. "Effect of Nutrition on Mental and Physical Development and Behavior" approved as an area of work. Administrative Adviser: P. J. Leyendecker.
- 4. "Interrelationships Between Root Disease Fungi, Their Hosts, and Invasion by Bark Beetles" approved as an area of work. Administrative Adviser: L. W. Rasmussen.
- 5. "Methodology for Evaluating Alternate and Multiple Uses of Land," including related aspects of: "Appraisal of Resources for Recreational Use;" "Income Potentials of Private and Public Recreational Areas;" and "Intensified Utilization of Game Resources" approved as an area of work. Administrative Adviser: J. A. Zivnuska.
- 6. "Market Coordination in Producing, Processing and Distribution of Beef" approved as an area of work. Administrative Adviser: C. P. Wilson.

NOTE: Regional research project outline proposals resulting from H 1 through 6 above should be available for review by RRC and WD at the 1970 Spring Meeting.

- I. Western Directors passed a motion to authorize an Ad Hoc Committee to examine the area of "Economic and Social Implications of Environmental Pollution" in order to determine what problems are researchable, which of these, if any, are peculiar to the West, and whether or not this is an area in which the Western Region might wish to take the lead in developing a national regional research effort. Administrative Adviser: J. B. Kendrick. It is understood that a report will be available for review by RRC and WD by July 1, 1970.
  - J. Western Directors passed a motion to authorize assembly of an appropriate committee to consider and formalize a proposal as a possible Western Regional Coordinating Project in the subject area "Methodology in Food and Nutrition Educational Programs." The proposal should be in terms of the WRCC criteria adopted by WD during the present meetings. Administrative Adviser: D. W. Bohmont. It is understood that a proposal will be available for review by RRC and WD by July 1, 1970.
  - K. Western Directors adopted RRC's recommendation that the statement of the Environmental Quality Task Force under the heading "Pesticide" be transmitted to the Administrative Advisers of W-45 and W-82 for their information and consideration.
  - L. Western Directors adopted RRC's recommendations that:
    1. Administrative Advisers for W-51, W-65, W-67, W-68, W-82, and W-107 review the report of the Water and Watersheds Task Force with their respective technical committees and give consideration, where appropriate, to altering the make-up of the committees to broaden the disciplinary base of the programs.
    2. During FY '71, the Task Force on Water and Watersheds be reconvened to review progress in the interim and to make a report to WD through RRC on the state of Western regional research in this area and to make such recommendations as may be deemed appropriate at that time.
- II. Ad Hoc Committee on Regional Research Philosophy (CRRP)
- A. Western Directors adopted the written report of CRRP as presented.
  - B. Western Directors authorized the present CRRP to follow through with the selection of appropriate new task force areas and administrative advisers.
  - C. Western Directors later approved the following recommendations of the CRRP:
    1. Regional research projects, resulting from recommended areas of work approved at this meeting should be ready for activation July 1, 1970.

2. The following additional task forces should be activated as soon as possible in FY '70, and they should submit their reports to RRC and the Western Directors by January 15, 1970:

<u>Task Force</u>	<u>Administrative Adviser</u>
a. Marketing and Competition, Foreign Agricultural Trade and Economic Development	C. P. Wilson
b. Farm Adjustments, Prices and Income	C. O. McCorkle
c. Farm Labor and Mechanization	R. K. Frevert
d. Rural Development and Family Living	G. B. Wood

3. At this time next year, WD give consideration to the establishment of the following three additional task forces that would be formulated in FY '71:

- a. Food Safety
- b. Forage, Range and Pasture
- c. Soil and Land Use

Those task forces formulated in FY '70 ought to have regional projects in the system ready for activation 7/1/71. Task forces formulated in FY '71 ought to have projects in the system ready for activation 7/1/72.

- D. Hervey requested that Administrative Advisers of WAERC, WSWRC, WHERAC, and WSRAC prepare written comments regarding their views and recommendations as to the prospects for changing the status of these standing advisory committees, and that copies of these written comments be sent to members of the CRRP as soon as possible.
- E. Chairman Kraus asked the CRRP to come up with a recommendation at the November meeting regarding the integration of the four standing advisory committees of WD into the new system.

### III. Matters related to ESCOP and ESCOP Legislative Subcommittee

- A. Western Directors passed a motion to recommend through our ESCOP or ESCOP Legislative Subcommittee representatives that we favor the Executive Committee in the Division of Agriculture of NASU&LGC total nine members; that it be composed of two members each from the Experiment Station, Extension, and Resident Instruction Sections, plus three from the Administrative Heads of Agriculture group; and that terms of office be staggered to facilitate continuity.
- B. Western Directors passed a motion that we go on record as favoring having a man related to agriculture on the staff of the NASU&LGC office in Washington, D. C.

- C. Western Directors adopted a recommendation that we seek to have our Western Director-at-Large invited to attend ARPAC meetings as a resource person to our elected representative, and that our ESCOP committee present this to ESCOP so that they will be aware as to what the WD are interested in doing.
- D. Western Directors passed a motion that the Legislative Subcommittee representatives from the Western Region be directed to work with the overall Legislative Subcommittee in developing a plan of procedure for the development and execution of legislative programs of interest to the Experiment Stations.
- E. Western Directors passed a motion that we ask our ESCOP representatives to take to ESCOP our position that we view with alarm existing and pending legislations regarding the pesticides use problem, and ask that they take under advisement the preparation of a recommendation to the Secretary of Agriculture.
- F. Western Directors passed a motion to refer the matter of the proposed new legislation, including a record of comments of the WD group at this meeting, to the Administrative Heads of Agriculture for their consideration.

IV. Western Directors passed a motion that funds from the WD Special Fund Account be used to pay expenses of the WD representative to ARPAC.

V. Western Directors authorized approval of a WSWRC request for a meeting of a work group on "Disposal of Solid Wastes Through Soils and Waters." The meeting will take place sometime between August 1 and November 30, 1969.

Chairman Kraus suggested to Frevert that an Administrative Adviser ought to meet with the group to explain our current situation regarding WRCC and the new technical committees that will arise out of recommendations of our task force groups.

VI. Western Directors passed a motion to authorize the participation of the W-6 Technical Committee in the assembly of a 20-year report of accomplishments of the National Coordinating Committee for New Plants.

VII. Western Directors adopted a motion that our publications policy be amended to indicate that we try and get a byline for giving credit for research on all journal articles as well as other publications resulting from those that have been financially supported with regional research funds.

VIII. In response to a request from Kraus, Lovvorn assured WD that CSRS would furnish the Directors with all the information regarding the types of administrative things the auditors from the Office of the Inspector General will be reviewing. This will enable the Directors to know what to expect, and it will assure that the Directors will have all of the relevant guideline materials in one place.

IX. The consensus of WD was that since the document "Suggestions for Functions of the Cooperative State Research Service (CSRS), United States Department of Agriculture," dated April 11, 1969, was prepared by the WD Forward Planning Committee and others prior to the selection of Dr. Roy Lovvorn as the new Administrator of CSRS, a copy of the document should be transmitted to Lovvorn.

X. Western Directors unanimously supported the following nominations for the 1970 Election of Officers:

WD Chairman, 1 year	P. J. Leyendecker
WD Vice Chairman, 1 year	J. E. Kraus
WD Secretary, 1 year	E. G. Linsley
RRC, 3 years	M. L. Wilson
RRC Alternate, 1 year	B. E. Day
C/9, 3 years	C. P. Wilson
C/9 Alternate, 1 year	E. G. Linsley
ESCOP, 3 years	R. E. Ely
ESCOP Alternate, 1 year	J. S. Robins
ESCOP Legislative Subcommittee, 2 years	J. A. Asleson
ESCOP Legislative Subcommittee, 3 years	R. E. Ely
ESCOP Marketing Subcommittee, 1 year	J. A. Zivnuska

XI. Future WD Meetings approved:

Fall 1969	Chicago, Illinois	November 9-12, 1969
Spring 1970	California	February 23-27, 1970
Summer 1970	Utah	August 3-7, 1970

August 12, 1969

TO : Dr. C. F. Kelly  
Dr. G. B. Wood  
Dr. J. A. Asleson  
Dr. R. D. Ensign

FROM : Leo R. Gray  
Recording Secretary

SUBJECT: Supplemental information to my memo to Western Directors on Actions of Western Directors at 1969 Summer Meetings, dated July 29, 1969.

Item III of my memo dated 7/29/69 pertains to ESCOP. For your information, I have elaborated on sub-items A, D, E, and F as follows:

A. Proposed changes in NASULGC By-Laws:

Copies of Proposed By-Laws of the Division of Agriculture, NASULGC, were distributed to Western Directors. There were mixed reactions to the proposed organization of the Executive Committee.

Myers noted that there needs to be clarification concerning the role of non-Land Grant colleges of agriculture in the association.

Kendrick later suggested one member of the Executive Committee might come from a non-Land Grant institution.

Burris preferred that a section of Administrative Heads of Agriculture be recognized on a comparable basis with the Experiment Station, Extension, and Resident Instruction Sections. He opposed the proposed organization of the Executive Committee on grounds that it would put a group in position to veto any action of ESCOP, ECOP, and RICOP, because of their position in the hierarchy.

Buchanan noted that now, no one other than an Administrative Head of Agriculture is eligible to become a member of the overall Executive Committee of the Association.

Myers noted that if the representative on the overall Executive Committee is rotated among ESCOP, ECOP and RICOP, and the ECOP man happened to be a Vice President for general extension -- not related to agriculture -- then agriculture might end up with no representation on the committee.

D. Development of legislative programs of interest to SAES:

There was some discussion regarding the compatibility of recommendations of SAES Directors and proposals of the ESCOP Legislative Subcommittee.

Two suggested points of procedure that emerged from this discussion were:

1. Personal contacts with our delegates in Congress are very desirable. However, contacts with Congress should be made on a continuing basis, but we should have specific contacts and specific purposes in mind; and
2. Not only should our Legislative Subcommittee keep us informed, but we should also keep them informed as to what we do in contacting our Congressmen and the results thereof.

E. Legislations regarding use of pesticides:

Day - It is a distressing thing that the regulations are tending to work into legislation designed to regulate agricultural technical matters. Using this approach, we will not arrive at rational decisions that would be possible were they to be made on the basis of the full knowledge we have on these matters.

- We should hold a position even though we disagree with our regulatory people.

Myers commented on the role of the chemical industry with respect to the pesticides use problem. He suggested the SAES

should get out some information indicating how little pesticides we can use and still get along.

F. Proposed new legislation:

Myers - The ACT is related back to the basic Morrill Act. Shouldn't it be related back as a companion Act to the Hatch Act? As it stands, for people research in rural America, we could easily develop a second Agricultural Experiment Station. In some institutions this could be essentially divorced from the Agricultural Experiment Station. This should not be. Might we not think of this and set it up in such a way that it becomes the equivalent of say the Purnell Act when it was passed. Then it would be a supplement and addition to the Hatch Act.

Day concurred that this appears on the surface to set up another Experiment Station System to cope with what we consider to be part of our normal function as we operate right now. In some instances there may be a real interest in setting up a competing, independent set up divorced from the present administrative structure of the Agricultural Experiment Stations in some states.

Myers - A strong point in the Hatch and Smith-Lever Acts, as far as the states are concerned is the fact that a Director is designated. The ACT might say the Director will be the Director of SAES or Cooperative Extension.

Myers indicated his main concern about the proposed ACT is to get it tied in some way back to the Colleges of Agriculture and thereby eliminate any possibility of establishing a second agricultural experiment station in the state or even within the same institution.

Kraus noted that when the Extension Directors met in Logan, they had a report on "Quality of Environment," and then they discussed how to implement the recommendations in this area. It was suggested that the Cooperative Extension Service and State Agricultural Experiment Station Directors go together and ask for a lump sum appropriation from Congress to do a job in this area together.

Kraus then noted this proposed ACT has Extension in it which in many ways is very good. There would be merit in the two getting together more than they have in the past. Maybe this could be done as an amendment to the Hatch Act.

Buchanan counseled the Western Directors that a simple, direct approach would be to seek to amend the Hatch Act, but we have been advised against that because we might get some things we don't want.

Myers suggested a substitute sentence for the clause on page one of the proposed ACT (7/18/69), beginning on the sixth line from the bottom:

DELETE: "or some other institution designated by Act of the legislature of the State concerned:"

SUBSTITUTE: "The institute shall be administered as a part of the program of the College of Agriculture, organized under the Act of July 2, 1962 (12 Statute 503), and coordinated with research under the Hatch Act and the Cooperative Extension Service under the Smith-Lever Act."

Buchanan raised a question as to whether the ACT should be limited to research. He noted the tentative indication is the FES might oppose the proposed ACT if it does limit the activity to research. He also noted some arguments against specifying that the institute be placed in the Agricultural Experiment Station as a mandatory requirement of the law.

Buchanan requested the Western Directors or Forward Planning Committee to give him some reaction regarding what ought to be done with this proposed ACT. He suggested that if this ACT is to be pursued, one of the four Regional Directors groups ought to endorse support of it.

Hervey - Since the proposed ACT does indicate a joint effort involving SAES and Cooperative Extension, maybe it ought to be given consideration by a joint body of both ESCOP and ECOP representatives -- perhaps a subcommittee might be set up between ESCOP and ECOP --, or by the Administrative Heads of Agriculture group.

- It may be that we could handle the new areas under existing legislation, if we can get sufficient increased support. If so, maybe a new act is not necessary.

- The ESCOP Legislative Subcommittee might continue to study this proposed ACT and consider modifications thereof, and invite a similar group from ECOP to work with them.

Kraus suggested we request the overall Deans group consider this an appropriate item of business.

Kendrick concurred that this proposal involves areas that neither the Cooperative Extension Service or the SAES can adequately carry alone, but that both might be able to handle it jointly.

Lovvorn - There is the possibility of keeping research and extension in a single package in the ACT. The overall Deans might develop some enthusiasm for it.

Thorne questioned the expressed interest in putting this "institute" entirely under the Colleges of Agriculture even under the most preferred structure that we have. If we look upon this as a total effort toward helping rural problems, we would have the Colleges of Business, social scientists on a very broad scale, and many other involved in this endeavor. He hoped it wouldn't be restricted so as to limit the institute to considerations of agriculture in the rural areas. It should be approached on a very broad scale if we are going to do much about it.

Burris noted that if this act were considered and never became law, maybe it would provide a platform in the hearings for airing of problems faced by SAES, and may show up the need for legislation in the social area.

Buchanan reviewed five points made to the ESCOP Legislative Subcommittee, but on which no action has been taken. They were:

1. There has been evidence of considerable interest in and discussion of so-called "people" research -- Glenn Pound, Earl Heady, et al.
2. The "thrust" of existing authority under which publicly funded agricultural research is currently supported is toward other, more traditional areas and problems.
3. Whether or not the new research could be supported under existing authority, it is possible that proposing new legislation would
  - a. dramatize the need;
  - b. result in new resources for funding and/or additional funds for this purpose;

c. clarify existing authority.

4. A draft has been prepared as a means of sharpening our focus on the matter of new legislation should it be decided to pursue it.

5. Negative considerations include

a. possible competition with Hatch and related funding;

b. possible undesirable amendments to existing authority as a result of "raising the question".

cc J. E. Kraus  
H. E. Myers