

MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE WESTERN ASSOCIATION
OF AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION DIRECTORS

Washington, D.C.

November 14, 1983

SUMMARY OF ACTIONS

November 14-15, 1983

	<u>PAGE</u>
1. Approved minutes of August 3-5, 1983 and September 28, 1983 WDA meetings.	1
2. Approved agenda as amended.	1
3. Approved eleven appointments to WDA offices.	2
4. Approved four Administrative Adviser changes: W-143 Nutrient Bioavailability -- M. J. Woodburn (OR) W-150 Beans -- J. R. Welsh (MT) W-157 New Crops -- M. H. Niehaus (NM) W-168 Seed -- E. E. King (ARS, CA) and D. E. Schlegel (CA-B)	3
5. Approved motion to adhere to summer deadline for deciding whether to hire a Western DAL.	10
6. Approved dates and locations for future meetings.	10

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>SUBJECT</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
1.0 Call to Order	1
2.0 Approval of Minutes of Previous Meetings	1
3.0 Report of Chairman	2
4.0 RIC Report	3
5.0 ESCOP Report	3
6.0 ESCOP Budget Committee Report	4
7.0 Division of Agriculture Committee on Biotechnology Report	4
8.0 Committee of Nine Report	4
9.0 Integrated Reproductive Management Report	5
10.0 W-84 Biological Control Foreign Travel	5
11.0 W. Extension Directors Computer Applications Study Team Report	5
12.0 CSRS Report	5
13.0 ERS Report	8
14.0 Micronesia Experiment Station	9
15.0 Western Director-at-Large Issue	9
16.0 Other Business	
16.1 Future Meetings	10
16.2 Plant-Water Stress Task Force	10
16.3 ERS Request for Assistance with Federal Leasing Studies	11
16.4 ARS Longrange Applied Breeding Programs	11
16.5 Treasurer's Report	11
17.0 Adjournment	11
APP. A ESCOP Proposed Budget Increases for CSRS FY 1986	12
APP. B Treasurer's Report	16

WESTERN ASSOCIATION OF AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION DIRECTORS

MINUTES

November 14-15, 1983
Shoreham Hotel
Washington, D.C.

ATTENDANCE:

Alaska	- J. V. Drew	New Mexico	- D. M. Briggs
Arizona	- L. W. Dewhirst	Oregon	- J. R. Davis
California	- L. N. Lewis	Utah	- C. E. Clark
	- D. E. Schlegel		- D. J. Matthews
	- L. G. Weathers	Washington	- L. L. Boyd
	- C. E. Hess	Wyoming	- C. C. Kaltenbach
Colorado	- R. D. Heil	OWDAL	- J. E. Moak
	- H. F. McHugh	CSRS	- J. P. Jordan
Idaho	- L. A. Bulla	ERS	- M. L. Cotner
	- R. J. Miller	Guests	- M. Briggs
Micronesia	- I. Lebehn		- R. Joyce
Montana	- J. R. Welsh		- R. M. Kottman
Nevada	- B. M. Jones		
	- L. Koong		

1.0 Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Dewhirst at 4:00 p.m., Monday, November 14, 1983, in Suite 163 of the Shoreham Hotel.

Director Davis introduced Richard Joyce, a member of CARET from Oregon. Director Jones introduced Dr. Ling-jung Koong, new Associate Director of the Nevada AES. Director Briggs announced that Koert Lessman asked for a reassignment at New Mexico and Dr. Merle H. Niehaus has been appointed Acting AES Director.

Chairman Dewhirst welcomed Pat Jordan to his first WDA meeting as Administrator of CSRS.

2.0 Approval of Minutes of Previous Meetings

MOTION CARRIED to approve the minutes of the August 3-5, 1983 WDA meeting as distributed.

MOTION CARRIED to approve the minutes of the September 28, 1983 WDA meeting as distributed.

Chairman Dewhirst reviewed the agenda and received requests for additional items. MOTION CARRIED to approve the agenda as amended.

3.0 Report of Chairman -- L. W. Dewhirst

3.1 Follow-up Actions

Dewhirst wrote Division of Agriculture Chairman Leo M. Walsh expressing WDA concerns about the balance between research and extension in the Council for Agricultural Research, Extension and Teaching (CARET) and requesting official Experiment Station representation to CARET.

Joyce reported that the bylaws of the National Extension Advisory Committee (NEAC) have been amended and NEAC will be involved in the development and training of lay leaders. CARET will serve as the advocate group in the budget process. The CARET members are appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the agriculture deans of their respective land grant institutions. CARET supports the Division budget request before the Congress in order to emphasize that the funds are used to support programs which are supported by the users of those programs.

3.2 Nominations

MOTION CARRIED to approve the following list of nominees for the offices and terms indicated:

Comm. of Nine alternate (1984)	L. L. Boyd (WA)
Research Imp. Comm. (1987)	L. A. Bulla (ID)
W. Agri. Research Comm. (1987)	L. A. Bulla (ID)
ESCOP Legislative Subcomm. (1987)	C. E. Clark (UT)
W. Exten. Dir's Computer TF	B. M. Jones (NV)
RPG-1 Natural Resources (1986)	L. G. King (WA)
RPG-2 Forest Resources (1986)	W. E. Frayer (CO)
RPG-3 Crops (1986)	C. A. Raguse (CA-D)
RPG-5 People, Communities (1986)	J. B. Stevens (OR)
Co-chairman, RPG-6 Economics (1986)	L. F. Rogers (WA)
Co-chairman, RPG-8 Foods, Nutrition (1986)	D. J. Lee (WA)

It was recommended that a human nutritionist be appointed to RPG-8 when a vacancy occurs next year. It was also noted that Clark's term on the ESCOP Legislative Subcommittee is for whatever term is established by the committee up to a maximum of four years.

3.3 ARS Reorganization

All Directors have received information from CSRS concerning the ARS reorganization of areas and shifts in management personnel. Dewhirst has been invited to attend a meeting of the Western area directors and deputy administrator. The Western areas and administrators will be:

<u>Regional Hdqtrs.</u> Oakland, CA	Deputy Admin. Assoc. Dep. Admin. Asst. Dep. Admin.	H C Cox P. H. van Schaik J. E. Bernardin
<u>Mountain States</u> Fort Collins, CO	(AZ, CO, NM, NV, UT, WY) Area Dir. Assoc. Area Dir.	R. D. Plowman Unknown
<u>Pacific Basin</u> Albany, CA	(CA, HI, WRRRC, WHNRC) Area Dir. Assoc. Area Dir. Asst. Area Dir. WRRRC Dir. WHNRC Dir.	W. G. Chace E. E. King E. E. Haskell H. P. Binger J. M. Iacono
<u>Northwest</u> Portland, OR	(AK, ID, MT, OR, WA) Area Dir. Assoc. Area Dir. Asst. Area Dir.	N. I. James J. M. Vetterling D. A. Price

4.0 RIC Report -- D. E. Schlegel

MOTION CARRIED to approve the following Administrative Adviser reassignments:

- W-143 Nutrient Bioavailability -- a Key to Human Nutrition
-- Dr. M. J. Woodburn (OR) to replace Dr. H. F. McHugh (CO)
- W-150 Genetic Improvement of Beans (Phaseolus vulgaris,
L.) for Yield Pest Resistance, and Nutritional Value
-- Dr. J. R. Welsh (MT) to replace Dr. K. J. Lessman (NM)
- W-157 Development of New and Improved Crops for Water
Conservation in Arid Lands -- Dr. M. H. Niehaus (NM) to
replace Dr. K. J. Lessman (NM)
- W-168 Seed Production and Quality Investigations -- Drs. E.
E. King (ARS, CA) and D. E. Schlegel (CA-B) as lead- and
co-Advisers to replace Drs. N. J. Chatterton (ARS, UT)
and C. E. Clark (UT)

The draft Supplementary Manual of Procedures for Western Regional Research has been distributed to Administrative Advisers for comment.

5.0 ESCOP Report -- L. L. Boyd

Boyd distributed a written report to Western Directors following the October ESCOP meeting. It was agreed that it would be desirable if he continued to send out reports immediately following the meetings.

If Directors have comments on the Zinn Committee report, please send them to Dale Zinn with copies to Boyd and Moak. The report appears to be acceptable to Western Directors except that it delineates the relationships of the DALs and ESCOP, which may conflict with future actions taken by the Western Directors with respect to a Western DAL.

6.0 ESCOP Budget Committee Report -- C. C. Kaltenbach

Kaltenbach solicited comments from the Directors on the proposal for the ESCOP 1986 budget request distributed at the Division meeting (contained herein as Appendix A). The following concerns were expressed: (1) Item VI should not mention reductions in state revenues, and might better be included under item I; (2) Try to introduce an item for capital equipment, perhaps under I; (3) The wording under item V should be changed to "the family as a production resource." Welsh noted that we should seek to find some way to include inflation in the budget requests.

7.0 Division of Agriculture Committee on Biotechnology Report -- L. A. Bulla

Al Wood, Chairman of the committee, will distribute a report at the Division meeting. The committee's activities were divided into five areas: (a) land grant institutions structure, (b) education and manpower needs, (c) university-industry relationships, (d) national biotechnology research program development, coordination, and evaluation, and (e) moral and ethical issues. The committee is recommending a \$70 million initiative, to be sold to the Department at the Secretary's level or to the White House as an initiative via Keyworth, the President's Science Adviser. The initiative would capitalize on the nationally recognized need for agriculture to maintain its cutting edge in this area. If it appears that the initiative will detract from formula funding, ESCOP will not support it. The proposal recommends the funds be open to all institutions and include capital equipment and predoctoral/postdoctoral fellowships.

8.0 Committee of Nine Report -- H. F. McHugh

The minutes of the September 21, 1983 meeting (attended by L. W. Dewhirst and myself) in New Hampshire have been published and report all actions taken by the Committee. Earlier, notice had been sent to the appropriate directors regarding specific actions involving you or scientists at your station.

The deliberations at the September meeting were notable for the level of concern displayed by reviewers and a genuine desire to make constructive feedback to the scientists. The care with which reviews had been made was obvious and this led to thoughtful decisions regarding the proposals. The committee received a preliminary report from the subcommittee, chaired by Dr. Dewhirst, addressing the questions of improving regional research science. Rather than attempting a "quick fix," the subcommittee wishes to

stimulate discussion that can be carried to the regional associations.

Another subcommittee addressed the matter of obtaining budget information from IR committees. Not only is C/9 desirous of having understandable information but also avoiding if possible the need for administrative advisers to travel to the May meeting. This subcommittee hopes to complete its work at the December meeting so that the guidelines can be reflected in the budgets presented in May 1984.

The Western Region has been ably represented by Dr. L. W. Dewhirst who has been a stalwart of the committee.

For your information, the dates of future meetings and the respective deadline dates are repeated below:

Meeting	Deadline
December 7, 1983 (St. Louis, MO)	November 15, 1983
May 22-24, 1983 (Washington, D.C.)	May 1, 1984
Week of September 10, 1984	August 21, 1984
Week of December 3, 1984	November 13, 1984

9.0 Integrated Reproductive Management Report -- C. C. Kaltenbach

No real activity since July. The second national meeting was held, and national guidelines developed. The guidelines were circulated and corrections sent to Washington in August. It is hoped a draft will be available soon. IRM is included in the FY 1985 and 1986 ESCOP budgets but it is unknown whether it will remain in the President's budget.

10.0 W-84 Biological Control Foreign Travel -- L. G. Weathers

There has been discussion within the technical committee about the need for a regional approach to searching for predators and parasites for target pests. Naegele at CSRS was looking into the possibility of a regional trust fund for such travel. If we decide to go that route, we will come back to the Western Directors with a specific request.

11.0 W. Extension Directors Computer Applications Study Team Report -- B. M. Jones

Jones was appointed to replace Lessman as liaison to this committee. The Extension Directors requested further information and will consider the report again at their summer meeting.

12.0 CSRS Report -- J. P. Jordan

1. I gratefully acknowledge the many letters, telegrams, telephone calls and personal visits which have been received since my appointment to the Administratorship. Generally they expressed two very significant points: (1) that we are in a critical time frame so far as publicly funded agricultural research is concerned and (2) each offered to assist in any way possible as the Experiment Station system, with CSRS as its Federal component, strives to make its needs known and its voice heard. I accept both the challenge of leadership at CSRS and the offers of assistance. It is critical that we present a solid front if we are to achieve our goals.

2. Dr. Bentley's charge to CSRS, as the USDA voice of university research, is to have an impact on agricultural research in the United States second to none. This does not refer simply to comparisons within the Department of Agriculture but even more broadly to include the National Science Foundation and National Institutes of Health in terms of impact on research, at least as it relates to agriculture. This means that with the small staff at the Cooperative State Research Service, we must carefully select the modes and activities in which we become engaged so that our impact will be equivalent to the other agencies mentioned. In terms of modus operandi, it might mean that we should seek membership on every significant committee within the Department of Agriculture dealing with agricultural research; CSRS faculty should probably be encouraged to develop an image as a leader and as a touch-stone for the thought leadership of each peer group within agricultural research; maybe the faculty of CSRS should be encouraged to do their basic job with 80 percent of the time, leaving 20 percent to express each individual's best strengths. ESCOP/Directors' input on these items are requested.

3. At the fall meeting of ESCOP it was agreed that a document should be prepared outlining goals, potentials, and needs for the agricultural research system over the ensuing years so far as the universities are concerned. The report should meet the same needs as the overall long range plan for ARS and the ES document "Extension in the 80's." Plans for the report have already caused it to be dubbed the "red, white and blue" report. The committee to prepare this document is in the organizational stage now and will be a joint publication of ESCOP and CSRS.

4. With a reduced number of scientists and support staff at CSRS, it will be even more important to fill positions with highly qualified individuals. Some directors have suggested that the type of person needed at CSRS is one with solid scientific credentials who also has interest and capabilities in administration. This could include individuals who are "comers" with potential to become department heads or deans. It also might involve department heads, associate deans, deans and directors who would like a short career with CSRS, or maybe an IPA appointment or some such arrangement that would allow them to be a part of the CSRS management team. Most directors accept the premise that the directors and deans must encourage the finest quality faculty to accept such appointments, either short-term or long-term with CSRS, if CSRS is to really

succeed.

5. The issue of roles and goals for CSRS and the relationship to ESCOP, the regional associations, NASULGC, etc., is a high priority. Although most people have a view of each of these organizations, it is helpful to have a common view. Additionally, some directors have suggested that the CSRS staff, in some ways, should parallel the National Program Staff of ARS. CSRS' role in supporting or partially supporting meetings and symposia should be related, say most directors, to issues that will impact the system and not simply support an additional professional meeting. Most directors would like to have the CSRS report to regional associations focus not so much on factual information that can be transmitted through the pink sheet, but rather on issues of policy and philosophy where the regional associations should have input. The same thing applies to ESCOP, especially since ESCOP meetings are where CSRS and the SAES can come to agreement on issues.

6. In discussions with directors, deans and vice presidents, program reviews surface as one of the highest priority areas for CSRS to continue. The question is how reviews ought to be organized and conducted in order to both strengthen the partnership between the USDA and the land-grant system and assist the reviewed institution in its management processes. Several approaches have been suggested, including the point that the identification of the chair for each review could be worked out jointly between the experiment station director and CSRS. In some instances it may do well to have a CSRS staff person in that role; in other instances it may be better to have one of the outside reviewers fulfill that function. The CSRS person makes a major contribution by participating in a series of reviews, thus providing the ability to "relate" among various institutions and their programs. Some directors insist that CSRS reviewing write-ups should reflect a greater degree of rigor. Others have identified the need for much more timely reports. At the option of the review team working jointly with the Station Director, it may be possible to have the CSRS representative stay a day-or-so following the departure of the main body in order to complete and leave with the institution the write-up of the draft report. There is support both for reviews that cross-cut various disciplines as well as departmental level reviews. With respect to the latter, some have suggested that they be fitted in more with the internal reviews of each university. It has been suggested that individuals who have previously been on an IPA assignment with CSRS are an excellent source of talented experience and that some of the reviews could be organized and carried out through a CSRS representative who may be stationed at one of the Experiment Stations (perhaps someone with a 20-25 percent CSRS appointment). Input on this important topic is sought.

7. With a reduction-in-force in CSRS, all of the same functions cannot be carried out in the same way they have in past years. It is critical for us within CSRS and with the input from the SAES system to state clearly what it is we can no longer do in terms of services. The input from ESCOP/Directors is sought to assist me in

setting priorities.

8. During the week of November 7, three finalists for the position of Associate Administrator were interviewed, each for a full day. They were Dr. Raymond A. Cragle, Dr. Clare I. Harris, and Dr. H. Graham Purchase. Director Lamar Harris represented the Experiment Station Directors on the screening committee and Director-at-Large Thomas S. Ronningen represented the Directors in the interview process. A decision will be made as rapidly as possible and cleared through the appropriate channels within the Department of Agriculture. I am extremely pleased that such high quality candidates applied for this position.

9. Some information items include:

- Continued improvement of the inside as well as the entrance into the West Auditors Building.
- Office space and meeting rooms for visiting directors, DALs, ESCOP committees, etc.
- Move of the Administrator's office to room 304-A will take place as soon as the move of telephones is accomplished.
- Assistant Secretary Bentley has approved a request to open discussion and seek suggestions about renaming the West Auditors Building. The idea is to rename the building to something meaningful to the cooperative state research system. The name of an individual who is of significance to us is a possibility; or the building could be named on a functional basis. I invite suggestions between now and the 20th of December at which time Assistant Secretary Bentley, Deputy Assistant Secretary Kendrick, ESCOP Chairman Clarke and myself will prepare a recommendation for Assistant Secretary Bentley to forward to Secretary Block and thence to the GSA.

During discussion, Directors agreed they would be willing to prioritize and provide short justifications for each review request. Dewhirst suggested CSRS could eliminate the review of new projects and the annual review of projects. Directors would like to see CSRS performing a leadership role, such as sponsoring the root diseases seminar and paper several years ago.

13.0 ERS Report -- M. L. Cotner

Cotner distributed two handouts: a paper entitled "United States Agricultural Policy in a 'Managed Trade' World" by Chatten and Lee, and another paper by John Lee entitled "Forces Shaping the Future of U.S. Agriculture" presented to the 60th Annual Agricultural Outlook Conference.

ERS is preparing a longterm plan for the agency which should be in draft form by next month. Cotner and Lee would like feedback and input from the Directors for that plan.

14.0 Micronesia Experiment Station -- I. Lebehn

Lebehn distributed a handout on the College of Micronesia System, which serves the Republic of Palau, the Federated States of Micronesia (Yap, Truk, Ponape, Kosrae), the Republic of the Marshall Islands, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. Palau, Ponape, and the Marshalls have agreed to give the land for the Experiment Station. A position announcement for the AES Director will be circulated within a month. A staff of four professionals is projected -- veterinarian, soil scientist, entomologist, and plant pathologist.

15.0 Western Director-at-Large Issue -- C. E. Clark, L. W. Dewhirst

Dewhirst reviewed his activities to date as the "acting" DAL. He has met several times with the other three DALs and they are willing to provide the West with their newsletters and other general information items. At the ESCOP meeting, it appeared the other three regions were not interested in reducing the number of DALs. However, they were asked to look at several possible configurations of staffing and have agreed to do so. Halpin has agreed to attend the WDA summer meeting to provide a DAL report.

Clark suggested Directors reconsider their September decision because our geographical isolation makes it more necessary that we have someone represent our interests in Washington.

Miller indicated that as the incoming CAHA chairman, he could certainly use the services provided by the Western DAL. However, he felt we should adhere to our timetable in order to give people an opportunity to seriously consider the issues. Lewis agreed with this view, and suggested we have not yet determined what the DAL position should accomplish.

Dewhirst suggested that perhaps we should meet with CAHA representatives to talk about the issue of DALs and their potential roles. Miller suggested Dewhirst write Ozbun, chairman of Western CAHA, proposing a joint meeting, perhaps in March.

Halpin discussed some of his responsibilities and perceptions of his role as the Southern DAL. He emphasizes regular, weekly contact with his Directors and frequent Station visitations, to remain informed about their concerns, educate them, and keep in contact with their ongoing research programs. This helps him respond to questions about agricultural research. During Station visitations, he also meets with department heads and explains the regional and national research system to them, and visits branch stations to see what is unique about a state's agriculture. His own interests lie in getting better media coverage of agriculture and agricultural research issues.

Drew asked Halpin his opinion on the ability of two DALs to handle the workload. Halpin felt the job was too large for only two people, especially since they would not be able to remain well

informed about the programs in the different states. He indicated that he does not establish a formal annual plan of work with his directors. Bulla questioned the rationale for having DALs on a regional basis--is regionalization very important in terms of DAL activities?

Lewis questioned the role of CSRS in serving the Directors, pointing out that the roles of the DALs had changed over the years in part to help perform functions that CSRS was unable to perform. Jordan indicated that CSRS can handle all the DAL roles except lobbying, but that doesn't answer the question of quality or how many people would be needed for optimal performance. CSRS cannot interact with Capitol Hill except by invitation. He emphasized that the primary relationship for CSRS must be with the regional associations through the chairmen, with the DALs providing continuity. There is an overlap of the functions that DALs and CSRS perform, and the overall system needs to be examined.

MOTION CARRIED that the Western Directors adhere to a summer deadline for deciding whether to hire a Western DAL. In the interim, the WDA continue to assess the need for a DAL by considering its relationship with CSRS, with NASULGC, with CAHA, and its own regional needs. This issue will be the major topic of discussion at the spring WDA meeting.

It was agreed that Directors should send their written thoughts on the issue to Clark. The entire staffing needs of the WDA should be considered. Do we want a DAL? What do we want that person to do? What do we want CSRS to do?

Dewhirst noted that if CAHA were invited to the spring meeting, the meeting would take longer than the currently scheduled one day.

16.0 Other Business

16.1 Future Meetings

MOTION CARRIED To approve the following dates and locations for future Western Directors Association meetings:

Spring	March 27, 1984	Salt Lake City, UT
Summer	July 30-August 2, 1984	Hilo, HI
Summer	August 5-9, 1985	Logan, UT

16.2 Plant-Water Stress Task Force

RPG-1 has taken the initiative in organizing a task force in water in response to the action of the Western Directors at the summer meeting in Corvallis. The task force will focus on the area of plant-water stress. Nominations for membership were widely solicited, and the final membership is:

H. W. Ayer ERS, Tucson, AZ

G. S. Campbell	WSU, Pullman, WA
W. R. Gardner	U of AZ, Tucson
R. J. Hanks	USU, Logan, UT
T. C. Hsiao	U of CA, Davis, CA
E. V. Maas	ARS, Riverside, CA
B. A. Melton	NMSU, Las Cruces, NM
J. E. Quisenberry	ARS, Lubbock, TX
R. J. Reginato	ARS, Phoenix, AZ

16.3 ERS Request for Assistance with Federal Leasing Studies -- L. L. Boyd

ERS has requested WRCC-55 "Rangeland Resource Economics" provide assistance in the review of some federal leasing studies. Directors agreed that WRCC-55 should not become involved in reviews of these studies for any agencies.

16.4 ARS Longrange Applied Breeding Programs -- L. A. Bulla

Bulla expressed concern that the ARS six-year plan proposes a severe reduction in both plant and animal applied breeding programs. Although the plan does not have final approval, steps have already been taken to reduce locations and efforts in these areas. Dewhirst indicated he would discuss this issue when he meets with western ARS administrators at their meeting in January.

16.5 Treasurer's Report

Welsh distributed for Hovin a financial statement of the Western DAL account at Montana for the fiscal year to date. The report is contained herein as Appendix B.

17.0 Adjournment

Chairman Dewhirst adjourned the meeting at 5:00 p.m., Tuesday, November 15, 1984.

ESCOP

PROPOSED BUDGET INCREASES

for

Cooperative State Research Service (CSRS)



FY - 1986

Recommended by ESCOP Budget Subcommittee

ESCOP BUDGET SUBCOMMITTEE PROPOSED BUDGET INCREASES
FOR COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH SERVICE - FY 1986

Introduction

The State Agricultural Experiment Station system performs almost 60% of the public food and agriculture research in the United States. The continued investment in support and funding of this dramatic state research system is essential if the U.S. is to maintain its leadership role in Food and Agricultural production in the decades ahead.

The United States agricultural research system has been extremely successful in providing the advanced technology to provide the food and fiber needs of this nation and others abroad. Farmers have been able to greatly increase productivity by using the tools generated from agricultural mechanization and scientific and technological advances. We are now entering the infancy of another period of rapid growth in knowledge and technology. The continued improvement in agricultural productivity is essential if the United States is to maintain its world leadership role for food, fiber, and forest products.

Today, America is an urban society and fewer people recognize issues surrounding food and fiber. The industrial age is giving way to the information-communication age and the agriculture community continues to explore ways to maximize benefits from this new technology.

A case must be made for additional Federal support and funding for research. The opportunity for new agricultural technologies, spanning the spectrum, has never been greater and new research investments in these potential technologies must be made. The stake is nothing less than the United States competitive edge in the world's agricultural economy.

Priorities for Increases in Funding

Major Research Emphasis:

- I. Expand basic science and biotechnology for plant and animal agriculture, including forestry. Food technology, the beneficial utilization of waste products, and the detoxification of environmental contaminants and other related areas are also included. \$12,750

Hatch & Hatch (1463c) ¹	\$ 9,250
Evans-Allen	500
McIntire-Stennis	800
Animal Health and Disease (1463 & 1434)	2,200

- II. Development of advanced integrated technology systems for food and fiber production and related post harvest technology in the U.S., including IPM, IRM, resource conservation, energy and food animal health. \$11,000

Hatch & Hatch (1463c)	\$ 7,650
Evans-Allen	1,200
McIntire-Stennis	500
Animal Health and Disease (1433 & 1434)	1,400
Rangeland (Sec. 1480, PL 97-98)	250

III. Research on conservation, preservation and effective utilization of soil, water and other natural resources, including the monitoring and protection of air, rain, and ground water quality. \$6,000.

Hatch & Hatch (1463c)	\$ 4,900
Evans-Allen	700
McIntire-Stennis	400

IV. Research on marketing, utilization and policy to increase the sale of U.S. agricultural products in foreign and domestic markets. \$3,000.

Hatch & Hatch (1463c)	\$2,750
Evans-Allen	150
McIntire-Stennis	100

V. Research to improve human nutrition, fresh and processed food safety and quality, and family and community management. \$5,000.

Hatch & Hatch (1463c)	\$ 3,350
Evans-Allen	1,650

VI. Expand Federal share of network research investment to assist states to maintain their research capacities during this period of serious reduction in state revenue. \$4,150 (see footnote 2.)

Hatch & Hatch (1463c)	\$ 3,100
Evans-Allen	450
McIntire-Stennis	200
Animal Health & Disease (1433)	400

VII. Special Research Topics.

Special research grants:

	<u>Increases</u>	<u>Restoration if needed or new item</u>
a. IRM	\$ 150	\$ 1,000 R
b. IPM	450	3,000 R
c. Pesticide Impact Assessment	800	0
d. Biological Control (new)	0	500 N
e. Pesticide Clearance	600	0
f. Minor use animal drugs	100	0
g. Animal Health (1414.c.1.)	1,500	0
h. Acid Precipitation	150	0
i. Germplasm resources research	300	0
j. International Agriculture Foreign Trade Policy (new)		1,000 N
k. National Crop Loss Assessment (new)		750 N
l. National Microbial Collections (new)		100 N
TOTAL	<u>\$ 4,050</u>	<u>\$ 2,350 N 4,000 R</u>

VIII. Competitive Grant (PL 89-106):

Although Competitive Grants are not administered by Cooperative State Research Service, ESCOP strongly supports increases in the Competitive Grants Program. ESCOP supports the addition of environmental stress as a topic in Plant Sciences and the addition of a new topic, Biotechnology. ESCOP further endorses reasonable increases for all current Competitive Grant topics for the Plant Sciences, Human Nutrition, and Animal Sciences.

Total Increases by Funding Authorizations

Hatch.....	\$24,000	
Hatch (1463c).....	7,000	
McIntire-Stennis.....	2,000	
Evans-Allen.....	4,650	
Animal Health and Disease (1433).....	1,000	
Animal Health and Disease (1434) (new item).....	3,000	
Rangeland Research Grants (PL 97-98).....	250	
Special research grants (PL 89-106).....	6,400	to 10,400
TOTAL	\$48,300	to \$52,300

¹Statement on Hatch (1463c): The 1981 Farm Bill contains an authorization, Sec. 1437. Section 1463c, for establishing funding levels at the State Agricultural Experiment Stations, to be not less than 25% of the total research funding in USDA. The requested increases in Hatch 1463c and corresponding increases in Evans-Allen 1463c reflect the level of increase needed to accomplish the 25% provision over a 5-year period (1%/year). ESCOP passed a resolution at its 1983 Spring meeting to give strong support for accomplishing the authorized level of funding contained in the 1981 Farm Bill.

²State legislatures provide about half the national investment in total U.S. publicly supported agricultural research. The Nation capitalizes handsomely on the "spillover effects" and the resultant increase in new technology and the resultant competitiveness of U.S. agriculture. Current financial distress in most states have caused them to reduce state programs including research. In 1982, 17 states made across-the-board cuts and 25 made selected program cuts. In 1983, 27 states made across-the-board cuts; 37 states, selected cuts. These cuts were imposed by state legislatures and not cuts initiated by the State Agricultural Experiment Stations or the Land Grant Universities. The total impact of these current state-by-state reductions will have tremendous long-term impacts on the total Agricultural Research system in this nation.

APPENDIX B

WESTERN DIRECTOR AT LARGE ACCOUNT
FINANCIAL STATEMENT FY1984

ITEM	ALLOCATION	INCOME	EXPENSE	BALANCE
JULY 1 BALANCE				2934.76
ALASKA	1716.18	1716.18		4650.94
ARIZONA	9102.69			4650.94
CALIFORNIA	19260.59	19260.59		23911.53
COLORADO	12616.21	12616.21		36527.74
GUAM	1472.66	1472.66		38000.40
HAWAII	4615.12			38000.40
IDAHO	7166.19	7166.19		45166.59
MONTANA	8024.28	8024.28		53190.87
NEVADA	4394.80	4394.80		57585.67
NEW MEXICO	4835.44	4835.44		62421.11
OREGON	11375.46			62421.11
UTAH	8290.98	8290.98		70712.09
WASHINGTON	16002.18	16002.18		86714.27
WYOMING	7085.02	7085.02		93799.29
TOTAL	115957.80			93799.29
				93799.29
101183	REGENTS OF CA		20000.00	73799.29
101783	NASULGC-RENT		9000.00	64799.29

11/14/83

