

MINUTES OF MEETINGS OF WESTERN EXPERIMENT STATION DIRECTORS

NOVEMBER 14-15, 1954

WASHINGTON, D. C.

The meeting was called to order at 9:40 A.M., November 14, 1954, by Chairman J. E. Kraus of Idaho. Reading of the minutes of the previous meeting was dispensed with upon motion by Wadsworth of Hawaii.

Director Buchanan of Washington gave a brief report upon activities of ESCOP during the past year. He reviewed the committee's activities in relation to the problem of getting bulletins to foreign libraries. A more detailed discussion of this problem was scheduled for the meeting of the combined groups of the Experiment Station Directors. Buchanan briefly reviewed the program of the National Communications Project in which Stanley Andrews is involved, and discussed the type of cooperation that would be expected from the states. A full discussion of this program was scheduled for the national meeting of the Directors.

Another item receiving considerable discussion was a proposal by Oklahoma A & M that that college build a building to serve as headquarters for U.S.D.A. activities on a rental basis with the idea that after it was amortized it would be available on a maintenance basis to the U.S.D.A. ESCOP has proposed that such action be commended in principle. The reaction of the various states is desired to such a proposal that would result in consolidation of U.S.D.A. offices in the state on the land-grant college campus. (Director Kelso of Montana raised some questions regarding the role of land-grant colleges in agricultural administration and recommended to the Directors that they read a book, entitled "Decline of Agrarian Democracy" by Grant McConnell.)

A resolution prepared by ESCOP relative to the status of the Office of Experiment Stations was presented to the group for review. At the suggestion of Director Sharp of California, several changes were made in wording of the resolution. A motion initiated by Wheeler that our group endorse the revised resolution was carried without dissenting vote. The content of the resolution as approved was as follows:

Whereas, each of the states and territories has accepted the provisions of the Hatch Act of March 2, 1887, establishing agricultural experiment stations;

Whereas, the Hatch Act and subsequent authorizations provide Federal grants and endowments for the support of state programs of agricultural research;

Whereas, the aforesaid grants and endowments, properly administered, stimulate and encourage state support for the total program of agricultural research;

Whereas, the research program at the state level is increased by the integration of Federal grants with much larger State fund contributions;

Whereas, it is imperative that the administrative organization of the Federal grant funds be such as to facilitate maximum coordination with the research program of the states;

Whereas, it is the duty of the Secretary of Agriculture to administer Federal-grant funds; and

Whereas, the agency designated by the Secretary to administer Federal-grant funds should be in a position to deal directly with the Secretary, the agencies under his administration, other departments of government, and the state agricultural experiment stations:

Now, therefore, it is recommended to the Secretary of Agriculture that (1) the Office of Experiment Stations be designated as the responsible agency within the Department of Agriculture to administer Federal-grant funds to the states; (2) the principal officer be designated as the Administrator, Office of Experiment Stations; and (3) the Administrator of the Office of Experiment Stations report directly to the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture for Federal-States relations.

This resolution was forwarded to the officers of the National Association of Experiment Station Directors where it was presented at a general meeting and passed by that group. (There may have been some additional modification of wording of the final draft.)

The possibility was pointed out that someone might propose to have both the Extension Service and the Experiment Station activities under one administrator who would report to the Assistant Secretary for state relations. A discussion that followed indicated general opposition of this group to such an idea. Director Buchanan reported on activities of the legislative committee of the national group of Experiment Station Directors. Of major interest was his summary of the recommendations made by the states and the U.S.D.A. relative to budget needs during the next ten year period. This topic was discussed in detail at a general session of the combined groups of Directors. As a result of the survey, recommendations will be made that in the next five years state appropriations for agricultural research be increased from the present rate of 72 million dollars to 132 million dollars, an increase of 60 million, that Federal grant funds for research be increased from 19 to 49 million, and that appropriations to the U.S.D.A. for research increase from 52 million to 82 million. This would reduce the present ratio of State to Federal grant funds from approximately 4 to 1 to 3 to 1. The data submitted by the Directors indicated a reduction in the increments needed during the second five years, but for the purpose of the report that was prepared the same increments were recommended for the second five year period.

The group was advised that arrangements had been made to present the report on the survey of research needs to major farm organizations in a meeting on November 29 with the legislative committee.

Discussion followed on proposed changes in the legislation relative to appropriation of Federal grant funds. The group was advised that a bill may be introduced in the next legislative session to consolidate all Federal grant appropriations. Director Walker of Utah raised the question about the

formula by which funds are allocated to the states. He was advised by Dr. Elting that under the proposed legislation the 1954-55 distribution would be frozen and that additional increments above that level, which amounts to about 19 million dollars, would be according to Section 9 formula.

A motion presented by Director Briggs of Wyoming, and seconded by Director Curry of New Mexico, was passed to the effect that the Western Directors suggest to ESCOP that the bill for consolidation of Federal grant funds be introduced by the Agricultural Committee of the Committees of the House and Senate upon recommendation of the Experiment Station Directors Association. Buchanan pointed out how this proposed bill was designed to consolidate appropriations rather than to change appropriations.

Buchanan also reported on the results of the survey regarding the personnel requirements for the proposed expanded research program in relation to the availability of personnel. Details of this phase of this report are available in the mimeographed material handed out at the meeting of the combined groups. In regard to the availability of senior scientists, it was of particular interest that in response to the questionnaire, only two states indicated that they were really in trouble this year in filling positions.

At the request of the secretary of the National Association of Experiment Station Directors the items on the agenda relative to election of members to the Committee of Nine and ESCOP and ESMRACK were taken up earlier than was scheduled on the agenda. Director Wheeler of Colorado was nominated and elected to replace Director Kraus on the Committee of Nine. Kelso was unanimously elected to be Wheeler's alternate. For ESCOP, Director Eckert of Arizona was elected to continue as alternate to Kraus, whose term expires in 1957. Eckert was elected for a two year period to ESMRACK. Dr. Clara Storvick from Oregon State College was elected to represent the Western Home Economists replacing Dr. A. F. Morgan who has retired. Buchanan was re-elected for another one year term on the legislative committee. Director Sharp of California was nominated and unanimously elected as alternate to Buchanan on the legislative committee.

Director Sharp expressed the opinion that the two year terms were too short and the four year terms were too long, and suggested that consideration be given to changing the term of office to three years. Director Wadsworth of Hawaii proposed that by the next meeting the committee report on recommendations for revision of the terms of office. The group passed a motion presented by Sharp to the effect that the term of office of members of the Committee of Nine be for three years with the individual ineligible to succeed himself, and this resolution be presented to the other three regional associations of Directors for consideration. Chairman Kraus named a committee consisting of Director Curry of New Mexico as chairman, Director Sharp, and Director Walker of Utah.

Briggs reported on activities of the Committee of Nine. The work load for this Committee was considerably heavier than in previous years. He was hopeful that in the future, projects would come in in better shape so that less time would be required by the Committee of Nine in the review of these projects. To help in this way, the Committee has worked up some supplementary statements that will be sent to Directors to attach to the manual trying to set forth suggestions that would be helpful in the preparation of the projects.

Considerable time was spent by the Committee of Nine on reviewing the interregional project proposals. Seven proposals were considered at the meetings of the Committee September 15-17 at the University of Minnesota. Four of these proposals were considered acceptable and were sent to the Directors for review. If no increases are available in the next fiscal year and if the present formula is followed, thirty-seven thousand dollars will be available for interregional No. IRI project dealing with potatoes. This would leave \$26,000 available to assign to one or more of the four projects that have been recommended for consideration.

A discussion then followed regarding the merits of the four interregional project proposals. The titles of these four proposals are as follows:

1. Indexing, evaluation, and development of methods and techniques for obtaining and preserving virus-free deciduous tree fruit stocks.
2. Energy requirements of humans.
3. Agricultural price structures and policy.
4. Interregional repository for the causative agents of poultry respiratory diseases.

The group was asked to establish priority ratings on these four projects. The Directors were reminded that the repository project had been approved by the Western Directors at their Las Cruces, New Mexico, meeting last spring. A tentative outline was submitted to the Directors by Kraus under date of August 24, 1954. The group seemed in general agreement that this project should be given number one priority, and a motion to that effect was made by Briggs, seconded by Henderson, and carried. The discussions that followed relative to the ratings for the other three projects were quite lengthy. Disagreement on the proper rating of these three projects was unanimous. Stimulated by a strong desire to adjourn for lunch, the group gave approval to a motion presented by Buchanan and seconded by Director Fleming of Nevada, to the effect that we leave the priorities of the other three projects in the hands of the Committee of Nine.

Briggs and Kraus emphasized the importance of complying with the time schedule adopted for consideration of interregional projects. They reported that the Great Plains project proposal and two others were rejected because they had not conformed with the schedule.

Briggs also reviewed proposals that had been suggested for more effectively coordinating the activities of ESMRACK and the Committee of Nine.

Following lunch the meeting was again resumed. Kraus was elected as the Western group's administrative adviser for the interregional project on tree fruit repository.

Eckert reported on the activities of ESMRACK. Its activities centered around the following items:

1. Discussion of relationship between ESMRACK and the Committee of Nine.

2. Preparation of new handbook on Title II projects.
3. Relationship with other agencies conducting marketing programs under Title II.
4. New projects and further scrutiny of the scope of Title II projects.

Both ESMRACK and the Committee of Nine recognized the need for additional coordination. Each committee thought that it would be possible to achieve this additional coordination without creating additional machinery.

The Office of Experiment Stations has accepted responsibility for revising the handbook which is somewhat out of date at the present time.

The committee recognized that there is a real need for greater coordination among the agencies conducting Title II programs. He urged that the heads of the agencies involved, which include the State Experiment Stations, the Extension Service, and State Departments of Agriculture, take the necessary steps to achieve this coordination. For example, an agency initiating a Title II project was urged to make copies of the project available to the other agencies and to consult with them when initiating a project in overlapping areas.

Eckert expressed concern about an atmosphere of indifference relative to activating Title II projects. He pointed out that at the present time there are not enough projects on file to utilize the funds which will be available if we get a new increment the next fiscal year. In order to encourage submission of good projects the deadline for submitting them has been extended to February 1, 1955. Out of approximately \$500,000 available to all groups, the Western group of states has only been allocated \$82,000. Of this amount, approximately \$23,000 are assigned to Washington. Three of the Western states and Hawaii do not have any Title II money.

Because of the failure of the states to submit a sufficient number of Title II projects it has been necessary to lower the specifications in order to get sufficient projects to utilize the funds that are available. Anything that falls under Section 203 will be considered, but it should still relate to the marketing problem. The door is still shut to strictly production projects. Matching funds must equal the allocation and must be spent on the project. Title II funds are good during the second year after funds are allotted.

Eckert discussed the Title II project of "Consumer Preference for Beef" with special reference to the methods used in achieving coordination. He requested action by the group on two points. First, whether or not the procedure had been followed in coordinating this group of Title II projects was acceptable, and if so, who should be appointed as administrative adviser.

A motion by Walker, seconded by Buchanan, that Eckert be commended for action taken so far on this project and he be designated as administrative adviser was passed.

A lengthy discussion followed regarding the pattern to be followed in coordination of Title II projects. The main problem was how to take advantage

of joint planning and integration without asking individual states to give up control of such things as methodology. Sharp warned against shifting too far toward the 9b3 pattern of coordination.

Dr. Elting, representing the Office of Experiment Stations, discussed some of the problems involved in handling and approving expanded programs. He emphasized that the funds cannot be expended until an outline is submitted and approved. The OES is very reluctant to make approvals retroactive.

He reported that several additions had been made to the OES staff and that they would be in a position to do a much more adequate job. In several of the states with larger programs they may send out pairs of inspectors.

He expressed considerable concern about the 20% marketing provision. At the national level only 18% has been committed for marketing research to date.

Elting reminded the Directors to inform his office regarding the dates of technical committee meetings in order that his office could have a representative at the meetings. Director Elting reported on some of the experiences his office has had in handling requests for information about research that was under way in the various states.

Dr. Elting also discussed the letter from Dr. Trullinger calling to our attention a conference held last January in Kerrville, Texas, under the general subject of pesticides and residues with particular relation to livestock. The Office of Experiment Stations took an active role in fostering this cooperative effort which they considered in one of those areas which are not being approached under the regional program and yet would seem to have strong regional and national implication. He suggested that this might be a subject in which the Directors would want to give some consideration as a regional group.

Wheeler handed out copies of what he described as the final, final, revised, revised copy of WM-4. A rather lengthy discussion followed. The main problem seemed to be concerning how state funds marked with an asterisk in the proposed budget would be transferred to the trust fund. A motion by Curry, seconded by Sharp, was passed. It provided that this revised project, pertaining to livestock marketing information, be identified as WM-21 and approved, provided suitable arrangements can be made for transfer of state funds marked with an asterisk in the proposed budget to the trust fund.

Henderson moved that Wheeler be designated as administrative adviser for WM-21. Second by Kelso. Carried.

Wheeler then distributed copies of the proposed sheep marketing project entitled "Sheep and Lamb Marketing Problems in the Pacific Western States." Except for the date, it is the same as the July 28 copy. One addition was made to section 7 in the second and third sentence. The contributing projects have been approved by the technical committee executive committee.

Curry moved and Kelso seconded a motion that the proposed project be identified as WM-22 and approved by the Western Directors for immediate activation. Carried.

Wheeler then passed out the suggested allotments for WM-21 and WM-22 as prepared by the executive committee of the technical committee of WM-4. Buchanan moved, Walker seconded, that reallocation of WM-4 funds to WM-4, WM-21, and WM-22 be as near to those proposed in the attached table as previous expenditures on WM-4 by states permit. Carried.

Moved by Briggs and seconded by Buchanan that Wheeler be administrative adviser for WM-22.

DIRECTORS ARE TO ADVISE O.E.S. AND OTHER DIRECTORS REGARDING APPOINTMENTS TO THE TECHNICAL COMMITTEE.

At 4:00 o'clock the group recessed for fifteen minutes.

Kelso was called on to lead the discussion of the proposal from the Home Economists of the Western Region for expansion of research in consumer food problems. He commented that if he interpreted the suggestion correctly in the proposal, it's simply an observation by the Home Economists who have been working together on W-4 and they are expressing their willingness and interest in carrying on some additional regional research in the Home Economics field, particularly in consumer food products. The Home Economists indicated that they could conduct such a project on some food commodities or food marketing. In other words, take either a commodity or marketing approach on these consumer food problems. They would be willing to go either direction. Some of the Directors thought that the Title II approach should be followed, despite the fact that the Home Economists seem to want to approach the thing through 9b3. Out of the discussion came a recommendation that a Western Home Economics Research Council be established that would function in a manner comparable to the Agricultural Economics Council.

Kelso was instructed to contact the Home Economists relative to establishment of such a council and development of research project proposals.

Kraus referred to a letter written in August by Dr. Wells and Dr. Shaw stating that the Agricultural Experiment Stations of the Western Region need to indicate their concurrence in the renewal of the memorandum relative to the Western Agricultural Economics Research Council. It is now desirable that the original agreement be changed to substitute the names Agricultural Marketing Service and Agricultural Research Service in each place where the Bureau of Agricultural Economics now appears. This proposed change will mean that each of these organizations would have membership in the council. The group, by approval of a motion presented by Curry and seconded by Kelso, authorized Kraus to write to Wells requesting extension of an appropriate memorandum of understanding.

Kraus opened the discussion regarding tentative budget allocations that had been developed by Kraus and Henderson and circulated to the Directors in August. A decision was reached to delay final action on project allocations until the February meeting at which time we should have a pretty good idea regarding the funds that would be available. Sharp pointed out that if we delayed action until the February meeting and found that we were to get the 5 million dollar increase, we would have to have the projects developed and approved and in to the Committee of Nine by March 26 which would be difficult.

Buchanan was asked to discuss a request by the Western Agricultural Economics Research Council that the Western Directors give them some target

figures to work with prior to their meeting of the Council. Several of the Directors thought that this was not advisable since they saw no more reason to set up target figures for the economists than for any other groups, such as the agronomists or livestock people. Sharp expressed concern about creating a series of vested interests in funds. No definite action was taken on the request, other than to ask Buchanan to relay to the Council the thinking of the Directors on this matter.

The next item dealt with the discussion on the Bureau of Land Management and state relationships. It was the general consensus of those present that the organization of the Bureau of Land Management now provides better opportunity for cooperative relationships with the states to work with the other groups of Directors in matters of policy relative to cooperation with the B.L.M. It was moved by Buchanan and seconded by Briggs that a committee be appointed by the chairman consisting of at least three. This motion was carried. Kraus is to advise the Directors by letter regarding the membership of this committee and its responsibility.

Buchanan moved that Kraus be designated to serve on the program. (Was he elected? The secretary got hungry and couldn't wait to find out.)

Meeting recessed about 6:00 P.M. for dinner.

The group reconvened in the evening at 7:15 and discussed Alaskan participation. Action was deferred until work is done on budgets.

Briggs read a letter dated September 21, 1954, from G. B. Wood to Kraus to the effect that the project on technical aspects of wool marketing and projects on economics of wool marketing have representation of economists on the technical committee. The group was in agreement that it is up to the Director to see that both groups are represented on a state contributing project if the nature of the project is such that this will strengthen the project. Decision on approval of budgets for wool projects will be delayed until the February meetings.

Briggs was appointed as administrative adviser on W-2 to replace Knott.

It was pointed out that rams at the DuBois Station are to be sold to State Experiment Stations for \$100 f.o.b. DuBois. There is no policy at present regarding sale of ewes, but this is being cleared with the Idaho Board of Regents. Kraus is to advise Directors regarding policy that is approved. The group favored that the price for ewes be determined on an individual basis based on their breeding record, age, quality, etc.

Buchanan discussed the Agricultural Research Institute. He urged that Western states be represented. Meetings are usually held in Washington, D. C. This will be discussed again at the spring meeting.

Need of a project review committee was discussed. Reaction was mixed. Wheeler moved that a project review committee be established for review of new and revised regional projects. Second by Wadsworth. Carried. The committee will be composed of three members on a rotation basis to be nominated by the group. Nominations included Briggs, Kelso, and Sharp. They were unanimously and reluctantly elected. Sharp was elected for one year, Kelso for two years, and Briggs for three years.

Wheeler moved that target levels of 12, 25, or 40 thousand dollars be suggested to technical committee for projects in economics of soil and water management. Seconded by Sharp and carried.

Walker was designated as the administrative adviser for both the water and soil management project and economics of soil and water management. Walker is to advise Directors of date of meeting of technical committees.

Kelso was named as administrative adviser for animal disease project. Henderson pointed out that allotments set up for animal diseases could include projects with insects and plant diseases. Kelso is to canvas Directors regarding animal diseases. Henderson is to contact Directors with objective of developing new regional projects on both insects and plant diseases.

Discussion followed on range nutrition. Fleming is to be administrative adviser. It will be separate from W-25.

Curry was designated to poll Directors for suggestions in production efficiency areas.

Henderson discussed proposal on physio-chemical evaluation of problems involved in pesticide action. The group questioned whether sufficient physical chemists were available.

Buchanan was designated as adviser for:

1. Development and use of new technological methods in marketing farm products.
2. Marketing horticultural specialty crops in the West.

ADVISERS ARE TO HAVE PRELIMINARY OUTLINES READY FOR REVIEW AT THE FEBRUARY MEETINGS.

New business: Discussion of dates for February meetings. February 14, 15, 16 suggested tentatively. Projects should get to Director Kraus by February 1.

Progress reports on W-23 and Khapra beetle phase of WM-16 were distributed by Henderson.

Respectfully submitted,

R. W. Henderson

R. W. Henderson
Secretary

RWH:ad

