

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

Davis, California

March 21-23, 1979

SUMMARY OF ACTIONS

Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors

March 21-23, 1979

1. Approved the August 9-11, 1979 Minutes with prior corrections. (p. 2)
2. Heard report of Chairman/Executive Committee and recommended that:
 - a. off-the-top funding for Western Region and IR projects remain at FY 1979 level unless Hatch funds increased (p. 4)
 - b. Recording Secretary budget (from W-106) for FY 80 be increased to \$27,500 (p. 5)
 - c. DAL FY 80 salary be increased to \$47,500 with a \$250/mo. dislocation allowance, for a total office budget of \$100,452 (p. 5)
 - d. 1979 Experiment Station Banquet at Land Grant not honor Hank Fortmann (p. 5)
 - e. Buchanan serve as Executive Vice Chairman of ESCOP for 1979 (p. 8)
 - f. Recording Secretary position be continued in Berkeley (p. 8)
 - g. consideration of SEA-AR offer to house Recording Secretary in Oakland be tabled (p. 9)
3. Requested ESCOP establish a subcommittee to make recommendations on housing and care requirements of food production animals used in research and teaching (p. 11)
4. Acted on RIC recommendations which:
 - a. approve project revisions for:
 - W-6 Germ Plasm (p. F-49)
 - W-82 Water quality (p. F-49)
 - W-84 Biological pest control (p. F-50)
 - W-131 Mosquito populations (p. F-50)
 - W-135 Stress in food-producing animals (p. F-51)
 - W-136 Poultry (p. F-51)
 - b. disapprove requests for project revisions for:
 - W-133 Outdoor recreation (p. F-50)
 - W-134 Nematodes (p. F-50)
 - W-140 Energy (p. F-51)
 - c. approve requests for new projects for:
 - W- Soil water properties, spatial variability and implications in soil management (p. F-51)
 - W- Timber and forage interrelationships in western montane forests (p. F-52)
 - W- Development of new and improved crops for water conservation in arid lands (p. F-52)
 - W- Limitations in crop yield potential as affected by the rhizosphere, soil, and other environmental factors (p. F-52)
 - W- Determination of the causes of and corrections for pH imbalance in grapes for processing (p. F-53)
 - d. disapprove requests for new projects for:
 - W- Chalk brood disease in bees (p. F-52)
 - e. approve requests for one-year extensions for:
 - W-138 Herbicidal movement in plants (p. F-53)
 - W-140 Energy (p. F-51)

- f. approve three-year extensions for:
 - WRCC-1 Beef cattle breeding (p. F-54)
 - WRCC-13 Seed production and technology research (p. F-54)
 - WRCC-24 Diseases and pests of grape crops (p. F-54)
 - WRCC-25 Diseases and pests of landscape plants (p. F-54)
 - g. approve the following new WRCC's:
 - WRCC-36 Interrelationships among low intensity land uses, population growth and public lands in western arid environments (p. F-53)
 - WRCC-37 Maximizing the effectiveness of bees as pollinators of agricultural crops (p. F-55)
 - WRCC-38 Occupational exposure to pesticides (p. F-55)
 - WRCC-39 Increased efficiency in marketing of lamb and mutton (p. F-55)
 - h. table request for a new WRCC on Rangelands pending further information (p. F-54)
 - i. approve the following new or changed Administrative Advisor assignments:
 - W-102 Livestock parasites - L. W. Dewhirst (AZ) (p. F-57)
 - WRCC-1 Beef cattle breeding - B. M. Jones (CO) (p. F-54)
 - WRCC-23 Clothing and textiles - L. L. Boyd (WA) (p. F-57)
 - WRCC-36 Land uses - E. H. Zube (AZ) (p. F-53)
 - WRCC-37 Bees - L. E. Myers (AR-AZ) (p. F-55)
 - WRCC-38 Exposure to pesticides - M. N. Schroth (CA) (p. F-55)
 - WRCC-39 Marketing of lamb and mutton - A. M. Mullins (ID) (p. F-55)
 - W- Soil water properties ... - J. R. Davis (OR) (p. F-51)
 - W- Timber and forage ... - E. H. Zube (AZ) (p. F-52)
 - W- Development of new crops ... - K. J. Lessman (NM) (p. F-52)
 - W- Limitations in crop yield ... - C. E. Evans (AR-CO) and D. D. Johnson (CO) (p. F-52)
 - W- pH imbalance in grapes ... - J. M. Lyons (CA) (p. F-53)
 - j. approve conducting in-depth reviews at WDA summer rather than spring meeting, retain February 1 as date for submitting project outlines, and change deadline for submitting annual reports and minutes to March 15 (p. F-57)
 - k. require AA's to verify scientists' commitments of resources with their Station Directors (p. F-58)
 - l. require AA's solicit new participants when projects seek to revise (p. F-58)
5. Commended Dr. Youmans and his staff on their work with the WRDC (p. 24)
 6. Reconfirmed Jackson, Wyoming as site of summer 1979 meeting, and accepted invitation of Nevada to host spring 1980 meeting (p. 30)
 7. Passed 7 Resolutions on
 - a. Condolences on the death of D. Wynne Thorne (p. 30)
 - b. Condolences on the death of Ralph Besse (p. 31)
 - c. Condolences on the death of Arlon G. Hazen (p. 31)
 - d. Suggested revision of Division of Agriculture Bylaws (p. 32)
 - e. Best wishes to Cy Card (pp. 32-33)
 - f. Appreciation to meeting speakers and guests (p. 33)
 - g. Appreciation to Davis campus hosts (pp. 33-34)

INDEX TO MINUTES

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Page</u>
1.0 Call to Order	1
2.0 Introductions	1
3.0 Announcements	1
4.0 Adoption of Agenda	2
5.0 Approval of Previous Minutes	2
6.0 DAL Report	2
7.0 Report of Chairman/Report of Executive Committee	3
8.0 SEA-Cooperative Research Report	9
9.0 Animal Health and Disease Research	11
10.0 Committee of Nine Report	12
11.0 Division of Agriculture, NASULGC	12
11.1 Experiment Station Section	13
11.2 ESCOP Report	13
11.3 ESCOP Legislative Subcommittee Report	15
11.4 Proposed Change in Division of Agriculture Bylaws	18
12.0 Joint Council on Food and Agricultural Sciences	19
13.0 Meetings of Regional Association Chairmen	19
14.0 Research Highlights on the Davis Campus	19
15.0 Users Advisory Board	20
16.0 IR-6 National and Regional Research Planning	20
17.0 WRCC-34 Western Region Integrated Pest Management	23
18.0 Overhead Charges on Western Region Pesticide Impact Assessment Program (WRPIAP)	23
19.0 RIC Report	23
20.0 Western Rural Development Center	24

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Page</u>
21.0 Western Regional Planning Committee (WRPC) Report	24
21.1 1979-1984 Projection Cycle	24
21.2 Subregional Cooperative Efforts	25
21.3 Executive Briefing on the Future of Food, Agriculture, and Renewable Natural Resources	25
22.0 Strategies for Dealing with Budget Reductions	26
23.0 Physical Facilities Study	27
24.0 Status and Implications of California Mechanization Suit . . .	27
25.0 Agricultural Policy Challenges for California in the 1980s . .	28
26.0 State and University Agricultural Relations	29
27.0 Other Business	30
28.0 Resolutions	30
29.0 Adjournment	34

INDEX TO APPENDICES

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Page</u>
A WDA Agenda	35
B Potential Decision Units and Analyses for FY 1981, SEA	37
C "Accreditation of Farm Animal Research and Teaching Facilities" by R. L. Preston	41
D Summary of SEA Budget Authority and House and Senate Marks . .	46
E FY 1980 ESCOP Austerity Budget Request for SEA-CR	47
F RIC Report	49
G Summary Report on a Symposium on Evaluation of Agricultural Research and Extension	61
H Weekly Highlights of Activities of Mark T. Buchanan, WDAL . . .	68
I SEA/CR Organization Chart	71

WESTERN ASSOCIATION
OF AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION DIRECTORS
MINUTES OF SPRING 1979 MEETING

University of California
Davis, California

March 21-23, 1979

ATTENDANCE:

Arizona	- L. W. Dewhirst	Utah	- C. E. Clark
California	- W. M. Dugger, Jr.		- D. J. Matthews
	- H. F. Heady	Washington	- L. L. Boyd
	- C. E. Hess		- W. G. Huber
	- J. B. Kendrick, Jr.		- D. J. Lee
	- D. E. Schlegel		- D. L. Oldenstadt
	- P. Casamajor		- J. S. Robins
Colorado	- D. D. Johnson	Wyoming	- L. C. Ayres
	- J. P. Jordan		- H. J. Tuma
	- H. F. McHugh	OWDAL	- M. T. Buchanan
Guam	- R. Muniappan		- J. E. Moak
Hawaii	- W. R. Furtick	SEA-CR	- W. I. Thomas
Idaho	- R. J. Miller		- C. I. Harris
	- A. M. Mullins	SEA-AR	- H C Cox
Montana	- J. A. Asleson	ESCS	- M. L. Cotner
Nevada	- D. W. Bohmont		- L. Quance
	- R. A. Young	FS	- D. E. Herrick
New Mexico	- V. H. Gledhill		- J. S. Krammes
	- K. J. Lessman	NASULGC	- R. K. Fendall
Oregon	- J. R. Davis	WRDC	- R. C. Youmans
	- W. H. Foote	Guests	- B. R. Eddleman
	- R. E. Witters		- R. Rominger
			- L. T. Wallace

1.0 Call to Order

Chairman Miller called the meeting to order at 8:00 am, Wednesday, March 21, 1979.

2.0 Introductions

Members and liaison representatives introduced themselves. Introductions of invited speakers occurred throughout the meeting.

3.0 Announcements

Director Hess welcomed the membership to Davis. Local arrangements were announced periodically.

Chairman Miller appointed W. H. Foote (chairman) and R. A. Young to serve as the Resolutions Committee.

The class of neophytes was identified: Paul Casamajor, Bobby Eddleman, Roger Fendall, Dave Herrick, Sam Krammes, Walt Thomas, and Bob Witters. Tailtwister Dewhirst instructed the neophytes appropriately and they embarked on the path of humility.

Director Kendrick announced that Dr. David E. Schlegel had just been appointed Dean of the College of Natural Resources at the University of California, Berkeley.

4.0 Adoption of Agenda

The agenda was adopted without addition, and is attached as Appendix A.

5.0 Approval of Previous Minutes

Minutes of the August 9-11, 1979 meeting of the Association were approved as corrected.

6.0 DAL Report - M. T. Buchanan

A written DAL report was circulated prior to the meeting and included a weekly highlight of DAL activities covering the period August 14, 1978 to March 1, 1979 as well as a copy of the minutes of a meeting of the four Regional Chairmen and the four Directors-at-Large. (Highlights-Appendix H)

Current DAL responsibilities include:

- . Western Director-at-Large
- . Executive Vice-Chairman of ESCOP
- . Chairman of the four Directors-at-Large
- . Co-chairman, National Research Planning Committee (NRPC)
- . Co-chairman, CRIS Policy Committee
- . Program Chairman, NISARC (fall meeting)
- . Member, ISEC Policy Committee on PRC Exchange (and subcommittees)
- . Member, Physical Facilities Study Work Group
- . Member, Western Basin and National Administrative Committees for Tropical Agriculture, Section 406
- . Several assignments for the Joint Council

6.1 SEA-AR Budget Reductions

Buchanan discussed possible scenarios with respect to the SEA-AR FY 1981 budget: (1) The executive budget could be sustained. In this case, western region AR would lose 100-120 positions, mostly in the post-harvest technology, wool research, and fruit, vegetable and poultry processing research at the Albany center. (2) Congress could restore the funding but the Department might refuse to restore the personnel slots.

In either case, AR might not have sufficient personnel to undertake the newly-mandated research. The SAES should be thinking of ways to assist AR in conducting the research through some type of extra-mural arrangement. *A mechanism for assigning priorities in broad*

areas and parceling out the research within the region needs to be found.

7.0 Report of Chairman/Report of Executive Committee - R. J. Miller

The Executive Committee met November 12 in St. Louis and March 20 in Davis, California. The minutes of the November meeting already have been distributed to the membership. The following items were discussed in Davis. Members present: R. J. Miller, D. D. Johnson, J. P. Jordan, H. F. Heady, C. E. Clark, J. A. Asleson, W. R. Furtick, M. T. Buchanan and J. E. Moak.

7.1 Follow-up items from November Executive Committee meeting

7.1.1 Arranging a meeting with Carol Foreman

At the November meeting, it was requested that the WDA Chairman attempt to arrange a meeting with several Western Directors and Carol Foreman when she attends the Pacific Egg and Poultry Association meeting in San Diego in April. Foreman will not be attending that meeting after all, and to date Chairman Miller has been unable to arrange a meeting with Foreman through her appointments secretary.

The Executive Committee discussed the general problem of trying to arrange for representatives and key decisionmakers in USDA, OMB, OSTP, etc. to make Station visitations in the western region and/or attend a meeting of the WDA. It was suggested that Doris Calloway at U.C. Davis might be able to have some success in arranging a meeting with Foreman. However, there are many other influential actors who have little knowledge of or experience with the Experiment Station system. It is equally important that we try to establish good working relationships and rapport with them. Among these are: Eric Robinson and Molly Frantz in OMB; Frank Press and his staff in OSTP; Dick Liebermann on Senator Eagleton's staff; Tom Grumbly, recently named Foreman's Assistant Director of Food Safety and Quality.

The purpose of such contacts should be to emphasize the importance of research to our food delivery system, the accomplishments and contributions of the Experiment Station system and our willingness and ability to respond to research thrusts identified by USDA and the Executive budget. It was remarked that such contacts are most fruitful when they are structured so that only one or two messages are emphasized and concrete examples are then presented.

In conclusion, members agreed that whatever could be done to improve our relationships and contacts with such people should be encouraged.

7.1.2 Memorandum of Understanding for the Joint Council

It was requested at the November meeting that ESCOP should

which would set forth their intention to work together cooperatively with a sharing of responsibilities. ESCOP has formally supported the development of a Memorandum of Understanding. The Joint Council has established a subcommittee to investigate this issue and the Station representative to the Joint Council, John Mahlstedt, is a member of the subcommittee. Members of the Executive Committee expressed concern that because the Regional Associations of Experiment Station Directors have staff in place, they will be asked to perform an inordinate amount of the work requested by the Joint Council.

The Executive Committee requests that the WDA representatives to ESCOP (Jordan, Hess, Miller) be advised that we support the establishment of a Memorandum of Understanding and we urge that it contain sections specifically delineating the responsibilities of all the participants.

7.2 Lease on DAL Washington, D.C. office

The Executive Committee reviewed the provisions of the lease on the DAL office in Washington, D.C. The tenure of the lease is three years, until December 30, 1981. The initial cost is \$12/sq. ft./yr. but escalator clauses are written into the lease. There is currently a vacant office in the suite which would be ideal for use by one of the other regions. To date, however, they have not expressed interest in renting Washington, D.C. office space.

7.3 Recommendations on off-the-top RRF allotments

	<u>FY 1979 Budget</u>	<u>FY 1980 Request</u>
W-6 Introduction, multiplication, maintenance, evaluation and cataloguing of plant germ plasm	\$139,288	\$154,262
W-84 Environmental improvement through biological control and pest mgmt	18,000	27,000
IR-1 Potato introduction	82,750	82,750
IR-2 Virus-free fruitstocks	115,180	120,340
IR-4 Minor use of chemicals	150,000	150,000
IR-5 CRIS	162,825	167,075
IR-6 National and regional research planning	110,000	177,920

The Executive Committee recommends that the off-the-top funding for the projects listed above remain at the FY 1979 appropriations level. If the FY 1980 appropriation includes an increase in Hatch formula funds, the Executive Committee recommends that the off-the-top allotments be increased by an amount not to exceed the percentage increase in Hatch funds nationally, up to the level of the projects' requests. There was some sentiment among the committee members to

increase funding for W-6 and W-84, and if the Committee of Nine has unallocated funds near the end of FY 1979, both projects are encouraged to request supplementals from these funds.

(Action of WDA: APPROVED)

7.4 Recording Secretary/Administrative Analyst FY 1980 budget request

Page 6 lists the FY 1978 and FY 1979 budgets and the FY 1980 budget request for the Recording Secretary. The funds would come from off-the-top W-106.

The Executive Committee recommends that the Recording Secretary Budget for FY 1980 (from W-106 RRF off-the-top funds) be increased to \$27,500.

(Action of WDA: APPROVED)

7.5 DAL FY 1980 Budget Request

Page 7 lists the FY 1978 expenditures, FY 1979 budget, and FY 1980 budget request for the office of the DAL.

The Executive Committee recommends that the FY 1980 budget request for the office of the DAL be approved at a total cost of \$100,452. This would include a salary increase for the DAL to \$47,500, a \$250/month dislocation allowance for the DAL, and a \$12,000 unexpended balance item.

(Action of WDA: APPROVED)

7.6 Experiment Station Banquet at Land Grant

Chairman Miller received a query concerning whether or not the Experiment Station banquet this year should honor Hank Fortmann on his retirement (similar to the George Browning recognition last year). If this is not favored, should we return to the Roy Kottman initiation ceremonies?

The Executive Committee recommends that the Experiment Station banquet at Land Grant should not be in honor of Hank Fortmann. We feel that each of the Directors-at-Large should receive a unique retirement recognition which will vary depending on their personalities, their tenure in their positions, and their contacts outside their regions. George Browning was honored at Land Grant because of his long service as the Executive Vice Chairman of ESCOP and the perception that he spent a large percentage of his time on issues of concern to all the Experiment Stations. A return to the Roy Kottman initiation ceremonies at the banquet would be acceptable.

(Action of WDA: APPROVED)

RECORDING SECRETARY/ADMINISTRATIVE ANALYST

BUDGETS AND EXPENDITURES

	<u>FY 1978 BUDGET</u>	<u>FY 1978 EXPENDITURES</u>	<u>FY 1979 BUDGET</u>	<u>FY 1980 BUDGET REQUEST</u>
<u>SOURCES OF FUNDS</u>				
W-106 Regional Research Funds	\$24,000	\$24,000	\$24,000	\$27,500
<u>REGULAR EXPENDITURES</u>				
Salaries	17,189	16,308.19	16,400	19,260
Benefits	3,061	3,225.00	3,000	3,490
Travel	1,200	1,721.71	1,500	2,000
Office expenses:				
Duplication	1,100	785.21	1,200	900
Mailing	650	225.24	650	600
Telephone	400	477.47	600	600
Office supplies	200	179.00	300	300
Miscellaneous items	200	936.37 ^{1/}	300	300
Library materials	0	0	50	50
	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
TOTALS	\$24,000	\$23,858.19	\$24,000	<u>\$27,500</u>

^{1/} Includes transfer of miscellaneous DAL expenses.

DIRECTOR-AT-LARGE
BUDGETS AND EXPENDITURES

7

	<u>FY 1978 EXPENDITURES</u>	<u>FY 1979 BUDGET</u>	<u>FY 1980 BUDGET</u>
<u>SUMMARY OF FUNDS</u>			
DAL account at Montana	\$67,279.34	\$76,000	\$81,000
Carry-over & reimbursement funds		38,152	19,452
<u>EXPENDITURES & BUDGETS</u>			
Salaries:	46,713.64		
DAL salary		45,100	47,500
DAL salary supplement		1,500	0
Asst. Admin. Analyst (\$15,660/yr) @ 45% time <u>1/</u>		6,672	7,047
Benefits (@ 22%)	7,854.55	9,325	10,450
Travel:	12,888.31		
DAL travel expenses		4,000	6,000
DAL longterm per diem		6,122	0
DAL dislocation allowance @ \$250/mo			3,000
Office space rental (currently \$12/sq. ft./yr.)	0	7,200	8,600
Office expenses:			
Duplication	1,091.36	1,100	1,500 ^{2/}
Mailing	857.82	975	1,000
Telephone	947.11	1,300	1,500
Office supplies	564.22	500	700
Miscellaneous items	292.34	300	300
Library materials	47.37	150	200
Equipment maintenance	161.12	200	200
Memberships	455.00	455	455
Equipment	908.65	600	0
Other items:			
Division of Agriculture	1,566.00		
FY 1978 overdraft		256	
Buchanan moving expenses		2,752	
Rental of telecopiers		1,104	
Escrow account for Buchanans' return to California		6,000	
 TOTALS	 \$74,347.49	 \$95,611	 \$88,452
PLUS: Unexpended balance for special needs		18,541	12,000
	<u>\$74,347.49</u>	<u>\$114,152</u>	<u>\$100,452</u>

1/ Below 50% time, no benefits paid and job title and description not audited by U.C.

2/ Includes rental of copying machine for Washington, D.C. office.

7.7 Executive Vice Chairman of ESCOP

ESCOP has formally requested that the WDA assign Mark T. Buchanan to be the Executive Vice Chairman of ESCOP for a one-year period (calendar year 1979). This would coincide with the western region holding the chairmanship of ESCOP during this period. It is agreed that this position will rotate among DALs in future years so that no one will be continuously in it. The Chairmen of the four regions and the Chairmen of ESCOP and its Legislative Subcommittee will make recommendations at the conclusion of the first year for policies to follow in succeeding terms.

The Executive Committee recommends that Mark T. Buchanan be appointed Executive Vice-Chairman of ESCOP for calendar year 1979.

(Action of WDA: APPROVED)

The Executive Committee also discussed the feasibility of covering the ESCOP Chairman's phone costs during 1979 from the Western Directors Special Fund. No action was taken.

7.8 Review of Recording Secretary function

At the November Executive Committee meeting, a subcommittee consisting of Johnson (Chairman), Miller and Clark was assigned the task of reviewing the need for, location of and responsibilities of the Recording Secretary.

Their report, supported by the Executive Committee, recommends that the Administrative Analyst position currently held by Jill Moak and currently located in Berkeley be continued and that Ms. Moak be encouraged to continue in that position. We further recommend that Ms. Moak continue to operate under the administrative direction of the WDAL.

Questions as to the location of the office space for Ms. Moak and secretarial, etc., support for Dr. Buchanan in Washington should be decided as the need for such decisions arise and as the particular demands and dimensions of the two offices develop and change.

(Action of WDA: APPROVED)

7.9 Possible Relocation of Recording Secretary Office

Chairman Miller received an invitation from H C Cox to locate the Recording Secretary office in western region SEA/AR offices recently established in downtown Oakland. Cox has also been urging that SEA/CR and JPE place some staff in the regional offices to facilitate coordination and exchange of ideas. Other advantages of such an arrangement would be telecopier and FTS access and better coordination for WRPC staff assignments.

Disadvantages of such an arrangement include increased difficulty of the accounting function, and effective absence of Station management/oversight of this office. In view of the California representative's commitment to continue to provide adequate office space for

the Recording Secretary for at least the next three years, the Executive Committee recommends tabling consideration of this invitation. The Executive Committee wishes to thank Dr. Cox and SEA/AR for this generous invitation.

(Action of WDA: APPROVED)

DISCUSSION:

During consideration of off-the-top funding requests, several Directors suggested that W-6 and W-84 investigate the possibility of going to a "fee for service" operation in order to eliminate the problems of the off-the-top arrangement (see 7.3, pp. 4-5).

8.0 SEA-Cooperative Research Report - W. I. Thomas/C. I. Harris

8.1 FY 1980 Budget

Hearings before the House and Senate were held last week and Thomas represented CR. SEA was asked questions on the increase in competitive grants at the expense of programs Congress mandated last year, the program cuts in AR, the reorganization. There were no questions about animal health. USDA prepared written responses to possible questions for our use and we were required to answer according to the prepared texts.

8.2 FY 1981 Budget

We have begun working with JPE staff, extension, resident instruction and Bernie Liska (ESCOP Legislative Subcommittee) on the decision units to be used (Appendix B). Bertrand is willing to push very hard for an inflation package within the units. CR is being kept well informed of every step of the process because one of our former employees is in the budget preparation unit.

At this time, it is not the intention of USDA to require the states to shift their resources into the identified high priority areas when no increased funds are provided, though the Congress could change this.

8.3 CR "reorganization"

Thomas distributed a new organization chart (Appendix I) with an Assistant Deputy Director position for Food, Nutrition and Social Sciences (currently vacant). In the future, Agriculture Handbook No. 305 will be published by SEA headquarters. For the time being we are still putting out our own newsletter.

Most of the CR staff has been moved to the 6th floor of the South Building, though CR administration is still located on the 3rd floor of the Administration building. It is possible that we may be moved to Beltsville. Advantages: interactions with AR and JPE planning staff. Disadvantages: Difficulty of personal contact with the SAES directors when they are in town.

I believe Bertrand wants me to serve as a sounding board and as the primary contact with the Station directors. However, feel free to contact Bertrand directly if you wish.

8.4 Ronningen retirement

Ronningen will retire June 30 and we will soon begin recruiting for his position. I have not yet decided whether I would prefer someone from the Experiment Stations or someone more experienced within the Department.

8.5 Hatch Administrative Manual for Cooperative Agricultural Research

I discussed the Manual revision at the Interim Committee of ESCOP meeting. Areas of concern are: (1) requirement that property or equipment purchased reverts to the government when you are finished with it; (2) purchases of equipment over \$1,000 must first be approved by USDA; (3) reporting of scientists' time. If we are unable to get OMB to revise the regulations we may try to have something added to the appropriations budget exempting us from this.

8.6 JPE staff

I would like to encourage you to maintain close contact with the JPE staff. It would be good to invite them to your meetings and to Station visitations since some of them, for instance Brazzel, do not have a background in agriculture.

8.7 Competitive and special grants

Thomas distributed Section 1414 of PL 95-113 and asked Directors to fill out the questionnaire on allowable negotiated overhead rates. The Section permits the Secretary to limit overhead costs.

The preproposal route will continue to be used on the special grants in an effort to minimize unnecessary work on preparing proposals. We have an advisory committee with representatives from each region which has been very helpful. Ed Miller is now in charge of this program.

8.8 Animal health and disease research funds

The funds have now been distributed under Section 1433. Please remember that you must commit these funds by September 30. I would say that formula funding for animal health is a second or third Departmental priority in seeking Congressional add-ons. Our first priority is the inflation increase.

8.9 CR travel restrictions

The President's order required a 20% decrease in unnecessary administrative travel, and the Secretary added an additional \$10 million decrease within the Department. As a result, our travel will be greatly reduced this year. Our travel priorities are: Committee of Nine, special grants peer review groups, special program reviews, and lastly technical committee meetings. We will still try to attend technical committee meetings when revision or extension is being discussed.

8.10 Bilateral exchange agreements with the PRC

During 1979 the mutual exchange groups will concentrate on germ plasm, biological control of pests, and livestock health. ISEC is the mechanism for the Department to interact with the universities in this activity. A newly formed subcommittee of ISEC with university representatives has been established and subgroups of this subcommittee will recommend the U.S. team members and locate appropriate places for the Chinese to visit when they come here. For this year, USDA will pay the transportation costs of the U.S. participants; the Department has not decided which agency budget will bear this cost but it may be SEA.

9.0 Animal Health and Disease Research - W. G. Huber

Huber distributed a summary on "Accreditation of farm animal research and teaching facilities" (Appendix C). We have always had to deal with accreditation of laboratory animals in biomedical research, but now there is some attempt to adapt the NIH Guide for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals to the care and housing of farm animals for research and teaching. The accreditation of laboratory animals is handled by the American Association for Accreditation of Laboratory Animal Care (AAALAC).

Recently, NIH revised its policy to require a strong commitment from institutions that receive NIH funds to comply with The Guide. Therefore, the grant status of an institution may be in jeopardy if any animal facility, including farm animal facilities, do not meet the standards outlined in The Guide; and the duplication of commercial practices with respect to farm animals will not meet the requirements set forth in The Guide. In addition, the AAALAC reviewers do not have experience or knowledge of food-producing animals.

What is needed? (1) Guidelines must be prepared by professional farm animal scientists, including agricultural engineers and veterinarians. (2) An accreditation group familiar with commercial farm animal practices and food-animal products needs to be organized.

It was moved and seconded that the WDA request ESCOP establish a subcommittee of animal scientists, veterinarians and agricultural engineers representing all interested groups (such as AAAS, dairy and poultry science researchers) for the purpose of making recommendations on the housing and care requirements of food production animals used in research and teaching, including selecting an accreditation organization, and seek to have these requirements adopted as the standards for use by HEW, NIH, FDA, etc.

(Action of WDA: PASSED)

FY 1979 formula funds must be encumbered by September 30, 1979 even though the funds were only received a couple of weeks ago. We are trying to compile a regional dossier of projects supported by these funds. At WSU the funds are being used to encourage mutli-disciplinary mission/objective research.

The research capacity base used for distribution of the funds was determined from information supplied by the institutions which were then reviewed "in the blind" both within and outside of USDA. The reviewers

took a narrow view of what types of research could be included in the assessment of capacity because they were concerned about the erosion of these funds to non-veterinary medicine and Land Grant universities

10.0 Committee of Nine Report - C. E. Clark

The Committee of Nine met in Geneva, NY on September 12-13, 1978 and in New Orleans, LA on December 5, 1978. The following W- project was recommended for approval and RRF funding:

W-153 Food Supplement Usage and Effects on Nutritional Status; October 1, 1978 through September 30, 1983; H. F. McHugh (CO), Administrative Advisor.

No new or revised W- projects were discussed at the December meeting.

The Committee of Nine requests that in the future when administrative advisors request regional project extensions, they include an appropriate statement of justification.

There was a discussion relating to the June meetings of the Committee of Nine. The lateness of this meeting makes it difficult for Cooperative Research to have all related reports completed in time to make projects functional on October 1. A meeting in May, instead of June, is preferred. It is suggested that Regional Associations set their spring meetings early enough to permit an earlier meeting time for the Committee of Nine. Seven to eight weeks is needed between the regional meetings and the Committee of Nine meeting.

The Committee members further discussed implementation of the new regional project IR-6 National and Regional Research Planning, Evaluation, Analysis and Coordination. Since the relationships between IR-6 and the national agricultural research system were vaguely described in the project outline, the IR-6 advisory committee will be requested to develop a more specific project outline, particularly the procedures section. This revised outline should be submitted to the Committee of Nine after about one year of operation.

The following officers were elected for 1980:

Chairman:	T. J. Whatley (TN)
Vice Chairman:	W. J. Benton (DE)
Secretary:	G. A. Donovan (RI)

The next meeting of the Committee of Nine will be in Washington, D.C. on June 5-7, 1979.

11.0 Division of Agriculture, NASULGC - R. K. Fendall

Fendall is on a short-term leave of absence from his duties as Assistant Dean of Agriculture at OSU, working in the Office of Governmental Relations at NASULGC. His aim while at NASULGC is to improve communication between the national office and the component institutions, and he has been putting out the "gold sheet" weekly to inform institutions of association activities on behalf of the USDA budget and other items.

This has freed some of McGregor's time and allowed him to hold a two-day budget seminar in February, which may become an annual event. He also held a public policy seminar in January. A screening committee is looking at applicants for a full-time Assistant Director of Governmental Relations, and an additional secretary will also be added to the office. A new fact book on the Division of Agriculture has been prepared as well.

Fendall distributed a sheet summarizing actions to date with respect to the USDA budget (Appendix D). He stated that the Association seems to be having some success in its budget requests and attributed that to the fact that all elements of the Division seem to be working together, combining their budget requests into one document which is supported by all.

At this time, the AID budget, specifically Title XII, seems to be in greater jeopardy than the USDA budget. The staff have established good relations with some of the House and Senate staff members, particularly Dick Liebermann and Tom Adams, and perhaps the attempts to kill Title XII will fail. Wampler has recently introduced the Restoration Act of 1979 which would put BLM and F&WS into the USDA, and in addition add an Assistant Secretary for research to USDA. If the President's reorganization plan carries and FS is moved to DOI, many feel that other programs will then be removed also.

11.1 Experiment Station Section Report - L. L. Boyd

Director Boyd had no items to report. Consideration of proposed changes in the Station Bylaws was deferred to the summer meeting of the WDA.

11.2 ESCOP Report - J. P. Jordan

11.2.1 At the summer meeting of WDA, the ESCOP representatives from the Western Region were instructed to encourage the development of a Memorandum of Understanding between the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges and the U.S. Department of Agriculture regarding the workings and functioning of the Joint Council on Food and Agricultural Sciences. Subsequently, ESCOP has gone on record favoring the Memorandum of Understanding. As Chairman of ESCOP, I have forwarded a letter to Dean Orville Bentley, Chairman of the Division of Agriculture, asking him to communicate this position to the Department of Agriculture on behalf of the Division of Agriculture. He assures me that he will do so.

11.2.2 With the confirmation of Dale Hathaway as Undersecretary of Agriculture for International Affairs, an Assistant Secretary slot becomes available. ESCOP has requested, again through the Division of Agriculture, that the Secretary of Agriculture elevate the Science and Education Administration Directorate to an Assistant Secretary level because of the size and scope of the SEA program, and because of the significance of agricultural research and extension along with teaching in the future of agriculture in America. No response has yet been received from the Secretary.

- 11.2.3 In the name of the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, President (now Chairman) Edwin Young (President of the University of Wisconsin system) has written to President Jimmy Carter praising him for his leadership in obtaining funding and support within his administration for higher education in general. ESCOP has gone on record as criticizing such blanket laudatory letters which are forwarded in the name of the Association without the concurrence of the subordinate units within the Association. In this particular case, it would seem appropriate to obtain clearance from the Division of Agriculture Chairman at least. Chairman Bentley has promised to take this issue up at the next Executive Committee meeting of the Association.
- 11.2.4 ESCOP's criticism of President Carter's recommended budget of FY 80 has been widely distributed in press releases and in a telegram to President Jimmy Carter. Copies of the telegram have been distributed to the membership of the Division of Agriculture through the Newsletter.
- 11.2.5 ESCOP has appointed an ad hoc Committee on Integrated Pest Management with the membership as follows: R. J. Kuhr (New York) Northeastern Region, Chairman; F. D. Knight (Maine) representing forestry schools; R. J. Miller (Idaho) Western Region; L. O. Warren (Arkansas) Southern Region; M. L. Tomes (Indiana) North Central Region. The purpose of this Committee is to study the feasibility of organizing integrated pest management (IPM) programs on a regional and national basis. This is an outgrowth of the Western Region's efforts.
- 11.2.6 Pending concurrence by the Executive Committee of WDA, M. T. Buchanan has been appointed Executive Vice Chairman of ESCOP, replacing George M. Browning. This appointment will be for one year only.
- 11.2.7 As Chairman of ESCOP, I have had opportunity to interact with Secretary Bergland, Assistant Secretary Cutler, Director Anson Bertrand and Deputy Director Walter Thomas on a number of occasions on behalf of the Experiment Stations and the Western Region.
- 11.2.8 ESCOP has gone on record as being opposed to the shift of the U.S. Forest Service and the Soil Conservation Service out of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and into the expanded Department of the Interior under the name of the Department of Natural Resources. The reasons for this are several but particularly revolve around the

issue of (a) the regional and national planning system involvement of forestry research, and (b) the fact that farmers and ranchers, in doing business with the U.S. Forest Service, have received much more equitable and reasonable treatment than has been the case in dealing with the Bureau of Land Management and other agencies of the U.S. Department of the Interior. Therefore, in terms of the impact on food and agriculture production in the United States, ESCOP's recommendation is that the related parts of the Department of the Interior be moved to the Department of Agriculture rather than the other way around. This has been communicated to the Department of Agriculture and to the White House.

- 11.2.9 Together with ECOP, ESCOP is, through Director Robert Hutton of Pennsylvania State University, assisting Senator Patrick Leahy of Vermont in efforts to legislate an extension of the Rural Development Act of 1972. For the program to continue, it must be reauthorized by May of 1979.

11.3 ESCOP Legislative Subcommittee Report - J. P. Jordan

11.3.1 FY 1980 budget

The discrepancies between the FY 1980 budget request approved at the November NASULGC meeting in St. Louis and President Carter's Executive Budget released on 22 January 1979 were so enormous as to require a reassessment in terms of the realities of this budget cycle. Attached (p. 47) is the revised recommendation from ESCOP for the 1980 budget. Admittedly, the figures are not the desired levels, but are in the best judgment of the ESCOP Legislative Subcommittee and the ESCOP Interim Committee the potentially obtainable levels. At least they are figures that can be used in working with the congressional members and their staffs on behalf of the Experiment Stations without being considered ridiculous and being ignored.

It should be known that the figures in the Executive Budget, although unacceptable to the Experiment Stations, are considerably higher than they were in the earlier December 1978 drafts. Specifically, formula funds were restored to the FY 1979 levels and competitive grants were increased by \$15 million. This provides an important improvement in base from which further negotiations can occur.

Through the combined efforts of Legislative Subcommittee Chairman Bill Flatt, Russ McGregor of the NASULGC office, and E. A. Jaenke and Associates, the amount of interaction

between ESCOP Subcommittee members and key staffs of the congressional appropriations committees have increased substantially this year. Moreover, many staff members from the congressional committees as well as OMB have been to visit the Experiment Stations of the United States. In the West, visits have included stations in California, Colorado and Hawaii. These are considered to be extremely important new dimensions of the ESCOP Subcommittee effort.

Referring to the efforts outlined in Director William E. Flatt's memoranda regarding efforts within the individual states, the West must put its shoulder to the wheel and be as effective in pushing on congressional leadership and staff as it can be. Only with a concerted national effort will improvements be made in future budgets. The question of whether one should clearly identify a certain portion of the formula funds as being related to "basic" research has been discussed.

11.3.2 FS and AR in FY 1980 budget

In terms of the President's recommended budget for FY 1980, the U.S. Forest Service has been inordinately hit as has the Agricultural Research/SEA. The position of the Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors on these two issues should emanate from this meeting. In both instances, the careful planning of the Regional and National Planning System is being threatened by a misuse of the data provided therein.

11.3.3 Workshops

In mid-February 1979, Russ McGregor of the NASULGC staff organized a budget planning workshop in which a number of key legislators and staff members from the U.S. Congress participated along with approximately twenty key people from ESCOP, ECOP and RICOP. R. J. Miller of the Western Region attended. An earlier four-day session was organized in January of 1979 at which J. P. Jordan and W. R. Furtick attended.

11.3.4 Staff support

In recent years, Experiment Station Directors have been less than satisfied with staff support provided to the budgeting process by the Office of NASULGC. With the recent appointment of a new President for NASULGC, Robert Clodius, two new staff members (one professional and one clerical) have been added under Dr. Russell McGregor for the purpose of expanding NASULGC's support of the Division of Agriculture's efforts regarding budget.

It may be some time before these two permanent slots are filled, but on an interim basis Roger Fendall has been loaned for a period of six months to NASULGC by Oregon State University.

Additionally, the question of whether NASULGC, the Division of Agriculture, or the Experiment Stations should have key staff within the U.S. Department of Agriculture has been resolved in favor of not placing staff within the confines of the Department except through the medium of the Interregional Project-6 (National and Regional Research Planning, Evaluation, Analysis and Coordination). Across the U.S., including many of the western states, there is a belief that an external assessment of the Experiment Station efforts and those of the Cooperative Extension Service in their budgetary interactions with the Congress would be very helpful. Additionally, many feel the need for a coach and counselor not to "represent us" to the legislative and executive branches of the federal government, but to assist and advise us as a consultant.

William P. Flatt's memorandum of February 26, 1979 addressed to the Directors of the Agricultural Experiment Stations articulates the official position in so far as the Experiment Stations are concerned. A lobbyist is not to be hired. Additionally, fearing that the reputation of E. A. Jaenke and Associates as lobbyists might jeopardize the tax status and the official position of NASULGC, this whole relationship was organized not through the Division of Agriculture or NASULGC but through a newly organized Committee on Agricultural Research, Extension and Teaching (CARET). CARET will work through the Cooperative League of the USA. "Assessments" to states must remain voluntary and should be from nonstate and nonfederal resources, preferably farm groups.

11.3.5 FY 1981 budget

In developing a working relationship between the Legislative Subcommittee of ESCOP and the USDA for formulating the FY 1981 budget request, the question of commitment of the Experiment Stations to the resultant budget that moves from the Department to OMB and from OMB to the Congress has been thoroughly discussed. It has been clearly stated that after the Experiment Station input has been made and the budget goes "behind the curtain", the Experiment Stations are still free to continue to champion the figures that they recommended and not necessarily those that emanate from the Department of Agriculture or OMB. With this in mind, ESCOP Legislative Subcommittee Chairman-Elect Bernie Liska is leading the

effort to work out the figures for the FY 1981 budget with USDA using as the basic guide, figures approved at the NASULGC meeting in St. Louis in November 1978. It is clear, however, that the ultimate figures will be modified somewhat from that set of recommendations in order to have something that the USDA feels that it can also champion. Nevertheless, we are free to return to our original recommendation as the process proceeds.

DISCUSSION:

Jordan encouraged Directors to contact their legislators during the Senate and House recesses in April. McGregor's office has asked Directors to inform them of all legislative contacts made, including phone calls. An acceptable working arrangement between the NASULGC office and E. A. Jaenke and Associates has been worked out and there is some sharing of information. Jaenke and Assoc. have delineated a budget strategy and specific actions far more quickly this year than has been done by the NASULGC office in the past. Whether the interactions that result from their assistance prove to be worth \$80,000 remain to be seen.

Kendrick commented on the Secretary's recent speech concerning a Departmental policy toward small farms, noting that such a policy might have substantial impact on research, extension and teaching budgets. Thomas noted that CR, Extension and AR had been asked to prepare position papers identifying their small farm efforts.

With regard to the FY 1981 budget, Jordan stated that the Legislative Subcommittee's priorities are: (1) Federal Pay Act compatibility and increased cost of purchasing goods and services; (2) increase in formula funds in line with the President's directive to increase basic research; (3) animal health research funds; and (4) PL 89-106 grants. Competitive grants is the fifth priority.

11.4 Proposed Change in Division of Agriculture By-Laws - A. M. Mullins

Mullins is chairman of the Division Bylaws Committee. A copy of the proposed revised Bylaws was circulated in advance of the meeting. The proposal to revise the Bylaws arose from a committee appointed four years ago to recommend ways of changing the structure of the Division of Agriculture in order to make it more effective. The Bylaws were discussed at the Land Grant meetings in November but no action was taken pending solicitation of comments from the regions.

The Directors expressed concern about some of the provisions of the Bylaws and the Resolutions committee was asked to prepare an appropriate resolution to send to the Bylaws Committee (see Resolution 4, p. 32).

12.0 Joint Council on Food and Agricultural Sciences - J. S. Robins

A report of activities up to and including the October meeting of the Council was distributed at the Land Grant meetings. Since that time the Executive Committee has met on four occasions and the Council met in regular session in January. Each of you should have received a communication titled "Joint Council Notes" under date of January 26. This communication is intended to serve as a regular communication to you of Council actions.

The most important business at the January meeting was the Resolution of the Organization for Planning and Coordination. Each of you should have received a communication on that subject. The Steering Committee of the Council is currently engaged in organizing for the regional meetings to further define the regional structure including a Council and three Regional Planning Committees. Those plans will be reviewed at the April meeting of the Council.

The Annual Report to the Secretary was finalized and forwarded in early February and an interim Research Facilities Report should have been delivered to the Secretary by March 9. The latter report focuses major attention on policy issues and contains a partial reporting of data collected through the recent survey. We hope that data can be finalized and reported within the next 60-90 days.

Next meeting of the Council will be in Washington, D.C. April 11 and 12.

The Joint Council agreed to take over ARPAC's sponsorship of a technological assessment of agricultural research. The working committee reported to the JC a study plan that would require 75 SY's. A revised, scaled-down proposal was approved by the JC in January. The study seeks to provide a base of information relative to the technical status of agriculture and its needs and problems. Since the only resources for conducting such a study lie within the public universities, you can expect to receive requests for some of your scientists' time in the near future.

13.0 Meetings of Regional Association Chairmen - R. J. Miller

Minutes of the meeting of the four Regional Chairman and DALs of February 15, 1979 were circulated with the DAL Report in advance of the meeting. Some national assignments were made among the DALs, taking into consideration their various special capabilities. Another meeting is planned at ESCOP in South Carolina, April 25-26. Miller reported that the other Chairmen now seem to feel it would be worthwhile to continue meeting several times a year.

14.0 Research Highlights on the Davis Campus - C. E. Hess

Hess presented a slide-talk on some of the research ongoing at the University of California, Davis. There are four major research categories: 24% in natural resources and environmental quality, 52% in food and fiber production and processing and marketing, 14% in people-oriented research, and the remainder is disciplinary research. There are currently 208 FTE in teaching and 308 FTE in research, 27 departments in the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, 4,642 undergraduates and 1,190 graduate students.

15.0 Users Advisory Board - M. T. Buchanan

Proceedings of the second meeting of the UAB were distributed in advance of the meeting. The third meeting of the Board was held in Washington, D.C., February 22-23.

I have been assured by Dr. James Nielson that Directors will be brought up-to-date and kept informed of the activities of this Board and the Joint Council. As you may know, Ms. J. C. Torio is Executive Secretary of the Joint Council; James M. Meyers has been recently employed as Executive Secretary of the Users Advisory Board. One of their duties will be to prepare and distribute informational items to the public and to participants in the U.S. system of research, extension and higher education.

Under the principle of "specialization and trade" among the DALs for greater efficiency and total effectiveness, J. E. Halpin and H. R. Fortmann attended the Users Advisory Board meeting while I was involved with Tropical Agriculture (Section 406).

As a part of their activities, Hank and Jim met prior to the formal UAB meeting with farmer members William H. Anthony, Sr. and with Mr. Robert Lee Scarborough. Mrs. Margaret Bucher Eklund was invited but did not attend. Reports from both sides (the farmers and the DALs) are positive. Jim and Hank reported that some of the exchanges at the UAB were totally from the USDA perspective including support of the President's FY 1980 budget (with all its contortions). We were glad there had been a prior exposure of some of the Board members to another perspective and to more information and data than were made available at the meeting. We plan to do more of this.

The DALs were encouraged on Friday, February 23, in our meeting with Dr. Bertrand by his statement that he would see to it that the state perspective as well as more information on the total system are presented at future UAB meetings.

16.0 IR-6 National and Regional Research Planning - K. J. Lessman/B. R. Eddleman

Lessman:

The first meeting of the Administrative Advisors to the newly formed IR-6 project was called by Dr. Dennis Rouse, Chairman, on November 15, 1978, in the Chase Plaza Hotel during the annual NASULGC meetings held in St. Louis.

At this meeting the objectives and purposes of IR-6 were thoroughly discussed and reviewed, and strategy outlined for seeking candidates for the position of IR-6 Director. Preliminary plans included a meeting in Washington, D.C., to be held during the week of December 12 in the offices of Drs. Tom Ronningen and Jim Nielson for interviewing prospective candidates.

The second meeting of the IR-6 Administrative Advisors was called by Chairman Rouse in Washington, D.C., on December 12, 1978, in the offices of Dr. Jim Nielson. At this meeting, Dr. Bobby Eddleman of the Department of Agricultural Economics, Mississippi State University, was interviewed as a candidate for the position of Director, IR-6. It was decided to offer the position to Dr. Eddleman at that time. Dr. Eddleman promised a reply shortly after the turn of the New Year. Other matters, such as the location of the project and possible candidates for other IR-6 positions, were discussed. Conclusions were that the Director and other project personnel would be located and work in the Washington, D.C. area.

In January Dr. Rouse called to inform the IR-6 Administrative Advisors that Dr. Eddleman could not accept the position of IR-6 Director if required to leave Mississippi to live in the Washington, D.C. area, but would the advisors consider negotiations that did not require the Director to move to Washington, D.C. At that time I reminded Dr. Rouse that it was my impression that the IR-6 project was approved by the regions, at least partly on the premise that the project would be located in the Washington, D.C. area. However, after more discussion it was agreed that Dr. Eddleman might well function effectively from the Mississippi location with other project personnel located in the Washington, D.C. area.

Dr. Eddleman has accepted the position of IR-6 Director and an agreement has been spelled out for Dr. Eddleman to remain in Mississippi for the time being. Mississippi State will provide office space and retain Dr. Eddleman on their payroll and retirement system. All costs are to be borne by the project. Dr. Eddleman will not engage in any other consulting or business activities that require management time on his part without prior approval by the Administrative Advisors. It is anticipated that Dr. Eddleman will be able to devote full time to the project beginning April 1, 1979.

B. R. Eddleman:

The IR-6 administrative advisory committee, technical committee and members of the Research Analysis Subcommittee of ESCOP met March 19-20 in Atlanta. Formal actions taken at that meeting include: (1) Project Director will rewrite the procedures section of the project outline by May 25; (2) Chairman of the Research Analysis Subcommittee of ESCOP was made an ex officio member of the IR-6 technical committee; (3) Project Director and/or Associate Project Director will serve as secretary of the administrative advisory committee and the technical committee; (4) W. B. Sunquist (MN) was named chairman of the technical committee. The chairman serves a two-year term and is eligible for re-election; (5) Endorsed action to delay any further change in the composition of the technical committee until IR-6 project is in full operation; (6) Research analyst position was upgraded to an associate project director; the Project Director must define the duties of this position; (7) Endorsed a revised budget request for FY 1980 in the amount of \$177,920; (8) Project Director must write up a work plan for FY 1980 consistent with the revised procedures section of the outline.

Public investments in agricultural research have increased less in the 1970s than they did previously, they have not kept up with inflation, and at the federal level there has been a decrease in agricultural research investments as a percentage of total federal R&D. Why? (1) Increased competition for public funds among all agencies; (2) A perception that there is a lack of urgency because we currently have ample food; (3) Other social goals take priority over investment in agricultural research; (4) Lack of knowledge and awareness of the impact of public investment in agricultural research and the benefits to society therefrom; (5) Lack of confidence in our present system of research decisionmaking.

The result of these perceptions has been an increased emphasis on accountability by the executive and legislative branches at the federal and state levels. This means more reports and studies of the research activities undertaken and proposed. This implies that there is less freedom for the managers and administrators to plan and conduct their programs using federal funding. It also implies an increase in the proportion of your resources being allocated to studies on the impact of past and proposed research programs.

I view IR-6 as one vehicle for a bottom-up input into the public decision-making process for agricultural research at the federal level with regard to long-range planning, research priorities, annual budget-making process, and those types of activities carried out to measure and look at the impact and evaluation of agricultural research programs both at the state and the federal level.

We will try to develop a mechanism using modified delphi techniques to canvass Directors on their future needs and priorities. We may try to cluster states to look at characteristics of homogeneity and difference, such that California and Florida might be in the same cluster. We will look at these clusters on a regional and a national basis in order to develop information on the research goals and priorities of that multi-state or sub-regional group. Each Director will be able to see how his programs and perceptions compare with those of the other states. This information can also be fed into the SEA-JPE staff, CR, the four research committees and regional councils and the Joint Council.

The Research Analysis Subcommittee of ESCOP will continue in operation at least through September 30, 1980. The kind of evaluative information on the benefits and impacts of research that has been developed by the committee has been useful. I believe OMB now accepts the validity of these studies but the new thrust is how do we plan to divide up a pie that remains the same size. OMB views our decisionmaking system as deficient in three ways: (1) The priorities and funding decisions are the result of value judgments and past bureaucratic processes rather than any rational decisionmaking process; (2) Because of this, many problem areas are poorly defined or defined in such a way that they are not amenable to research solutions; (3) Because the problems are not well defined, the process of reaching internal decisions is fuzzy and not understood by outsiders.

We will attempt to define priorities and provide you with listings of them, but you will have to be the ones to rank these priorities. You will necessarily be taking into consideration the differences between local, state, subregional, regional and national priorities.

17.0 WRCC-34 Western Region Integrated Pest Management - R. J. Miller

Arlon Davison (WA), representing Extension, and R. C. Dobson (ID), representing Resident Instruction, have been appointed Co-Administrative Advisors to serve with R. J. Miller and H C Cox. Each state and AR area director's office was asked to name one representative. The committee met in early December to begin to plan an IPM program. They hope to have a regional project outline completed by May 1979.

They identified the range dryland and irrigated agriculture ecosystems to work on, using cotton, corn, sugarbeets, alfalfa, and small grains as the major crops. Lead persons for each commodity were identified to develop the research projects.

ESCOPE has named an IPM subcommittee with an administrative representative from each region and Miller is the western region representative.

Miller presented an initial request to Bertrand for \$15,000 in FY 1980 to support travel of the participants. This has since been revised to a \$10,000 travel request, with the other regions also requesting funds, though the West's will be greater because of the greater cost of travel in the West.

18.0 Overhead Charges on Western Region Pesticide Impact Assessment Program (WRPIAP) - J. B. Kendrick

Kendrick suggested Directors consider the question of overhead charges since the problem is getting more acute for many states as university budget officers seek additional sources of funds. The traditional position with respect to the IR-4 leader lab and the WRPIAP program is that no overhead would be charged by California and therefore no overhead should be charged by the subcontracted states. However, this position means confrontations with budget officers for many of the participants. Kendrick proposed that Directors budget full costs of their research, including overhead, since overhead is a legitimate cost against many of the research programs.

During discussion, Jordan noted that everything except formula funded cooperative programs is charged overhead in Colorado. Dewhirst added that Experiment Stations might be better able to argue against overhead on formula funds if overhead could be charged on all other sources of funds. Kendrick expressed the view that Directors should begin thinking about taking some sort of collective stance towards overhead.

It was agreed that a fuller discussion of the problem of overhead would be scheduled at a future meeting.

19.0 RIC Report - D. L. Oldenstadt

The RIC Report is included as Appendix F, pages 49 - 60.

20.0 Western Rural Development Center - R. C. Youmans

About 30 extension and research faculty are currently involved in projects sponsored by the WRDC, and there is some project activity in each of the 13 western states (including Alaska). Although there must be a research and an extension component in every project, projects primarily involving extension predominate at this time. This is partly because there is no formal mechanism for Youmans to have a relationship with the interested researchers. Youmans listed some of the current projects and their progress, including both full-fledged projects and "seed" projects. He wondered if a formal WRCC would provide the mechanism for identifying researchable projects in the West. Since the dissolution of the WSRAC, the Farm Foundation has not received any research proposals from the West.

Directors suggested Youmans write them outlining his needs and his desire to stimulate research, asking the Directors to provide him with the names of interested researchers. The Center also has the authority to call meetings of interested researchers without the necessity of a formal WRCC.

It was moved by Johnson, seconded by Kendrick, that Dr. Youmans and his staff be commended on the positive way in which they are carrying out their responsibilities with respect to the Western Rural Development Center.

(Action of WDA: APPROVED)

21.0 Western Regional Planning Committee (WRPC) Report - C. E. Clark

21.1 1979-1984 Projection Cycle

Information on Western states' ten largest RP's and priorities identified in the last three projection cycles was distributed in advance of the meeting. The 1979-84 projection cycle has been divided into two phases. Phase I began in November and will end May 1, the date by which administrators' projections should have been received. Phase II is for iteration and refinement of the projections and will begin May 1, 1979 and continue through 1980. The process of making the projections gives the administrator an opportunity to gather together his determinations of needs and priorities. The Phase I projections will be included in the FY 1980 Secretary's report to the President. It is anticipated that the Phase II revisions will appear in a second publication. You will be requested to update your base data to FY 1979 and to provide a short narrative statement to WRPC. We hope to have summaries of the projections available by July 1 for review by the RPG's prior to the research administrators' meeting scheduled for August 8.

We sometimes hear it said that western priorities are not really recognized nationally--that we have unique problems that differ from those of the other regions. However, the data distributed to you indicates that there is a high degree of correspondence between western region priorities and nationally identified priorities.

21.2 Subregional cooperative efforts

Davis:

In the Pacific Northwest region (WA, OR, ID), the deans and directors of teaching, extension and resident instruction meet together at least once each year. There are several substantial agreements involving teaching, such that students from one of the universities can study at one of the other schools for a portion of his/her program. In the research area, a number of the department chairmen meet regularly (sometimes the entire departments), to define common problems and share experiences. There are cooperative trade-offs in erosion control (STEEP program), swine research, dairy research, range sheep and hill-lands sheep research, small animal and equine research. It is difficult to coordinate the animal science areas because of the need for animals in all three states for teaching purposes. We have discussed problems associated with consulting, worked closely on international agricultural programs, sponsored workshops on management techniques. We exchange position descriptions at the time a vacant position is being defined so there is an opportunity to optimize our resources. Our experience with our clientele groups is that so long as their needs are communicated to the Station doing the research, and the results of the research are relayed to the producer, the clientele groups are willing to try such arrangements.

Matthews:

In the states of MT, WY, CO and UT, we have begun to take a subregional cooperative approach to research, extension and teaching. We are trying to focus our trade-offs in the areas in which our states differ. Our first effort is concentrating on student exchanges, and each dean has requested 15 out-of-state tuition waivers to accommodate this. This will be especially helpful for graduate student exchanges. We have also begun talking about areas of excellence in our different institutions, and in Utah we have agreed that we cannot be excellent in all areas of agriculture.

21.3 Executive Briefing on the Future of Food, Agriculture, and Renewable Natural Resources - L. Quance

The general scenario for change in food, agriculture and renewable natural resources shows that globally, there will be a long-range future of neither feast nor famine but unfolding supply-demand management. The long-range growth in demand for services of renewable natural resources, driven by population and income growth, has probably passed an inflection point, shifting from increasing at an increasing rate to increasing at a decreasing rate. Supply appears technically and economically capable of producing quantities of goods and services demanded at reasonable prices.

The real problems are not in the demand and supply per se but in how society accepts and manages change. These include: (1) improved

public and private processes for social management; especially decision processes relating to the allocation of renewable natural resources to competing uses; (2) research programs to facilitate change from dependence on nonrenewable to renewable resources; (3) improved educational programs to facilitate participatory democracy and acceptance of needed change by the public; (4) bringing an orderly process to global interdependence where there is no effective institutionalized world order.

Quance presented a subsector summary for food and fiber, water, and forests and rangelands. He also reviewed current events and reports on the future of food, agriculture, and renewable natural resources, including the Global 2000 Study, the National Workshop on Future Challenges in Renewable Natural Resources, the Resources Conservation Assessment, the OTA study of World Food Futures, the President's Commission on World Hunger, and agriculture in the World Integrated Model.

A synopsis of expected agricultural adjustments in the west to 1990 includes: (1) population is expected to grow faster while farm output is expected to grow slower in the west compared to the nation; (2) competition for renewable natural resources will intensify with population relative to cropland and cropland harvested as a percent of total cropland increasing faster in the west than in the nation; (3) farm output in the west is expected to increase less than one percent per year with productivity increases contributing about two-thirds of the increase and additional cropland about one-third.

22.0 Strategies for Dealing with Budget Reductions

DISCUSSION:

Kendrick reported that although the California State budget will have a slight increase in FY 1980 due to mandated salary increases, there are also some mandated program cuts. Most program cuts can be handled by attrition. The largest problem is in the county extension offices; they have been undergoing intensive program planning by counties and units which should lay a good foundation for making the downward adjustments. If a program is terminated it is then possible to terminate tenured people, although the concept of tenure has not been legally determined yet--does tenure apply to the university system or to a particular campus?

In Idaho, the legislature froze the university budget at the FY 1979 level and mandated some salary increases. In agriculture there is a 5% mandated program reduction coupled with a 7% salary increase; Miller stated they intend to handle the decreases by selective program reduction or termination. In addition, the legislature eliminated EFNEP and Rural Development funding. Research will lose 15.5 FTE.

Cox reiterated that nationally for SEA-AR there is a \$20 million increase for new work and a \$26 million decrease in other programs. If this budget is approved, about 450 people will be terminated. He expressed concern that AR might make the cuts through attrition rather than "biting the bullet" and eliminating programs.

Herrick noted that the Forest Service is facing a 7 per cent reduction in FY 1979 dollars, and they plan to eliminate some lines of work and group others around the regional centers. He indicated that it is very difficult to make selective reductions because of the complication of the federal RIFing process--those with seniority get 90 days to try out for any job for which they are qualified and if satisfactory can usurp the new job.

23.0 Physical Facilities Study - M. T. Buchanan

There are two facets to the physical facilities study--the survey of facilities, designed and conducted by the physical facilities workgroup, and the policy statements related to federal funding of research facilities. The survey data is essentially complete and will be appended to the report. The policy statements are being written within the Department, and the major problem with the report is that decisionmakers within the Department do not share the view that there should be federal funding of state-used facilities. The report has thus gone through numerous revisions, all unacceptable to the Joint Council. If the final report remains unacceptable, the Joint Council plans to either issue a minority report or in some other way indicate their disapproval. There have been similar problems with the nutrition study and the Joint Council had to withdraw support of that study.

Robins indicated that the Joint Council intends to discuss the problem of Department changes to Council-supported studies at its next meeting. He encouraged Directors unhappy with either the final nutrition or physical facilities reports, to let the Secretary, Cutler and the Users Advisory Board know of their displeasure.

24.0 Status and Implications of California Mechanization Suit - J. B. Kendrick, Jr.

The California Agrarian Action Project, Inc. has filed a suit against the Regents of the University of California, six current and former members of the Board of Regents, and four current and former officers of the University, alleging a conflict of interest in the use of public funds for research involving agricultural mechanization. The suit claims research was undertaken of benefit only to certain large agricultural corporations and financially benefitted the individual regents and officers named in the suit. A second part of the suit claims that the research undertaken has led to a decrease in farm labor jobs and that this is in conflict with the section of the Hatch Act stating "... to promote a sound and prosperous agriculture and rural life as indispensable to the maintenance of maximum employment and national prosperity and security." The suit seeks to enjoin the University from using public money for any research program that accrues a specific benefit to large agricultural businesses. The University has not filed a response to the suit at this time.

The San Francisco Chronicle and Los Angeles Times both ran editorials suggesting the suit was without merit, but this prompted Mr. Abascal (Chairman of the Users Advisory Board and legal counsel to the California Agrarian Action Project, Inc.) to write a long article in the Times explaining that the intent of the suit was to show that the agricultural research establishment was conducting research of benefit to a very small segment of society.

Kendrick sent a copy of the suit to Bertrand suggesting the implications with regard to formula funds might warrant Department legal counsel interest. Other states conducting significant amounts of mechanization research may also be affected.

DISCUSSION:

Eddleman pointed out that studies show that even if displaced labor is given 50% compensation, tremendous benefits to society accrued from the development of the tomato harvester. Furtick noted that the Hawaii pineapple industry was the first mechanized agricultural industry and their labor force is now unionized and has the highest salaries for agricultural labor in the world. The California Agricultural Labor Relations Act will lead to fewer farm labor jobs than any mechanization research.

25.0 Agricultural Policy Challenges for California in the 1980s - L. T. Wallace

[Remarks based on the University of California, Division of Agricultural Sciences, Agricultural Issues Task Force, 1978, Special Publication 3250.]

About two years ago, Kendrick appointed a subcommittee with Tim Wallace as Chairman, to identify the major issues facing California agriculture in the future. The study was initially viewed as a follow-up to the H. Carter and J. Youde report entitled A Hungry World. The task force assignment was divided into eleven subject areas. The task of producing the report was assigned to a core group of University faculty and others. For each subject area, a study group was formed consisting of 15 to 25 members from the private sector, from government, and from the University. Each study group met separately with members of the core group for a day and a half or two days, primarily during the fall of 1977. Using open discussions and background materials, problems and public policy pressures in each area were identified and debated.

Public policy issues involving the food system grow out of social, economic and political tensions created by (a) agriculture as a competitor for resources (water, land, energy, labor, capital); (b) agriculture as a supplier of food and generator of economic activity; and (c) agriculture as a force helping to shape the physical environment and rural life.

All the study groups agreed that water was the most critical factor limiting land use and production in California agriculture. Policy issues surround water supply, water quality and water conservation. Most of the conflicts surrounding land use will arise because of its two vital roles--as a base for the food system and as living space. In spite of continued urban growth, there will be more productive farmland available in the next decade than water to irrigate it. Energy will be more costly during the coming decade, but will remain a highly productive input to agriculture. With regard to labor, policy intervention during the 1980s will deal with the maturing process of farm labor bargaining and management as a result of the 1976 Agricultural Labor Relations Act.

A pervasive policy concern of the study groups was the effect of government regulation. Regulations unquestionably increase costs, but the policy making assumption is that the benefits are worth the costs. It

is likely that there will be more regulation of California agriculture in the 1980s, rather than less.

In its role as a supplier of food, agricultural marketing policy and food consumption policy will remain important, with federal rather than state decisions predominating. The major policy issue with respect to the environment is "who is going to pay for environmental protection--the polluter (what if you can't find him?), or society at large." Employment and access to political action will remain major issues in rural development. The study groups also agreed on the need for better communication between scientists and policy makers, which poses a challenge to our educational system.

26.0 State and University Agricultural Relations - R. Rominger

Mr. Rominger is Director of the California Department of Food and Agriculture, succeeding Dr. Wallace in that position. The Director of the Department of Food and Agriculture is a member of the Governor's cabinet.

There is a close working relationship between the University of California and the state government, particularly between the Division of Agricultural Sciences and the Department of Food and Agriculture. This is partly because historically the people of this state have come to expect a lot from the University and its Extension Service--the University has had high visibility. In addition, most of our legislators are now from urban areas, with little knowledge of the University's service to the people; they are beginning to draw upon the University's scientific expertise to help them establish policy positions with regard to agricultural issues. The Department works closely with the University from the administration on down to the county agent level.

The Department is involved in the policy issues articulated by Dr. Wallace. It receives far more requests for assistance from people today than it used to, and this means it must turn to the University for information more often than formerly. In addition, the Department must work closely with other state agencies that have an impact on agriculture--such as the state Air Resources Quality Board.

Sometimes we provide the University with the resources to assist us, under specific contracts. Right now we are supporting the University's request for funding to set up a statewide integrated pest management program, and we will put some of our own money into the project. At other times, UC's ongoing programs are generating information in which we are interested.

Higher food prices and the visibility of the farm labor movement in California are providing us with an opportunity to try to educate the public about food and agricultural policy issues in this state. It is important for the consumer and urban dweller to be aware of these policy issues.

DISCUSSION:

Kendrick noted that it is crucial for agricultural administrators to convince the general public that all their efforts flow to the public benefit. Eddleman questioned whether or not we have let the technology

and the private marketplace determine the institutional structures that emerge in society. He expressed confidence that the educational and research system of the country could develop technology to meet the societal goals and institutional structures, if they could first be defined.

27.0 Other Business

27.1 Symposium on Evaluation of Agricultural Research and Extension - R. J. Miller

Dave Herrick prepared a summary report on the Symposium held May 21-23, 1978 in Moscow, Idaho. His summary is included in these minutes as Appendix G , pages 61-67.

27.2 Future Meetings

The summer meeting will be held in Jackson, Wyoming, August 8-10. Ayres handed out a brochure on the motel and noted that Frontier Airlines does fly to Jackson. Reservation forms will be mailed to the Directors in April.

The spring 1980 meeting will be hosted by the Nevada Station, at a city yet to be named. Western SEA-AR would like to host a joint meeting with the Directors in summer 1980. Chairman Miller will contact Extension Directors about holding another joint meeting sometime in the near future.

28.0 Resolutions - W. H. Foote

The Resolutions Committee consisted of Foote (Chairman) and R. A. Young. The Western Directors passed the following Resolutions:

28.1 Resolution 1

WHEREAS, Dr. D. Wynne Thorne, retired Director and Vice President for Research at Utah State University died in Logan, Utah, February 15, 1979, and

WHEREAS, Dr. Thorne was an active and respected member of the Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors from 1956 to 1966 and from 1971 to 1974; he was Chairman of the Association in 1961 and served on many important committees; his service to the Association and to agricultural research was always of very high order and his companionship exemplary and inspirational, and

WHEREAS, after his retirement from Utah State University, Dr. Thorne remained active in international agricultural development and devoted his time and effort to make parts of the underdeveloped world a better place to live, and

WHEREAS, Dr. Thorne is survived by his wife, two sons and three daughters,

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors express their deepest sympathy to Mrs. Wynne Thorne and family.

28.2 Resolution 2

WHEREAS, Mr. Ralph Besse, retired Associate Director of the Oregon Agricultural Experiment Station, died in Corvallis, February 13, 1979, and

WHEREAS, Director Besse joined the Oregon State University faculty in 1922 and served in various agricultural positions until his retirement in 1953; he was director of the agricultural programs in Israel under the USAID and served the State Department in other capacities from his home; he wrote many publications on agricultural economics, irrigation, legislation, and programs about the Experiment Station; he was appointed an Assistant Director of the Station in 1932 and served as an Associate Director from 1949 to 1953, and

WHEREAS, Director Besse was Chairman of the Western Directors Association for two terms and a member of ESCOP representing the region, and

WHEREAS, Director Besse, after his retirement, remained active in the Oregon Agricultural Research Foundation serving as a trustee and secretary, and

WHEREAS, Director Besse is survived by his wife, Helen, and one son,

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors express their sympathy to Mrs. Helen Besse and her family.

28.3 Resolution 3

WHEREAS, Dean and Director Arlon G. Hazen, Regional Director of the North Central Region died unexpectedly at Fargo, North Dakota on January 28, 1979, and

WHEREAS, Director Hazen served 22 years as Dean of the College of Agriculture and Director of the Agricultural Experiment Station at North Dakota, and

WHEREAS, Director Hazen was a staunch advocate and a hard and dedicated worker for the Land Grant system and agriculture in North Dakota and the Nation,

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors express their sympathy to Mrs. Betty Hazen and family.

28.4 Resolution 4

WHEREAS, the revised Bylaws of the Division of Agriculture were reviewed by Dean A. M. Mullins, Chairman of the Division Bylaws Committee, and

WHEREAS, it was noted that ESCOP had reviewed the proposed Division Bylaws and recommended changes outlined in the ESCOP Minutes of the October 10-11, 1978 meeting, and

WHEREAS, the Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors express their concern with certain sections and suggest the following changes:

Section 3. Governance of the Division. The Executive Committee is empowered to act on behalf of the Board between meetings of the Board and report their action for ratification at the next Board meeting.

Section 3. a. Board of Directors. The Western Directors believe the membership of the Board is too large, will be unwieldy and result in unnecessary travel expenses for the number of members and meetings proposed. The Board should be composed of representatives from CAHA, ESCOP, ECOP, RICOP and affiliated groups. Representatives from the USDA and AID Budget Committees and Water Resources Administrative Policy Committees should be deleted from Board membership.

Section 3. a. Meetings of the Board of Directors. The Board shall meet at least twice a year and one meeting should be held prior to the scheduled meetings of the Senate Executive Committee. Additional meetings may be called by the chairman as necessary.

Section 3. b. Executive Committee. The Western Directors recommend an Executive Committee composed of one representative each of CAHA, ESCOP, ECOP, RICOP, Divisional Representative to the Association Executive Committee, and two representatives from affiliated groups on a rotational basis. This Executive Committee of seven should elect its own chairman, vice chairman, and secretary.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that these suggested changes in the proposed Bylaws be transmitted to the Division and we recommend their inclusion in the Bylaws.

[Transmit also to the Chairmen of ESCOP, ECOP and RICOP.]

28.5 Resolution 5

WHEREAS, Dr. Cy Card, Assistant Director of the Agricultural Experiment Station, College of Agriculture, University of Idaho from 1975-1979 resigned to accept a position as Head of the Department of Veterinary Medicine at Pennsylvania State University, and

WHEREAS, Dr. Card was a dedicated teacher and a clinical pathologist and served the Western Directors successfully as an Administrative Advisor and a loyal friend to many members,

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors convey the title of emeritus director and wish Dr. Card success in his new position.

28.6 Resolution 6

WHEREAS, Dr. Walter I. Thomas	Deputy Director, SEA-CR
Dr. Roger Fendall	Intern in the NASULGC Office
Dr. Bobby R. Eddleman	Director of IR-6
Dr. R. C. Youmans	Director, W. Rural Development Center, OSU
Dr. LeRoy Quance	ESCS
Dr. L. T. Wallace	Extension Economist
Mr. Richard Rominger	Director, California Department of Food and Agriculture

have traveled many miles to visit and present their reports and papers to the meeting of the Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors,

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors extends its sincere thanks and appreciation for their efforts to make this meeting a success.

28.7 Resolution 7

WHEREAS, members and guests of the Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors have completed a very successful and productive meeting while enjoying the beautiful sights and hospitality of the University of California, Davis, and

WHEREAS, Dean C. E. Hess and his staff, through their efforts to provide and arrange for lodging, meals, field trips, transportation and relaxation, have contributed greatly to the success of the meeting, and

WHEREAS, special thanks are extended to Barbara Doran and Barbara Malmin who deserve special recognition for their efforts to provide arrangements and services for the meeting, and

WHEREAS, the visit to the Viticulture and Enology Wine Cellar provided the members and guests an opportunity to see and taste products from an outstanding research program, and

WHEREAS, the delicious chicken barbeque and social hour provided by Dean Hess and his staff was a fitting climax to an already successful meeting, and

WHEREAS, those members who were displaced from their motel rooms by the visit of Mrs. Rosalynn Carter not only received a nice letter of appreciation from the Mayor of Davis and a discount on a nice motel room, but they will always be able to say they slept in the same room as Rosalynn Carter,

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors express their sincere thanks and appreciation to their friends and associates at Davis, California.

28.8 Minority Resolution

[The following Resolution was brought by the neophyte class-- Paul Casamajor, Bobby Eddleman, Roger Fendall, Dave Herrick, Sam Krammes, Walt Thomas, and Bob Witters.]

WHEREAS, Dr. Krammes did not know the meaning of ESCOP, and

WHEREAS, Dr. Witters did not know the French pronunciation of calves, and

WHEREAS, Mr. Casamajor did not know the father of Sacramento, and

WHEREAS, Dr. Eddleman did not know the most important export of his native state of Mississippi, and

WHEREAS, Dr. Thomas did not know when Washington, D.C. became the capital city of the United States, and

WHEREAS, Mr. Herrick did not know the location of the state of Colorado, and

WHEREAS, Dr. Fendall also blew his questions, and

WHEREAS, these sorry neophytes of this 133rd meeting of the Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors did obediently sit through two and one-half days of highly stimulating deliberations by their betters; neophyte Casamajor did tap his wine glass effectively and at an appropriate time during the Association banquet; and, as a group, they did ply their betters with pears, cracker jacks, cocktail goodies and illustrated jokes,

NOW THEREFORE be it resolved that these seven neophytes have proved themselves to be fully qualified for true and equal membership in this august organization, and are thus due the high respect and other honors that this membership does imply.

Although the minority Resolution was not approved, the neophytes were reluctantly voted into Association membership with the hope that they will not see fit to attend future meetings.

29.0 Adjournment

Chairman Miller adjourned the meeting at 11:45 am, Friday, March 23, 1979.

WESTERN DIRECTORS ASSOCIATION MEETING
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
DAVIS, CALIFORNIA

MARCH 21-23, 1979

AGENDAWEDNESDAY, MARCH 21*(203 Mrak Hall, UCD Campus)*

- | | | |
|----------|------|--|
| 8:00 am | 1.0 | Call to Order |
| | 2.0 | Introductions |
| | 3.0 | Announcements |
| | 4.0 | Adoption of Agenda |
| | 5.0 | Approval of Previous Minutes |
| 8:25 am | 6.0 | DAL Report - M. T. Buchanan |
| 8:40 am | 7.0 | Report of Chairman/Report of Executive Committee - R. J. Miller |
| 9:30 am | | <i>Coffee Break</i> |
| 9:45 am | 8.0 | SEA/Cooperative Research Report - W. I. Thomas |
| | (a) | Hatch Administrative Manual for Cooperative Agricultural Research |
| | (b) | Animal health and disease research funds |
| 10:45 am | 9.0 | Animal health and disease research - W. G. Huber |
| | (a) | Facility requirements |
| | (b) | Formula funding--current status |
| 11:15 am | 10.0 | Committee of Nine Report - C. E. Clark |
| 11:30 am | | <i>No host lunch</i> |
| 1:00 pm | 11.0 | Division of Agriculture, NASULGC - R. K. Fendall |
| | (a) | NASULGC staff in-put in FY 1980 budget process |
| 1:30 pm | 11.1 | Experiment Station Section Report - L. L. Boyd |
| | (a) | Proposed change in Section By-Laws |
| 1:40 pm | 11.2 | ESCOP Report - J. P. Jordan |
| 2:00 pm | 11.3 | ESCOP Legislative Subcommittee Report - J. P. Jordan |
| | (a) | FY 1980 Executive Budget |
| | (b) | Agreement with Jaenke and Associates |
| | (c) | Experiment Station input into FY 1981 SEA Budget |
| 2:55 pm | 11.4 | Proposed change in Division of Agriculture By-Laws - A. M. Mullins |
| 3:05 pm | | <i>Coffee Break</i> |
| 3:20 pm | 12.0 | Joint Council on Food and Agricultural Sciences - J. S. Robins |
| | (a) | Appointment of members to National Research Committee and Western Research Committee |
| 3:45 pm | 13.0 | Meetings of Regional Association Chairmen - R. J. Miller |
| 4:00 pm | 14.0 | Research Highlights on the Davis Campus - C. E. Hess |
| 4:30 pm | | <i>Wine tasting - Viticulture and Enology Wine Cellar</i> |

THURSDAY, MARCH 22

(203 Mrak Hall, UCD Campus)

8:00 am 15.0 Users Advisory Board - M. T. Buchanan
8:15 am 16.0 IR-6 National and Regional Research Planning - K. J. Lessman/
B. R. Eddleman
8:40 am 17.0 WRCC-34 Western Region Integrated Pest Management - R. J. Miller
9:00 am 18.0 Overhead charges on Western Region Pesticide Impact Assessment
Program (WRPIAP) - J. B. Kendrick, Jr.
9:20 am 19.0 RIC Report - D. L. Oldenstadt
10:00 am *Coffee Break*
10:15 am RIC Report (continued)
10:45 am 20.0 Western Rural Development Center - R. C. Youmans
11:30 am *No host lunch*

(Faculty Club, Club Room, UCD)

1:00 pm 21.0 WRPC Report - C. E. Clark
(a) 1979-1984 Projection Cycle
2:15 pm *Coffee Break*
2:30 pm 21.1 Commodity supply-demand projections for use in projection
cycle - L. Quance (ESCS)
3:30 pm 22.0 Strategies for dealing with budget reductions
(a) Increased cooperation between SAES and AR
(b) State Station examples
4:30 pm *Tour of campus*

FRIDAY, MARCH 23

(203 Mrak Hall, UCD Campus)

8:00 am 23.0 Physical Facilities Study - M. T. Buchanan
8:20 am 24.0 Status and implications of California mechanization suit -
J. B. Kendrick, Jr.
8:45 am 25.0 Agricultural Policy Challenges for California in the 1980's -
L. T. Wallace
9:45 am *Coffee Break*
10:00 am 26.0 State and university agricultural relations - R. Rominger
(Director, California Department of Food and Agriculture)
11:00 am 27.0 Other business
11:30 am 28.0 Resolutions
12:00 n *Adjournment*

APPENDIX B

B-37

Potential DU's and Analyses for FY 1981
Science and Education Administration Zero-Based Budget

Potential Decision Units	FY 80 Approx. \$ in Mil.	
. Crop Production	146	
. Crop Protection	85	<u>Special Analyses</u> Pest Management (IPM, etc.) Energy (Title XIV, Biomass, Passthrough) Basic Research Water Quality and Land Management International Programs Small Farms Alternative Agricultural Systems Higher Education Use of Computer Assisted Communications Reduction of Food Losses Aquaculture Management Information Systems Technology Transfer in Forestry Facilities Weather, Climate, Plant Stress and Green Thumb Space Technology PHT (Build on PHT Assessment) Extension Evaluation Contingency Human Nutrition Rural and Community Development Youth Development Programs Food Safety and Quality Hatch McIntire-Stennis Smith-Lever 1890's Schools Title XIV Criteria for Comparison of Research and Extension Funding Mechanisms Adequacy of Technology Supply Competitive Grants
. Animal Production	45	
. Animal Protection	80	
. Food Quality and Safety	45	
. Food Protection, Distribution and Exports	25	
. Technology and Safety of Non-Food Agriculture Products	33	
. Economics and Farm Management	20	
. Human Nutrition	91	
. Family/Consumer Resource Development	32	
. Youth Development (4-H)	69	
. Rural and Community Development	29	
. Land and Water Resources	69	
. Forestry and Range Resources	13	
. Technical Information Systems	8	
. Research, Extension, and Teaching Capacity Maintenance (Pay Act Comparability).	(15)	
. Facilities Development and Equip.	8	
Total	798	

Description of Program Content of
Proposed FY 1980 SEA Decision Units

The organization units of SEA include Extension, Agricultural Research, Cooperative Research, Human Nutrition Center, Program Management (Competitive Grants Office), Higher Education and Technical Information. The programs of several units contribute to the information developed and disseminated in support of the objectives of each Decision Unit. Basic research is included in most programs.

FY 80 Approx.
\$ in Mil.

1. Crop Production 146
 - Improve plant genetic resources consistent with nutritional and other market needs.
 - Improve the efficiency of production systems consistent with the energy and water conservation and environmental quality needs.
2. Crop Protection 85
 - Improve the control of weeds, insects, diseases, nematodes and other pests consistent with environmentally safe practices (biological control as a component of IPM).
3. Animal Production 45
 - Improve animal genetic capacity for production, reproductive and feed efficiency consistent with consumer demands.
 - Improve the efficiency of livestock management systems consistent with national concerns to save energy, improve human health and maintain environmental quality.
4. Animal Protection 80
 - Reduce losses and the threat from foreign and domestic diseases, parasites, insects, toxic chemicals and poisonous plants consistent with objectives to maintain the quality of food supply and the environment.
 - Control biting insects that attack man and animals consistent with environmental objectives.
5. Food Quality and Safety 45
 - Improve methods and information to help protect foods from toxic residues, microorganisms and natural toxins.
 - Improve food processing methods consistent with food quality and safety energy conservation and environmental quality objectives.

6. Food Protection, Distribution and Export 25
- Reduce food losses while maintaining product quality in the marketing channel.
 - Reduce losses and maintain product quality in export markets.
7. Technology and Safety of Non-Food Agricultural Products 33
- Improve the technology for natural fibers, leather and tobacco consistent with objectives for safe products and a safe environment for workers.
 - Improve the value of agricultural products and byproducts consistent with national energy objectives.
8. Economics and Farm Management 20
- Improve economic analysis and management information to support Federal policy analyses and production/marketing systems consistent with needs of both small and commercial farms.
9. Human Nutrition 91
- Improve information on nutrient requirements, what people eat and the factors involved, the composition of foods, program and policy analysis consistent growing public demand for this information.
 - Improve nutrition education for low-income families and the public at large based on new approaches and the growing body of scientific information.
10. Family and Consumer Resources Development 32
- Improve the information consumers and families need to make wise choices concerning their money, personal skills, home and clothing.
 - Improve information supporting the individuals participation outside the home and in community activities.
11. Youth Development (4-H) 69
- Improve education experiences for youth directed to their individual self-development and citizenship.
 - Provide practical ways for youth to contribute to goals of families, communities and the nation.

12. Rural and Community Development 29
 - Improve information and assistance essential to effective community decisionmaking and implementation of community plans.
 - Improve information in support of operators of small farms and their families.
13. Land and Water Resources 69
 - Improve methods to appraise and manage soil and water resources consistent with environmental guidelines and long-term productivity.
 - Improve methods to characterize weather and climatic patterns and relate these patterns to crop production.
14. Forestry and Range Resources 13
 - Improve the productivity of forestry and range resources consistent with multiple use objectives (wildlife, conservation and recreation).
 - Improve information for small operators concerning harvesting and marketing high quality wood products.
15. Technical Information Systems 8
 - Provide a national library resource and delivery, current awareness, and other services to users across the country.
 - Improve management information systems to inform program managers at the national, state, and local levels.
16. Research, Extension, and Teaching Capacity Maintenance (15)
 - To maintain capacity at Land-Grant Colleges and Universities through Federal funding to off-set increased salary costs.
17. Facilities Development and Equipment 8
 - Develop and maintain research facilities consistent with program objectives.
 - Provide scientific and other sophisticated equipment necessary to achieve program objectives.

was passed to provide scientific information for teaching and making recommendations for production agriculture. Research was conducted with plants or animals under production conditions.

Conclusions usually stated how these conditions could be improved to enhance the production rate or efficiency and, therefore, the economic return. Early innovators in the agricultural industry reaped economic returns, but in time, the competitive nature of the industry resulted in most of these economic benefits being passed on to the consumer. Thus only about 17% of the income of an average U.S. citizen is spent for food, the lowest percentage in the world.

Partially because of this success story, financial support of research for other purposes has been appropriated. Perhaps the most widely known is for research by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare through its National Institutes of Health (NIH). The aim of this research is to provide knowledge for improving human health and combating disease. Since research utilizing human subjects has obvious limitations, scientists dealing with human diseases and metabolic aberrations often use animal models to determine basic information and develop theories and approaches that lead to the correction and prevention of human disease.

Thus animals, primarily "laboratory animals," are the major experimental tool used in human health research. Since results from this research are applied to humans rather than to the animal itself, the experimental conditions under which these animals are kept obviously do not duplicate "natural" conditions. Often, animals were kept under less than ideal conditions that may have resulted in invalid conclusions for application to humans.

APPENDIX C

C-41

ACCREDITATION OF FARM ANIMAL RESEARCH AND TEACHING FACILITIES

R. L. Preston, Chairman
Department of Animal Sciences
Washington State University

Accreditation requirements for laboratory animals do not fit the needs of teaching and research on production animals. Just the lab animal requirements be misapplied, we should develop accreditation requirements for production animal teaching and research.

We are rapidly approaching the time when all animal care and facilities for teaching and research will have to be accredited. This includes farm or production animals. If special accreditation requirements are not developed, we risk having accreditation standards developed for laboratory animals imposed on production animals used in teaching and research. Let's examine how we arrived at our present situation and what we might do to bring about the proper solution to accreditation of farm animal facilities and care.

The Hatch Act of 1887 established a mechanism for sustained agricultural research by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. The result was an unprecedented body of scientific knowledge that is a major factor in the ability of the U.S. to lead the world in agricultural production. This knowledge was not limited to direct application by farmers and ranchers in the production of food and fiber. It also developed a reservoir of basic biological information about plants and animals that benefits not only agriculture and veterinary medicine but also such biological sciences as botany, zoology, physiology, human nutrition, and medicine.

A major point to remember, however, is that the Hatch Act

tution, organization or agency, including Federal, State, or local government agencies in the U.S.

4. Institutions will be required to submit more complete assurance statements regarding their compliance with The Guide.
5. Institutions will have to file a new assurance statement every five years. When an institution is not in compliance, an annual progress report will be required. Failure to correct deficiencies in a reasonable period of time could be the basis for withholding or terminating awards to that institution.
6. Grant applications and contract proposals will be expected to include information that makes possible an assessment for the rationale for animal use, the precautions taken to avoid discomfort and injury, and whether or not the numbers proposed and species to be used are appropriate.
7. Standards for the construction and use of housing, service, and surgical facilities should meet those described in the Guide.

Somewhat related to the revised NIH policy is the publication in the December 22, 1978 Federal Register (Part II, pp 59986-60020) the "Good Laboratory Practice Regulations for Nonclinical Laboratory Studies." These regulations specify certain animal care and supply facility requirements, and encourage "the humane treatment of animals used in nonclinical laboratory studies by establishing minimum requirements for the husbandry of animals during the conduct of such studies." This regulation notes that the FDA Commissioner

Because there was need to improve the conditions under which animals were kept for laboratory research, NIH published the Guide for Laboratory Animal Facilities and Care in 1963. This publication has been revised several times. The most recent revision was published in 1978 as the Guide for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals (NIH Publication No. NIH 78-23). "The purpose of The Guide is to assist scientific institutions in using and caring for laboratory animals in ways judged to be professionally appropriate." Scientists and research laboratories who request financial support from NIH must be able to show that they conform to The Guide before funding from NIH can be received.

This has led to a need for accrediting facilities and institutions regarding their ability to properly house, manage and care for laboratory animals being used in research. The American Association for Accreditation of Laboratory Animal Care (AAALAC) developed a voluntary accreditation program based on The Guide. NIH relies heavily on the AAALAC accreditation program; in fact it is stated that "Accreditation by AAALAC is the best means of demonstrating compliance with the NIH policies contained in The Guide."

Recently, NIH revised its policy to require a stronger commitment from institutions that receive NIH grants, contracts or other awards to comply with The Guide, including the following:

1. Animal is defined as any live, vertebrate animal used in research, experimentation, testing, training, or related purposes.
2. An animal facility is defined as any building, room, area, or vehicle designed to confine, transport, maintain, or use animals.
3. An institution is defined as any public or private insti-

-6-

housing experts to obtain specific information."

Space recommendations are also listed for quail, chickens, sheep, goats, swine, cattle and horses (pages 34-35).

The real crux of the accreditation requirements for farm animal care and facilities is the interpretation of The Guide by those responsible for accreditation. For instance, how is the statement "All waste should be collected, removed, and disposed of in a safe and sanitary manner" to be applied to stables, feedlots or pastures commonly used for farm animals? Commercially caged laying hens usually have about 60 in² of floor space per bird compared to the 72 in² shown to be required in The Guide. Pigs are given 4-8 ft² of floor space in practice, compared to The Guide figures of 6-30 ft². Growing-finishing cattle are commercially fed in slotted floor facilities with 20-25 ft² of floor space per head, compared to the 100 ft² shown in The Guide for penned cattle (201-500 kg.). "Professional judgment should be applied in determining exercise needs of large domestic animals, such as horses and cattle." Who makes this professional judgment? "Physical comfort, as applied specifically to housing, includes such factors as keeping the animals dry and clean, ... keeping the animals at a comfortable temperature." What does this mean for farm animals normally kept outdoors in lots or pastures?

The point is, The Guide is not suitable for accrediting the care and facilities for farm animals. To apply these standards will simply result in the situation presented earlier: the duplication of commercial practices will not meet the requirements set forth in The Guide. The National Academy of Sciences has two

-5-

is unaware of any facility accreditation program that is mandatory. Furthermore, it states that "Because the husbandry requirements for laboratory animals differ greatly from those of large animals, the Agency does not require that large animals be reared and maintained under the same conditions as laboratory animals."

The specific meaning of the above policy revisions and regulations to the conduct of research and teaching using farm animals in public or private facilities is uncertain at this time. Institutional grants may be affected by the accreditation status of facilities used for "any live, vertebrate animal." Therefore, the grant status of an institution may be in jeopardy if any animal facility, including farm animal facilities, do not meet the standards outlined in The Guide. A recent inspection at one land-grant institution found their farm animal facilities to be out of compliance with The Guide; the inspectors did not approve duplication of commercial practices. The Guide is too voluminous to be reviewed here. What is pertinent, however, are the specifications relating to farm animals. On page 29 of The Guide, one finds the following statement:

"The requirements for large domestic animals used in most biomedical research projects are similar to those previously described (for laboratory animals). However, it may be necessary to house horses, cows, sheep, goats, or pigs under less stringent conditions, e.g., those animals used as blood donors, for immune serum production, or in agricultural experiments on the production of food and fiber. For these types of research needs, they are usually housed in pens and barns in rural areas. If such construction is planned, it is advisable to consult with agricultural engineers or farm animal

publications giving Guidelines for the Breeding, Care, and Management of Laboratory Animals - Swine and Ruminants (cattle, sheep, and goats). These publications provide "practical guidelines for the maintenance of these species under a variety of research situations. Since a wide variety of types of facilities can be designed, it was felt that only general recommendations should be made." However, these guidelines do not address caring for animals kept under more extensive conditions typical of commercial animal production.

An additional concern in the application of the revised NIH policy to farm animal teaching and research is the interpretation of the requirement for information on the rationale for animal use, the numbers proposed and the species to be used. Farm animals are used for production research because they are in fact the target animal for application of results. The rationale for using these animals is obvious, including the species. The numbers proposed as well as the experimental design are prerogatives of the principal investigator to best answer the objectives of the proposed research. Approval of these experimental protocols must rest with individuals trained to do production animal research who understand the major purpose of research and teaching related to farm animals.

What is the major purpose of research and teaching related to farm animals? It is to provide results and to teach students for the commercial animal industry. Therefore, the methodology of research and teaching where farm animals are used must simulate commercial conditions. As with laboratory animals, appropriate guidelines and standards for care and use of farm animals will improve the validity and applicability of research results and the

proper training of students for the commercial animal industry. In the absence of appropriate guidelines, we can expect inappropriate guidelines to be applied by inspectors who do not know or understand the purpose of farm animal teaching and research. Without research results that apply to commercial animal production continual advancements in the efficiency of animal production will cease leading to increased cost of animal products to the consumer.

Therefore, what is a proper solution to this problem? Guidelines must be prepared by professional farm animal scientists, including agricultural engineers and veterinarians. ARCAS provides a logical organization that can prepare appropriate guidelines and conduct accreditation of farm animal care and facilities. Sources of information such as the National Academy of Sciences publications cited above, the NRC Nutrient Requirements of Domestic Animals, The Midwest Plan Service specifications for animal housing, American Society of Heating, Refrigeration and Airconditioning Engineers for building ventilation, the many handbooks for management of farm animals such as the Great Plains Handbook for Beef Cow-Calf and Beef Cattle Feeding and the Pork Industry Handbook, all should be part of the resource material used for preparing guidelines for farm animal care and use.

Once guidelines are prepared, they should be reviewed by the USDA, NIH, FFA and other appropriate agencies and approved as one method by which institutions, public and private, may accredit their farm animal facilities and management practices. After the guidelines have been approved, then institutions can request accreditation reviews to determine if their farm animal facilities

-9-

are in compliance. If not, deficiencies can be identified and a timetable established for their correction.

Some will say that this is all unnecessary; we have done without accreditation in the past without serious problems. Someone else may impose unrealistic guidelines, however, while we are being complacent. I feel that we, the professional animal scientists, know best the needs for proper care and use of farm animals. I believe it is time for us to prepare appropriate guidelines and conduct the accreditation of farm animal care and facilities for teaching and research purposes.

APPENDIX D

Summary of SEA Budget Authority for AR, CR, Extension and Technical Information Systems
Including 1978 Actual, 1979 Estimate, 1980 Request, Division of Agriculture Austerity
Request, and Recommended Changes by House and Senate Agriculture Committees

Agency Function Program Name	Budget Authority (Dollars in thousands)							
	1978 Actual	1979 Estimate	1980 Request	Div. of Ag. Net Request 1/	House Ag. Committee Marks	House Net Change	Senate Ag. Committee Marks	Senate Net Change
<u>Science and Education Administration</u>								
<u>Agricultural Research</u>								
Research on animal production	60,872	66,167	67,791	--	67,791	NC	64,791	- 3,000
Research on plant production	119,522	134,128	128,119	--	131,418	+ 2,500	135,612	+ 6,694
Research on soil, water, and air	37,954	43,251	45,608	--	46,608	+ 1,000	45,076	- 532
Human nutrition research	15,508	22,008	25,714	--	27,714	+ 2,000	25,714	NC
Marketing and consumer research	73,085	75,696	67,625	--	72,625	+ 5,000	77,125	+ 9,500
Constr., repair, and maint. of facilities	17,191	8,216	8,216	--	8,216	NC	9,716	+ 1,500
Contingency research fund	1,000	1,000	1,000	--	1,000	NC	1,000	NC
Account Total	340,132	350,466	344,872	--	355,372	+10,500	359,034	+14,162
Buildings and facilities	--	35,720	--	--	--	NC	--	NC
Scientific activities overseas	5,750	5,750	7,500	--	7,500	NC	7,500	NC
Total - Agricultural Research	345,882	391,936	352,372	--	362,872	+10,500	366,534	+14,162
<u>Cooperative Research</u>								
Federal administration	1,694	1,696	1,781	NC	1,781	NC	1,781	NC
Title V rural development research	1,500	1,500	--	+ 1,800	1,500	+ 1,500	5,000	+ 5,000
Competitive research grants	15,000	15,000	30,000	NC	21,000	- 9,000	20,000	-10,000
Special research grants	7,235	15,773	11,610	+ 7,800	19,410	+ 7,800	15,610	+ 4,000
Cooperative forest research	9,500	9,500	9,500	+ 665	10,165	+ 665	10,250	+ 750
Hatch payments to AES	109,066	109,066	109,066	+ 7,635	118,501	+ 9,435	117,566	+ 8,500
Payments to 1890 colleges, Tuskegee	14,153	16,360	16,360	+ 1,415	17,775	+ 1,415	17,635	+ 1,275
Continuing animal health research	--	5,000	--	+10,350	10,350	+10,350	12,500	+12,500
Grants for industrial hydrocarbon res.	--	500	--	NC	1,000	+ 1,000	--	--
Total - Cooperative Research	143,148	174,395	178,317	+29,665	201,482	+23,165	200,342	+22,025
<u>Extension Activities</u>								
Title V rural development extension	2,400	2,400	--	+ 2,500	2,500	+ 2,500	6,500	+ 6,500
Federal administration	100	100	--	NC	--	--	--	--
Smith-Lever payments to states	143,753	147,553	147,553	+10,300	157,853	+10,300	162,553	+15,000
Retirement	16,033	16,033	16,033	+ 5,000	21,033	+ 5,000	16,033	NC
Penalty Mail	16,245	16,245	16,245	NC	16,245	NC	16,245	NC
Urban gardening program	3,000	3,000	--	+ 3,000	3,000	+ 3,000	3,000	+ 3,000
Expanded nutrition and family education	50,560	51,810	50,560	+12,500	50,560	NC	57,560	+ 7,000
Pesticide impact assessment	735	1,735	1,735	NC	1,735	NC	1,735	NC
Rural development program	1,000	1,000	--	+ 1,000	1,000	+ 1,000	1,000	+ 1,000
Pest management program	4,435	5,435	6,435	NC	6,435	NC	6,435	NC
Farm safety program	1,020	1,020	--	+ 1,500	1,500	+ 1,500	1,000	+ 1,000
Nonpoint source pollution	--	--	1,300	NC	1,300	NC	1,300	NC
Energy demonstrations	--	--	300	NC	300	NC	2,500	+ 2,200
Federal administration (direct)	6,534	6,534	6,791	NC	6,791	NC	6,791	NC
1890 institutions and Tuskegee extension	9,333	10,115	10,115	+ 700	10,815	+ 700	10,115	NC
Competitive education grants	--	--	1,250	+ 1,250	1,250	NC	--	- 1,250
Bankhead-Jones aid to colleges	11,500	11,500	--	+11,500	11,500	+11,500	11,500	+11,500
Payments to District of Columbia	874	874	874	NC	874	NC	874	NC
Federal administration	36	36	36	NC	36	NC	36	NC
Direct marketing, farmer-to-consumer	1,500	--	--	NC	2,000	+ 2,000	--	NC
Forestry extension program	--	--	--	+ 5,000	--	--	5,000	+ 5,000
Aquaculture program	--	--	--	NC	--	--	1,500	+ 1,500
Total - Extension Activities	269,058	275,399	259,227	+54,250	296,727	+37,500	311,677	+52,450
<u>Technical Information Systems</u>								
National agricultural library	7,109	7,252	7,360	NC	7,360	NC	7,360	NC
Food and nutrition info. & educ. res. Ctr.	--	475	475	NC	475	NC	475	NC
Total - Technical Info. Systems	7,109	7,727	7,835	NC	7,835	NC	7,835	NC
Miscellaneous Contribution Funds	1,650	1,500	1,500	NC	1,500	NC	1,500	NC
TOTAL - Science and Education Administration	766,847	850,957	799,251	+83,915	870,416	+71,165	887,888	+88,637

1/ Unified "austerity" request of 2/29/79.

**FY 1980 ESCOP AUSTERITY BUDGET REQUEST FOR
SEA-COOPERATIVE RESEARCH, USDA
(Requests Above President's Budget)**

The FY 1980 President's Budget represents a net decrease of \$11,079,000 in USDA-SEA-Cooperative Research programs in the State Universities and Land Grant Colleges. Research programs on animal health, soybeans, transportation, marketing and storage research, and rural development were deleted. In addition, the states were requested to initiate \$6,800,000 of new national priority programs without any new Hatch funds. ESCOP proposes adding \$29,665,000 to the President's Budget, which is only \$18,537,000 above the FY 1979 appropriation of \$159,395,000.

Priority I: Maintain Research Capacity, \$11,515,000

To maintain research capacity, but at reduced levels, of State Agricultural Experiment Stations, including Regional Research (Hatch, \$9,435,000), Eligible 1890 Institutions (PL 95-113, Sec. 1445, \$1,415,000), Schools of Forest Resources (McIntire-Stennis, \$665,000), and Animal Health (PL 95-113, Sec. 1433, \$350,000). These are based on 7% increased costs of conducting research. Even this level will result in some reductions of programs because increased costs of energy, utilities, laboratory equipment and supplies will undoubtedly exceed 7%. The President's Budget for Hatch Act Payments to States represents \$28 million less in purchasing power than was appropriated in FY 1966!!

Priority II: Restoration of Programs, \$11,350,000

High priority basic research programs on Animal Health (\$5,000,000) should be restored in Section 1433 and the \$5,000,000 deleted from Special Grants (Sec. 1414c) be added to Sec. 1433. Research on soybeans (\$500,000) and transportation, marketing and storage (\$500,000) should be continued under PL 95-113, Sec. 1414c, Special Grants. The President's Budget deleted any funds for Rural Development Research (\$1,500,000) or Rural Development Centers (\$300,000). If these programs are not reauthorized, ESCOP recommends continuing them under Hatch and Hatch Regional (Sec. 1463b).

Priority III: National Priority Initiatives, \$6,800,000

The President's Budget included two areas of increased research emphasis-- Integrated Pest Management (\$3,000,000) and Non-point Source Pollution (\$2,800,000). However, no funds were provided for these purposes, nor were funds to enable state scientists to meet responsibilities and cooperate with AR-SEA in Plant Germ-plasm Repositories (\$1,000,000). State scientists should be involved in these national priority initiatives, but additional funds are needed under Hatch (Sec. 1463b) and Special Grants (Sec. 1414c). ESCOP recommends that Alcohol Fuels Research (Sec. 1419) be conducted as part of the Energy Research Special Grants Program (Sec. 1414c), which was included in the President's Budget.

WPF:np

2/12/79

Table 1. FY 1980 ESCOP Austerity Budget Request for Cooperative Research-SEA

	1979 Appropriation	Original ESCOP Request 11/12/78*	FY 1980 President's Budget	ESCOP	
				Austerity Request 1/26/79	Austerity Change From Pres. Budget
<u>Hatch Act (Sec. 1463b)</u>	\$109,066,000	\$134,000,000	\$109,066,000	\$118,501,000	\$ 9,435,000 <u>1/</u>
State Agri. Exp. Stations including Regional Research					
<u>McIntire-Stennis</u>	9,500,000	11,700,000	9,500,000	10,165,000	665,000 <u>1/</u>
<u>Eligible 1890 Inst. (Sec. 1445)</u>	16,360,000	20,100,000	16,360,000	17,775,000	1,415,000 <u>1/</u>
<u>Animal Hlth. (Sec. 1433)</u>	5,000,000	25,000,000	0	10,350,000	10,350,000 <u>2/</u>
<u>Special Grants (Sec. 1414c)</u>	15,773,000	12,810,000	11,610,000	19,410,000	7,800,000 <u>2/</u>
<u>Rural Development, Title V</u>	1,500,000	1,850,000	0	(1,800,000) <u>3/</u>	(1,800,000) <u>3/</u>
<u>Alcohol Fuels Res. (Sec. 1419)</u>	500,000	500,000	0	(500,000) <u>4/</u>	(500,000) <u>4/</u>
<u>Small Farms Res. (Sec. 1441)</u>	0	2,500,000	0	0	0
<u>Facilities (Sec. 1414, 1416)</u>	0	13,800,000	0	0	0
<u>Federal Administration</u>	1,696,000	1,696,000	1,781,000	1,781,000	
Total CR-SEA	\$159,395,000	\$223,956,000	\$148,317,000 <u>5/</u>	\$177,982,000	\$29,665,000

*Original ESCOP Budget Request for minimum level to maintain programs. After the President's Budget was announced, ESCOP prepared an austere budget, to continue programs, but below the minimum to maintain current research levels.

1/To maintain research capacity, but at reduced levels, at State Agricultural Experiment Stations, Eligible 1890 Institutions, and Colleges of Forest Resources, Home Economics and Veterinary Medicine. If not reauthorized, Rural Development research is included in Hatch and Hatch Regional (PL 95-113, Sec. 1463b). Regional research provides an additional peer review system for planning, coordinating and implementing identified research needs that affect more than one state.

2/Restoration of An. Hlth. (Sec. 1433) plus \$5,000,000 from Special Grants (Sec. 1414c) to be administered under Sec. 1433.

3/Rural Development research and Rural Development Centers are included in Hatch (Sec. 1463b), in case they are not reauthorized.

4/Alcohol Fuels research is included under the Energy Research Special Grants (Sec. 1414c) in the President's Budget.

5/The Competitive Grants Program (Sec. 1414b) is not administered by Cooperative Research, so it is not included in the ESCOP budget request. The President's Budget included an increase of \$15 million for this program.

APPENDIX F

RIC REPORT

RIC Met March 20, 1979 in Davis, California. Present at this meeting were D. L. Oldenstadt, J. R. Davis, W. M. Dugger, L. W. Dewhirst, D. E. Herrick, H C Cox, C. I. Harris, J. E. Moak, and guests W. I. Thomas, J. S. Krammes, and L. L. Boyd

1.0 Regional research projects and coordinating committees scheduled to terminate September 30, 1979

W-6 Plant introduction	W-137 Marketing of lamb and mutton
W-67 Water-soil-plant relations	W-138 Herbicide movement in plants
W-68 Soil-water movement	W-139 Bees
W-82 Water quality	W-140 Energy
W-84 Biological pest control	W-141 Government programs
W-131 Mosquito populations	W-146 Re-entry intervals
W-132 Small grains	IR-1 Potato introduction
W-133 Outdoor recreation	IR-5 CRIS
W-134 Nematodes	WRCC-1 Beef cattle breeding
W-135 Stress in food-producing animals	WRCC-13 Seed technology
W-136 Poultry	WRCC-24 Grapes
	WRCC-25 Landscape plants

2.0 Requests for project revisions

2.1 W-6 Introduction, multiplication, maintenance, evaluation and cataloguing of plant germ plasm

A request for a revision of project W-6 entitled "Introduction, multiplication, maintenance, evaluation, cataloguing of plant germplasm" was received from Administrative Advisor W. H. Foote.

RIC recommends the revised project outline in the above entitled area be approved and forwarded to the Committee of Nine, to be effective from October 1, 1979 to September 30, 1984, with Dr. W. H. Foote to continue as Administrative Advisor.

(Action of WDA: APPROVED)

2.2 W-82 Dissipation and degradation of herbicides and related compounds in soil and water systems

A request for a revision of project W-82 entitled "Processes affecting pesticides and other organics in soil and water systems" was received from Administrative Advisor W. R. Furtick.

RIC recommends the revised project outline in the above entitled area be approved and forwarded to the Committee of Nine, to be effective from October 1, 1979 to September 30, 1984, with Dr. W. R. Furtick to continue as Administrative Advisor.

(Action of WDA: APPROVED)

2.3 W-84 Environmental improvement through biological control and pest management

A request for a revision of project W-84 entitled "Establish, improve and evaluate biological control in pest management systems" was received from Administrative Advisor D. W. Bohmont.

RIC recommends the revised project outline in the above entitled area be approved, to be effective from October 1, 1979 to September 30, 1984, with Dr. D. W. Bohmont to continue as Administrative Advisor. Before the project is forwarded to the Committee of Nine, the outline must be modified to document the SEA/AR participation in the procedures section, and FS should be invited to participate.

(Action of WDA: APPROVED)

2.4 W-131 Development of integrated strategies for management of mosquito populations

A request for a revision of project W-131 entitled "Development of integrated strategies for management of mosquito populations" was received from Administrative Advisor C. E. Hess.

RIC recommends the revised project outline in the above entitled area be approved and forwarded to the Committee of Nine, to be effective from October 1, 1979 to September 30, 1984, with Dr. C. E. Hess to continue as Administrative Advisor.

(Action of WDA: APPROVED)

2.5 W-133 Determinants of choice in outdoor recreation

A request for a revision of project W-133 entitled "Outdoor recreation and the public interest: allocating resources among competing uses" was received from Administrative Advisor L. C. Ayres.

RIC recommends the revised project outline not be approved. If the committee wishes to rewrite the outline, RIC would expect the proposal to contain specific information on each state's contribution to the objectives, and the procedures each state will use in pursuing those objectives should be stated.

(Action of WDA: APPROVED)

2.6 W-134 Research, development and use of nematode pest management systems

A request for a revision of project W-134 entitled "Development of the basic parameters for nematode pest management decisions" was received from Administrative Advisor D. E. Schlegel.

RIC recommends the revised project outline not be approved. RIC recognizes this is an important area of research and requests participation in the project be resolicited both within the Western Region and nationally (perhaps through an announcement in the Experiment Station Letter), including participation by SEA/AR. The outline should then be rewritten to reflect each state or agency's contribution to the project objectives and procedures. RIC would be willing to re-evaluate the project at its summer meeting in 1979.

(Action of WDA: APPROVED)

2.7 W-135 Limiting stress of food producing animals to increase efficiency

A request for a revision of project W-135 entitled "Limiting stress of food producing animals to increase efficiency" was received from Administrative Advisors R. D. Plowman and D. J. Matthews.

RIC recommends the revised project outline in the above entitled area be approved and forwarded to the Committee of Nine, to be effective from October 1, 1979 to September 30, 1984, with Drs. R. D. Plowman to continue as lead-Advisor and D. J. Matthews to continue as co-Advisor.

(Action of WDA: APPROVED)

2.8 W-136 Poultry production and environmental quality

A request for a revision of project W-136 entitled "Improving poultry house environments" was received from Administrative Advisor R. E. Moreng.

RIC recommends the revised project outline in the above entitled area be approved and forwarded to the Committee of Nine, to be effective from October 1, 1979 to September 30, 1984, with Dr. R. E. Moreng to continue as Administrative Advisor.

(Action of WDA: APPROVED)

2.9 W-140 Energy in western agriculture--requirements, adjustments and alternatives

A request for a revision of project W-140 entitled "Energy in western agriculture--adjustment alternatives and policy considerations" was received from lead-Administrative Advisor L. L. Sammet.

RIC recommends that the revised project outline not be approved. Instead, RIC recommends that project W-140 be extended for one year, from October 1, 1979 to September 30, 1980, with Drs. L. L. Sammet and M. N. Schroth to continue as lead and co-Advisors, respectively. During that year, the committee should decide whether or not to terminate, request WRCC status, or seek revision. If another revision is sought, RIC requests the outline include specific information on each state or agency's contributions to the project objectives and procedures.

(Action of WDA: APPROVED)

3.0 Requests for establishment of new projects

3.1 W- Soil water properties, spatial variability and implications in soil management

A request for a new project in the above entitled area was received from Administrative Advisor J. R. Davis on behalf of W-68 "Soil water and its management in the field."

RIC recommends the project outline in the above entitled area be approved, to be effective from October 1, 1979 to September 30, 1984, with Dr. J. R. Davis to serve as Administrative Advisor. Before the outline is forwarded to the Committee of Nine, RIC requests that Dr. Claude Phené of SEA/AR be written into the project.

(Action of WDA: APPROVED)

3.2 W- Timber and forage interrelationships in western montane forests

A request for a new project in the above entitled area was received from Administrative Advisor E. H. Zube on behalf of the ad hoc technical committee.

RIC recommends the project outline in the above entitled area be approved and forwarded to the Committee of Nine, to be effective from October 1, 1979 to September 30, 1984, with Dr. E. H. Zube to serve as Administrative Advisor. RIC further requests that this committee maintain coordination with project W-151 "Optimization of the use of range and complementary forages for red meat production," perhaps by the mutual exchange of representatives.

(Action of WDA: APPROVED)

3.3 W- Development of new and improved crops for water conservation in arid lands

A request for a new project in the above entitled area was received from Administrative Advisor L. W. Dewhirst on behalf of WRCC-32 "New and/or improved crops development for water conservation under arid land conditions."

RIC recommends the project outline in the above entitled area be approved, to be effective from October 1, 1979 to September 30, 1984, with Dr. K. J. Lessman to serve as Administrative Advisor. Before the outline is forwarded to the Committee of Nine, RIC requests that Dr. S. M. Dietz of the plant introduction station at Pullman (SEA/AR) be written into the project.

(Action of WDA: APPROVED)

3.4 W- Chalk Brood disease in bees

A request for a new project in the above entitled area was received from Administrative Advisor L. E. Myers and chairman W. P. Stephen, on behalf of W-139 "Maximizing the effectiveness of bees as pollinators of agricultural crops."

RIC recommends the project outline in the above entitled area not be approved. The current cooperative activity is progressing satisfactorily and there is no perceived need for a regional project.

(Action of WDA: APPROVED)

3.5 W- Limitations in crop yield potential as affected by the rhizosphere, soil, and other environmental factors

A request for a new project in the above entitled area was received from Administrative Advisor C. E. Evans on behalf of W-67 "Application of information on water-soil-plant relations to use and conservation of water."

RIC recommends the project outline in the above entitled area be approved and forwarded to the Committee of Nine, to be effective from October 1, 1979 to September 30, 1984, with Dr. C. E. Evans to serve as lead-Advisor and Dr. D. D. Johnson to serve as co-Administrative Advisor.

(Action of WDA: APPROVED)

- 3.6 W- Determination of the causes of and corrections for pH imbalance in grapes for processing

A request for a new project in the above entitled area was received from Administrative Advisor J. M. Lyons on behalf of the ad hoc technical committee.

RIC recommends the project outline in the above entitled area be approved and forwarded to the Committee of Nine, to be effective from October 1, 1979 to September 30, 1984, with Dr. J. M. Lyons to serve as Administrative Advisor.

(Action of WDA: APPROVED)

- 4.0 Request for extension of project

- 4.1 W-138 Herbicidal modification of plant environment and its prediction

A request for a one-year extension of project W-138 was received from Administrative Advisor C. E. Hess. The extension is needed in order to test the phenological model developed by the committee using the data gathered during the 1978 growing season and with information to be gained from this year's weed crop competition studies.

RIC recommends that project W-138 "Herbicidal modification of plant environment and its prediction" be extended for one year, from October 1, 1979 to September 30, 1980, with Dr. C. E. Hess to continue as Administrative Advisor.

(Action of WDA: APPROVED)

- 5.0 Request for establishment of ad hoc technical committee

- 5.1 W- Interrelationships among low intensity land uses, population growth and public lands in western arid environments

A request for the establishment of an ad hoc technical committee to develop a regional project proposal in the above entitled area was received from Dr. L. W. Dewhirst on behalf of some interested scientists in the region.

RIC recommends the request for an ad hoc technical committee be denied. RIC further recommends that WRCC-36 "Interrelationships among low intensity land uses, population growth and public lands in western arid environments" be approved, to be effective from October 1, 1979 to September 30, 1982, with Dr. E. H. Zube to serve as Administrative Advisor. RIC charges the committee to define the regional research possibilities in this subject area, and requests that the committee prepare and submit a formal WRCC petition by May 15, 1979.

(Action of WDA: APPROVED)

- 6.0 Requests for WRCC extensions

- 6.1 WRCC-1 Beef cattle breeding

A request for a three-year extension of WRCC-1 was received from Administrative Advisor J. A. Bennett.

RIC recommends that WRCC-1 "Beef cattle breeding" be extended for three years, from October 1, 1979 to September 30, 1982. Because Dr. Bennett is retiring in 1980, RIC recommends that Dr. B. M. Jones (CO) serve as Administrative Advisor. RIC thanks Dr. Bennett for his service to the Western Directors Association as Administrative Advisor of WRCC-1.

(Action of WDA: APPROVED)

6.2 WRCC-13 Seed production and technology research

A request for a three-year extension of WRCC-13 was received from Administrative Advisor W. F. Keim.

RIC recommends that WRCC-13 "Seed production and technology research" be extended for three years, from October 1, 1979 to September 30, 1982, with Dr. W. F. Keim to continue serving as Administrative Advisor. It is understood that the committee would terminate at such time as a regional project might be activated.

(Action of WDA: APPROVED)

6.3 WRCC-24 Diseases and pests of grape crops

A request for a three-year extension of WRCC-24 was received from Administrative Advisor D. L. McLean.

RIC recommends that WRCC-24 "Diseases and pests of grape crops" be extended for three years, from October 1, 1979 to September 30, 1982, with Dr. D. L. McLean to continue serving as Administrative Advisor.

(Action of WDA: APPROVED)

6.4 WRCC-25 Diseases and pests of landscape plants

A request for a three-year extension of WRCC-25 was received from Administrative Advisor G. A. McIntyre and chairman L. W. Moore.

RIC recommends that WRCC-25 "Diseases and pests of landscape plants" be extended for three years, from October 1, 1979 to September 30, 1982, with Dr. G. A. McIntyre to continue serving as Administrative Advisor. RIC commends the committee on its efforts to recruit nematologists, entomologists and weed scientists and encourages it to continue such efforts.

(Action of WDA: APPROVED)

7.0 Requests for establishment of new WRCC's

7.1 WRCC- Rangelands

A request for establishment of a WRCC entitled "Rangelands" was received from Dr. D. W. Bohmont on behalf of the Western Universities Public Rangelands Coordinating Committee.

Because RIC was unable to determine whether the proposed WRCC would replace the Western Universities Public Rangelands Coordinating Committee or whether it would be a parallel committee, RIC recommends that consideration of this request be tabled until the summer WDA meeting pending clarification from Dr. Bohmont.

(Action of WDA: APPROVED)

7.2 WRCC- Maximizing the effectiveness of bees as pollinators of agricultural crops

A request for the establishment of a WRCC in the above entitled area was received from Administrative Advisor L. E. Myers and chairman W. P. Stephen, on behalf of W-139 "Maximizing the effectiveness of bees as pollinators of agricultural crops."

RIC recommends the establishment of WRCC-37 "Maximizing the effectiveness of bees as pollinators of agricultural crops," to be effective from October 1, 1979 to September 30, 1982, with Mr. L. E. Myers to serve as Administrative Advisor. RIC requests the committee seek participation from other disciplines besides entomology and apiculture. If the committee wishes to pursue objective 3, representatives from horticulture, agronomy and genetics will be needed.

(Action of WDA: APPROVED)

7.3 WRCC- Occupational exposure to pesticides

A request for the establishment of a WRCC in the above entitled area was received from Dr. M. N. Schroth on behalf of W-146 "Worker safety re-entry intervals for pesticide-treated crops."

RIC recommends the establishment of WRCC-38 "Occupational exposure to pesticides," to be effective from October 1, 1979 to September 30, 1982, with Dr. M. N. Schroth to serve as Administrative Advisor. RIC requests the committee circulate the petition throughout the region to solicit wider participation, especially the participation of western region EPA.

(Action of WDA: APPROVED)

7.4 WRCC- Increased efficiency in marketing of lamb and mutton

A request for the establishment of a WRCC in the above entitled area was received from Dr. J. A. Jacobs on behalf of Administrative Advisor A. M. Mullins and W-137 "Increased efficiency in marketing of lamb and mutton."

RIC recommends the establishment of WRCC-39 "Increased efficiency in marketing of lamb and mutton," to be effective from October 1, 1979 to September 30, 1982, with Dr. A. M. Mullins to serve as Administrative Advisor.

(Action of WDA: APPROVED)

8.0 Project and coordinating committee reviews

Projects and committees were assigned to individual members of RIC for review; Administrative Advisors are invited to contact the reviewers (listed in parentheses) for their specific evaluations.

The following projects and coordinating committees appear to be progressing satisfactorily with good publication records, adequate resources, and the technical committees are following project objectives:

W-109 Codling moth population management in the orchard ecosystem (Cox)

If the committee seeks to prepare a revision this year, RIC suggests limiting the focus to pheromones and least disruptive approach to codling moth management is too narrow.

W-110 Relationships and interactions between pathogens, their hosts and attacks by bark insects (Herrick)

If the committee prepares a revision this year, project objectives should be considerably narrowed and participants' contributions to the objectives should be specified.

W-112 Beef cattle and sheep reproduction (Dewhirst)

If the committee prepares a revision this year, the objectives should be more narrowly focussed and an attempt made to bring the disease and physiology aspects more closely together.

W-122 Discovery and control of natural toxicants in the food chain (Harris)

This is a crucial area of research at this time and the committee has made very good progress. RIC suggests that the committee seek some participation by or coordination with the program at the SEA/AR poisonous weeds laboratory.

W-124 Optimum utilization of sewage sludge on agricultural land (Davis)

The committee should outline its accomplishments in greater detail in the annual report. The committee will need participation by parasitologists or pathologists in order to accomplish objective 3 of the outline.

W-125 Soil interpretations and socio-economic criteria for land use planning (Cotner)

W-142 Reproductive efficiency of turkeys (Oldenstadt)

W-143 Nutrient bioavailability--a key to human nutrition (Davis)

In response to Administrative Advisor comments, RIC notes that more than half the western regional projects receive less funding than this project. If the committee prepares a revision this year, it should focus on the key issues in this area of research and include an assessment of the value of the previous accomplishments.

W-144 Development of social competencies in children (Harris)

RIC notes that the committee is progressing satisfactorily now but will probably not accomplish all its objectives due to a slow start.

W-145 Impacts of relative price changes of feeds and cattle on the marketing of U.S. beef (Cotner)

W-150 Genetic improvement of beans for yield, pest resistance and nutritional value (Dugger)

WRCC-20 Virus and virus-like diseases of fruit crops (Dugger)

WRCC-21 Mine waste reclamation on land displaced by coal, oil shale and other mining activities (Herrick)

No reports were available for review on this committee. If RIC has not received the annual minutes and Advisor's evaluation before its summer meeting, RIC will recommend the committee terminate September 30, 1979.

WRCC-23 Clothing and textiles (Oldenstadt)

RIC does not feel it is necessary for the committee to set up a regional project on cost-benefit analysis. RIC encourages the committee to continue to seek to identify researchable problem areas in the clothing and textiles field, including searching for models to identify the social benefits and impacts of this research.

WRCC-26 Evaluating management of predation in relation to domestic animals

RIC encourages the committee to seek some representation from social scientists and preservationists.

WRCC-27 Potato variety development (Oldenstadt)

WRCC-28 Developing, implementing and coordinating research on crop loss appraisals

If project W-134 continues beyond 1980, RIC encourages WRCC-28 to coordinate its activities with W-134.

WRCC-29 Diseases of cereal crops (Davis)

WRCC-30 Western region soil survey (Dewhirst)

WRCC-32 New and/or improved crops development for water conservation under arid land conditions (Cox)

9.0 Administrative Advisor reassignments

RIC recommends the following changes in Administrative Advisor assignments:

W-102 Protection of livestock against internal parasites by management methods - Dr. L. W. Dewhirst replace Dr. C. S. Card as Administrative Advisor

WRCC-23 Clothing and textiles - Dr. L. L. Boyd replace Dr. M. B. Keiser as Administrative Advisor

(Action of WDA: APPROVED)

10.0 Regional research policies

10.1 RIC 2nd and 4th-year review of projects and WRCC's

RIC discussed whether or not to continue 2nd and 4th-year reviews of projects and WRCC's. It was agreed that although it is not possible for RIC to conduct "in-depth" reviews given the limited information available, there is still value in conducting the reviews on a sort of "oversight" basis. However, it is difficult to conduct these reviews at the spring WDA meeting because committee reports are often late in arriving.

RIC recommends that it continue to conduct 2 and 4-year project and WRCC reviews but at the summer rather than the spring meeting of the WDA. As a result, RIC further recommends that the deadline for receipt of annual reports, minutes, and Administrative Advisors' evaluations be changed from February 1 to March 15, to coincide with the SEA/CR deadline. RIC will continue to require that requests for project revisions, extensions, or new projects or WRCC's be received by February 1 in order to allow for RPG reviews of the requests.

(Action of WDA: APPROVED)

10.2 Resources listed in project outlines

There have been problems in trying to ascertain whether or not Directors are aware of the resource commitments scientists list in regional project outlines. As a result, RIC recommends that Administrative Advisors be required to verify with Directors and administrators (either in writing or by telephone) scientists' resources (SY's, PY's and TY's) before submitting project proposals to RIC.

(Action of WDA: APPROVED)

10.3 Solicitation of new participants

RIC recommends that Administrative Advisors be required to circulate all new project proposals or requests for revision or extension to all Western Directors and administrators of USDA agencies in order to provide an opportunity for new participants to join projects.

(Action of WDA: APPROVED)

11.0 Administrative Advisor assignments

See attached pages 11 and 12 for current Advisor assignments.

Administrative Advisor Assignments

Asleson, J.A.	W-148, WRCC-21
Ayres, L. C.	W-133
Bohmont, D. W.	W-84
Boyd, L. L.	WRCC-23
*Brooks, S. N.	W-126
Burris, M. J.	W-112
*Chace, W. G.	W-150
Clark, C. E.	W-122
*Cox, H C	WRCC-34 ⁺
Davis, J. R.	W-68, W-128, W- Soil water properties
**Davison, A. (WA)	WRCC-34 ⁺
Dewhirst, L. W.	W-102, W-139 ⁺ , W-151, WRCC-32
**Dobson, R. C. (ID)	WRCC-34 ⁺
Dugger, W. M.	W-152 ⁺ , IR-4
*Evans, C. E.	W-67, W- Limitations in crop yield potential
Foote, W. H.	W-6, W-132, IR-1
Furtick, W. R.	W-82, WRCC-28
**Gardner, B. D. (CA)	W-149
**Gilmour, C. M. (ID)	W-147
Gledhill, V. H.	W-141
Heady, H. F.	W-110
Hess, C. E.	W-131, W-138
Johnson, D. D.	W-67 ⁺ , WRCC-33, W- ⁺ Limitations in crop yield potential
**Jones, B. M. (CO)	WRCC-1
Jordan, J. P.	IR-5
**Keim, W. F. (CO)	WRCC-13
Kendrick, J. B.	W-149 ⁺
Lee, D. J.	W-45, IR-2
Lessman, K. J.	IR-6, W- New and improved crops
Lyons, J. M.	W-127, W-130, W- pH imbalance in grapes
Matthews, D. J.	W-135 ⁺ , WRCC-26
McHugh, H. F.	W-143, W-153
**McIntyre, G. A. (CO)	WRCC-25

* USDA research administrators

** Other

+ Designates the Co-Administrative Advisor in a project with Co-Advisors

Personnel Assignments (continued):

**McLean, D. L. (CA)	WRCC-24
Miller, R. J.	W-106, W-124, W-147 ⁺ , WRCC-34
Moreng, R. E.	W-136, W-142
**Moss, D. N. (OR)	WRCC-27
Mullins, A. M.	W-137, W-145, WRCC-39
*Myers, L. E.	W-139, WRCC-37
Oldenstadt, D. L.	W-118, W-126 ⁺
*Plowman, R. D.	W-135, W-151 ⁺
Rice, R. R.	W-144, WRCC-35
Robins, J. S.	W-109
Sammet, L. L.	W-140
**Schafer, J. F. (WA)	WRCC-20, WRCC-29
Schlegel, D. E.	W-134
Schroth, M. N.	W-140 ⁺ , W-146, W-150 ⁺ , WRCC-38
**Smith, O. E. (WA)	WRCC-17
**Upchurch, R. P. (AZ)	WRCC-11
*van Schilfgaarde, J.	W-152
Young, R. A.	W-125, WRCC-30
Zube, E. H.	WRCC-36, W- Timber and forage interrelationships

* USDA research administrators

** Other

+ Designates the Co-Administrative Advisor in a project with Co-Advisors

SUMMARY REPORT

ON A

SYMPOSIUM ON EVALUATION OF AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND EXTENSION

University of Idaho, Moscow, May 21-23, 1978^{1/}Purpose of Symposium

To bring together and evaluate state-of-knowledge on methodology for quantifying and evaluating results of agricultural research and extension.

Executive Summary

- . Bottom line: Meaningful estimates of research costs and benefits as basis for allocating research resources are not yet possible. But work is underway that should provide helpful tools.
- . Studies of past research show rates of return from 20 percent to well over 100 percent. The methodology used is open to question in some cases.
- . Growth in agricultural productivity is leveling off (from 24 percent growth in 1950's to 11 percent in 1960's and probably still lower in 1970's). Reasons not clear. May be approaching biological limits in some areas, but shifts in social goals and leveling off of expenditures for agricultural research are probably the major causes.
- . Research and extension have had little impact on agricultural policy or resource allocation--probably because of focus on biological aspects of issues that are decided, primarily, on a socioeconomic basis.
- . Past agricultural research has resulted in high productivity per man-day but has had less effect on productivity per unit of land. Future emphasis must be on the latter. Need to develop grains, for example, that will respond to heavier fertilization and other intensive culture practices.

^{1/}Based on notes taken by David E. Herrick during the Symposium. A full proceedings will be available later.

G-62

- . Research has led to major shifts in agricultural productivity among Regions. For example, gains in the South, due to heavy research investments since WW II, have put economic pressure on the Midwest.
- . Agricultural research has been a major benefit to consumers; minor benefit to producers. This could change if foreign markets expand.
- . Average time lag between completion of agricultural research and peak level of application of results is 7 years. At the end of 13 years the information (or technique) is largely obsolete.
- . Recent studies indicate that agricultural research has not reached point of diminishing marginal productivity.
- . Major need to develop ways to assess values of noncommodity outputs of alternative agricultural practices.
- . Some key people dealing with research and extension evaluation are:

Walter Fishel, USDA-SEA
 A. A. Araj, University of Idaho
 Hans Binswanger, Yale
 Robert Evenson, Yale
 Joseph Havlicek, VPI
 Vernon Ruttan, University of Minnesota
 Robert Manthy, Michigan State University

Selected Highlights from Individual Presentations^{2/}

Trends in agricultural productivity

Growth in agricultural productivity is leveling off. Reasons are unclear but may have important implications regarding future of research and extension.

Agricultural productivity increased 24 percent in 1950's, then dropped to 11 percent during 1960's. May be because we are approaching biological limit--or may be largely due to leveling off of research effort (Federally supported research now accounts for about 2 percent of the Federal agricultural budget) or shift in social goals (e.g. increased costs and constraints imposed by environmental goals) or a combination of these and other factors.

It is obvious that the amount and quality of water available in many areas is an increasingly important factor.

^{2/}List of symposium speakers is attached.

Trends in agricultural research and extension

Fact finding and educational roles have been effectively handled in general. Several important needed shifts are now underway--especially move toward interdisciplinary and systems approach to problem solving.

Major apparent weakness is the lack of clear goals and a complete, integrated plan (full holistic approach) for our program of agricultural research and extension. This plan, and study selections within it, should be based on an economic analysis of alternatives.

Our current program priorities, and study selections, are too often a result of missionary zeal of individuals. As a result, too much of our research is focused on questions that are too narrow. Typically we are heavy on answers to the biological side of an issue and essentially illiterate on the socio-economic side.

Agricultural research and investment in the U.S. has focused on mechanical efficiency. As a result agricultural output per worker is high in the U.S., far exceeding any other country, but our output per unit of land is low. From now on our potential for increased production will be through biological improvement rather than mechanical improvement. Will need to develop grains, for example, that will respond more to intensive culture including heavier fertilization. Must move rapidly to avoid severe food shortages. Opportunity is there for major gains, but we continue to encourage mechanical development by subsidizing investments in machinery (e.g. high depreciation rates). This has slowed needed shift to more intensive agriculture.

Although many decisions are now made on the basis of perceived values of non-commodity products, our current methods of analysis are not dealing with them adequately, and too often, not at all.

Evaluation of research and extension

Public expenditures for agricultural research and extension in the U.S. exceeds \$1 billion annually. Private sector expenditures equal or exceed this amount. Administrators and the public are increasingly demanding means of assessing the outputs of this major investment.

For evaluation purposes, research can be treated as an economic activity:

- . Research is probabilistic. This uncertainty of output has a major influence on its economic impact.
- . Research output is subject to obsolescence. The impact of a given piece of agricultural research lasts, on the average, about 13 years. Hence, maintenance investments are required.
- . Like other economic activity, research and extension are subject to diminishing marginal productivity. That is, at some point an additional dollar will not increase output as much as did the last previous dollar. (Studies indicate that this point has not been reached in agricultural research).

- There is a time lag between investments in research and the application of the new knowledge or technology developed. Average lag time for applications of agricultural research (between investment and peak level of application) is about 7 years--by 13 years after the new knowledge or technology became available it is largely obsolete. (Both time periods are broad averages and differ substantially by subject matter and type of research involved.)
- The rate of adoption of new knowledge, and maintenance of effectiveness of its application, is significantly affected by level of investment in extension.

Several evaluation approaches based on these premises have been developed and used. For example, the Iowa Experiment Station used an economic approach to evaluate research alternatives in terms of their contribution to State and National goals. Research allocations were then made to maximize returns in terms of these goals. The goals set were growth, security and equity. Interdisciplinary teams estimated, for alternative programs, probable degree of success, anticipated potential cost savings and/or productivity increases resulting from the research, degree and rate of adoption of results, rate of obsolescence, schedule of research and extension costs, etc.

The Minnesota Agricultural Experiment Station uses a computer-based model (MARRIS) as an aid in evaluating research alternatives. The model is used to estimate benefit-cost ratios and internal rates of return. Selection between projects is then left to the decision maker.

Results of evaluations of several specific projects show internal rates of return for agricultural research (dealing with a wide array of commodities from grain through sugar cane, poultry and livestock) ranging mainly from 20 percent to more than 100 percent. Several weaknesses of these studies were discussed, including lack of treatment of costs of labor displacement due to resulting shifts in farming practices; investment costs of implementing the research; effect on international trade, etc. The limited usefulness of knowledge about the cost effectiveness of past studies for planning and justifying future research was also discussed.

Time factor in evaluating research is a major problem. Some of the most important scientific contributions have taken many years, with little apparent production along the way. An example is Cambridge economist Marshall, who spent 10 years on what turned out to be a milestone book. Must avoid too much emphasis on short term payoffs.

Final conclusion was to the effect that meaningful estimations of research costs and benefits as a basis for allocating research resources is not yet possible.

Who benefits from agricultural research and extension?

When demand for a product is elastic (when more will be bought if price is lowered) research tends to benefit the producer. When demand for a

product is inelastic (which tends to be the case with most agricultural products) research tends to benefit the consumer. As a result, agricultural research in the U.S. has benefited the consumer in a major way, and has benefited the farmer relatively little.

Regional shifts in agricultural productivity closely correlate with shifts in research expenditure. Increased productivity in the South following WW II for example, resulted in greatly increased productivity there. This put economic pressure on other regions--especially the midwest. Current productivity levels differ widely among states, ranging from a low of .87 for Oregon and West Virginia (based 1949-50=100) through 1.02-1.10 for Iowa, Missouri and Illinois, to 1.34 and 1.35 for Florida and Arizona. Reasons for the differences are not fully clear. An analysis might provide helpful information on the effectiveness of various research and extension activities.

Logically, research and extension should contribute in a major way to policy development and resource allocation decisions but, in fact, have had modest if any significant effect. Apparently this is due to our preoccupation with the biological aspects of issues and lack of attention to the socioeconomic aspects.

General

Past evaluations of research and extension effectiveness have been based, primarily, on secondary data. As a result there has been a severe credibility problem with many of the studies. We badly need evaluations, or at least validation studies, based on primary data.

So the basic questions remain: How much research and extension do we need? Why? We must develop better, rational answers to these questions. The SEA initiative to establish a "Research Review and Evaluation Group" to focus on determining the impacts and value of research programs could be an important step in the right direction.

It is clear that we cannot separate the benefits of research and extension. Each depends on the other.

G-66

Symposium Staff

Tom Adams, Staff Person, House Agricultural Committee

A. A. Araji, Professor, Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Idaho, and Member, Interim Research Evaluation Committee (ESCOP)

Hans Binswanger, Professor, Department of Economics, Economic Growth Center, Yale University

George Browning, Regional Director, North Central Agricultural Experiment Station Directors

Mark Buchanan, Director at Large, Western Agricultural Experiment Station Directors

Lucas Calpouzos, Professor and Head, Department of Plant and Soil Sciences, University of Idaho

Ruth Deacon, Professor and Dean, College of Home Economics, Iowa State University, and Member, Interim Research Evaluation Committee (ESCOP)

Howard Diesslin, Director, Cooperative Extension Service, Purdue University and Chairman, Extension Committee on Policy (ECOP)

Robert Evenson, Professor, Department of Economics, Economic Growth Center, Yale University

Robert Firch, Professor, Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Arizona

Walter Fishel, Staff Officer, USDA-SEA

Bob Frary, Director, Cooperative Extension Service, University of Wyoming

Richard Gardner, Research Associate, Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Idaho

Joseph Havlicek, Professor, Department of Agricultural Economics, Virginia Polytechnic Institute, and Chairman, Interim Research Evaluation Committee (ESCOP)

Jim Hildreth, Director, Farm Foundation, and President, American Agricultural Economics Association

Wallace Huffman, Assistant Professor, Department of Economics, Iowa State University

Robert Huttan, USDA-SEA (Research)

Dean Jansma, Professor, Department of Agricultural Economics, Pennsylvania State University, and Member, Interim Research Evaluation Committee (ESCOP)

Symposium Staff (continued)

Robert Manthy, Professor, Department of Forest Economics, Michigan State University, and Member, Interim Research Evaluation Committee (ESCOP)

R. J. Miller, Director, Idaho Agricultural Experiment Station, and Chairman, Western Directors of Agricultural Experiment Station

M. L. Peterson, Professor, Department of Agronomy, University of California, Davis

Vernon Ruttan, Professor, Department of Agriculture and Applied Economics, University of Minnesota

Andrew Schmitz, Professor, Department of Agricultural Economics, University of California, Berkeley

Jerome Siebert, Associate Director, Cooperative Extension Service, University of California, Berkeley

Robert Sim, Research Associate, Department of Agricultural Economics, University of Idaho

Don underman, Affiliate Professor, USDA, University of Idaho Research and Extension Center, Aberdeen

Irving Tallman, Professor and Chairman, Department of Sociology, Washington State University

Richard Walsh, Professor, Department of Economics, Colorado State University

William Wood, Cooperative Extension Service, University of California, Riverside

WEEKLY HIGHLIGHTS OF ACTIVITIES OF
 MARK T. BUCHANAN, WDAL
 August 14, 1978 - March 1, 1979

<u>Week</u>	<u>Activities</u>
Aug. 14-18, 1978	In Washington, D.C.: IPA selection process, JMN and staff Animal Health Science Research Advisory Board RICOP Executive Comm. CRIS Advisory Comm. In St. Louis, MO: ESCOP
Aug. 21-25, 1978	In Washington, D.C.: Meeting with Dr. Bertrand Assistance on Joint Council Annual Report, structure and outline Meeting with Buckman on plans for NRPC Selection panel for SEA/CR Deputy Director Discussion with representatives of SEA/E et al on possible revised program structure
Aug. 28 - Sept. 1, 1978	In Washington, D.C.: Selection panel for Head, Evaluation and Impact Staff Prepare letter for President, NASULGC on exclusion of Hatch and Smith-Lever funds from requirements of grants and contracts for services More on Joint Council report Revise IR-6 for nth time and call Ray Miller
Sept. 4-8, 1978	In Washington, D.C.: JMN on staff role for IR-6 and JPE--policy neutral, policy guided, or policy supportive? Facilities Study Work Group McCracken on possible organization of JPE (states' involvement) Report to Div. of Agriculture Executive Comm.
Sept. 11-16, 1978	In Washington, D.C.: Meeting with Dr. Bertrand Meeting with Joint Council Executive Comm. (on structure and outline of Annual Report) Edited "Administrators Panel" from Moscow Seminar on Cost-Benefit Analysis Met with BARR Executive Comm. on major issues
Sept. 18-22, 1978	In Washington, D.C.: Meeting with JMN and C. Beer on preparation of Annual Report for Joint Council Introduction to PLATO Meeting with Goldschmidt at U.C. office re space
Sept. 25-30, 1978	In Washington, D.C.: Host to Peairs and Doris Wilson Physical Facilities Work Group meeting Beltsville--Technical Information Services, Denver Library NRPC meeting

6.0 DAL REPORT

-4-

<u>Week</u>	<u>Activities</u>
Oct. 2-6, 1978	In Washington, D.C.: Budget discussion with Louis Wise Prepare NRPC report for the Joint Council
Oct. 9-13, 1978	In Washington, D.C.: ESCOP NISARC ESCOP Legislative Subcommittee Joint Council Annual Report - achievements and priorities Report to Joint Council Executive Comm.
Oct. 16-21, 1978	In Beltsville, MD: TIS - electronic mail system In Washington, D.C.: Flowers to J. Halpin and Secretary for continuing as Secretary of NISARC
Oct. 23-27, 1978	In Washington, D.C.: Meeting with Dr. Bertrand In Columbus, OH: ARI
Oct. 30-Nov. 3, 1978	In Washington, D.C.: Meeting with T. Kinney, fellow Co-chairman of CRIS Policy Comm. Hosted Eleanor Reilly, California SAES Business Officers Conference
Nov. 6-10, 1978	In Washington, D.C.: Joint Council Annual Report - achievements Tropical Agriculture, Sec. 406 Left for St. Louis
Nov. 12-17, 1978	In St. Louis, MO: Land Grant and associated meetings of ESCOP, Legislative, WDA Executive Comm., etc.
Nov. 20-25, 1978	In Fredricksburg, VA: Address SEA/CR Workshop In Washington, D.C.: DAL meeting
Nov. 27-Dec. 1, 1978	In Washington, D.C.: Meet with Study Groups for Directors' Intentions on use of formula funds and Physical Facilities Check with Buckman et al for NRPC guidelines Meet with Dr. Bertrand and Ray Miller
Dec. 4-8, 1978	In Washington, D.C.: Substitute for Pat Jordan, meeting of Div. of Agriculture and E.A. Jaenke and Associates Attend first meeting of Users Advisory Board
Dec. 11-15, 1978	In Washington, D.C.: PRC Exchange meeting Tropical Agriculture meeting annual leave

<u>Week</u>	<u>Activities</u>
Dec. 18-22, 1978	In Washington, D.C.: Emergency sessions re Molly Frantz's objections to Physical Facilities forms Discussion (telephone primarily) re Jaenke and Assoc.
Dec. 27-29, 1978	In Washington, D.C.: Pat Jordan in town
Jan. 2-5, 1979	In Washington, D.C.: Moved into new office at 1750 K Street
Jan. 8-12, 1979	In Washington, D.C.: DAL meeting Report to Joint Council for Physical Facilities Work Group
Jan. 15-19, 1979	In Washington, D.C.: Tropical Agriculture meeting John Myers re CRIS data for NRPC PRC Exchange
Jan. 22-26, 1979	In Washington, D.C.: DAL meeting Meeting with Dr. Bertrand Meeting with Liska, Thomas et al re FY 1981 budget In San Diego, CA: Cotton Council Research Committee
Jan. 29-Feb. 2, 1979	In San Francisco, CA: National Assoc. of Wheat Growers Research Comm. In Washington, D.C.: Research Facilities Study Work Group Pat Jordan here
Feb. 5-9, 1979	In Washington, D.C.: ISEC - PRC Exchange J. Nielson and J. Hildreth, "how it all fits together?"
Feb. 12-17, 1979	In Washington, D.C.: ESCOP Interim and ESCOP Legislative Subcommittees NISARC DAL Regional Chairmen
Feb. 19-23, 1979	In Washington, D.C.: The Great Snowstorm of 1979 Users Advisory Board (pre-education) Tropical Agriculture Meeting with Bertrand Meeting with Thomas
Feb. 26 - March 1, 1979	In Washington, D.C.: Meeting with Molly Frantz re CRIS ISEC - PRC Exchange Preparation for WDA meeting



