

Gillmoak

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

Atlanta, Georgia

November 19, 1980

WESTERN ASSOCIATION
OF AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION DIRECTORS

MINUTES OF FALL 1980 MEETING

November 19, 1980
Peachtree Plaza Hotel
Atlanta, Georgia

ATTENDANCE:

Alaska	- J. V. Drew
Arizona	- L. W. Dewhirst
California	- J. B. Kendrick, Jr.
	- D. E. Schlegel
	- L. L. Sammet
Colorado	- D. D. Johnson
	- H. F. McHugh
	- J. P. Jordan
Guam	- R. Muniappan
Hawaii	-
Idaho	- R. J. Miller
Montana	- J. R. Welsh
Nevada	- R. A. Young
	- D. W. Bohmont
New Mexico	-
Oregon	- R. E. Witters
Utah	- D. J. Matthews
Washington	- L. L. Boyd
Wyoming	- C. C. Kaltenbach
OWDAL	- M. T. Buchanan
SEA-CR	- E. C. Miller
IR-6	- B. R. Eddleman
ESCOP	- C. O. Little

Call to Order

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Johnson at 8:10 a.m.

Minutes

Minutes of the previous meeting were not yet available thus will be considered at the Spring Meeting, 1981.

DAL Report

See attachment entitled "Notes From Washington" Volume 1, Number 12, dated Nov. 4, 1980 including Enclosure 1 and Enclosure 2.

Proposed Changes in DAL Office

Committee of four to evaluate DAL suggested he look for new office (to save money). Dal has tried to obtain office space on University of Maryland campus. None is available. Space is available in Beltsville with SEA-AR. Alternatives are:

1. Stay in current office--convenient but expensive;
2. Move to Beltsville with SEA-AR--not convenient, close association with AR may not be desirable--cheap, access to telecopiers.
3. South Building--desirable, but not likely to obtain space

This matter will be subject to further investigation and evaluation. Dr. Oran Little complimented WDA for supporting DAL in Washington D.C.

National ^{Research} Planning Committee

Elmer Clark and Mark Buchanan were appointed to NRC. Next meeting is scheduled December 2, 1980.

IR-6

Dr. Bobby Eddleman announced that a letter is coming asking for names of scientists who can project effects of new technologies on productivity.

Joint Council

Dr. J. P. Jordan discussed position statement on Farm Mechanization which proposes that society has an obligation to retrain displaced persons but that we must not cease research on mechanization. Consensus is that WDA agrees with this concept.

SEA-CR Report (See attached report by W. I. Thomas)

Dr. E. C. Miller discussed budgets and SEA-CR staffing. He announced that the new Hatch manual will be available soon (November 28). Of major concern is OMB's expectation that indirect costs be paid. Consensus was that true cooperative agreements should be excluded but not others. It is logical that different rates might be established depending on "degree of cooperation". It was suggested that civil rights legislation should be administered by the Department of Labor to avoid double accounting.

Committee of Nine

See attached report.

W-6 Resolution on Fee For Service

Viewpoint of the West is different from that of other Regions. Committee of nine will have a report by May 1981.

Travel Costs

An effort should be made to schedule meetings at locations and times to take advantage of reduced air fare rates (travel on Saturday, for example). WDA will ask RIC to make an analysis of dates, locations and number of meetings.

ESCOPE

Concern was expressed relative to each state providing two people for service on CARET Council. R. J. Miller stated that the plan is being changed to request only one. A new letter is being drafted.

ESCOPE Legislative Subcommittee

Selected people from states will be asked to go to Washington D.C. to assist in the budget process.

RIC

Items under consideration include regional project on asparagus pests, IR-6 and publication policies. Recommendations will be forthcoming at Spring meeting.

Western Regional Council

The council has held two meetings. H. C. Cox was elected chairman for another term.

Western Research Committee

WRC has requested RPG's to get their priorities in by mid January.

Funding of Western Rural Development Center

Extension Directors are not willing to put in their share. Consensus of opinion of WDA was that if Title V funding is not continued, the center be discontinued. This matter will be reconsidered at Spring meeting.

Future Meetings

Spring 1981 - Joint meeting with Extension Directors in Oakland, April 1-3, 1981. November 1981 meeting at Land Grant Meeting - no decision; will reconsider at Spring meeting. Summer 1982 - Alaska July 26-28.

Resolution

WHEREAS, Dr. Claude Burton Hutchison died in Berkeley, California, on August 25, 1980, and

WHEREAS, Dr. Hutchison devoted his life to the cause of agriculture in the United States, the Western Region, and the State of California, in his capacities as Dean of the College of Agriculture, Director of the Agricultural Experiment Station, Director of the Giannini Foundation of Agricultural Economics, and Vice President of the University of California, and Dean of the College of Agriculture, University of Nevada, and

Whereas, Dr. Hutchison was responsible for furthering the careers of many outstanding agricultural scientists now scattered throughout the United States,

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, that the Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors extends its sincere sympathy to his wife Brenda and his children and grandchildren.

Passed unanimously.

Title XIV

Mark Buchanan discussed Betty Hawthorne's request that Title XIV carry a Home Economics sub-title of \$100,000 per institution. ESCOP voted negative. CAHA recommended against putting in a specific amount or specific fields. Consensus of WDA was same as that of CAHA.

Regional Project on Food Processing

Dr. Kaltenback announced that more participants are needed.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 10:19 a.m.

Western Agricultural Experiment Station Director's Association

Committee of Nine Report

November 19, 1980

C. E. Clark
D. L. Oldenstadt

A minor change has been adopted by the Committee of Nine in the deadline for receiving proposals for Regional Projects: "Signed project proposals must be received in the Regional Research Office, SEA-CR, at least three weeks prior to Committee of Nine Meeting." Formerly, the policy called for proposals to be mailed to SEA-CR three weeks ahead of the meeting. This provided insufficient time to process and review the proposals.

Committee of Nine is concerned over missing reports, participation, and funding of W-156, Timber and Forage Interrelationships in Western Montane Forests. Only one station listed funding for FY 1980 and the tentative allotment schedule for 1981 showed no improvement.

The importance of travel to technical committee meetings by participating scientists was emphasized. Attendance at these meetings is important to effectively participate in joint regional projects. The intent is that some of the Regional Research funds (RRF) be made available for such travel. The Committee of Nine endorses the principle that travel to technical committee meetings should be exempt from travel restrictions which may be imposed on "State" funds.

Committee of Nine recommended approval for RRF funding of all proposals submitted from the Western Region.

Committee of Nine members from the Western Region suggest that the Director's Association strengthen the position of its representatives on the various regional and national committees. Or, perhaps such assignments could be better coordinated if assigned to members of the Association's Executive Committee. Direct confrontation by the Association to national committees on concerns over policies or actions taken by the committees, without working through designated representatives can result in embarrassment to the Association and to individuals.

November 4, 1980

Volume 1, Number 12

1. ISEC Scientific Exchange Committee. The committee met October 31 to review a list of proposals for exchanges with China for 1981. Roger Neetz also explained his intentions to ask the committee to fill an expanded role in the future. This would include informing interested parties of opportunities through OICD for participation not only in the China program but in other programs as well. For example, there is a move toward resumption of former country/institutional ties for U.S. universities. There likely will be other programs and countries involved in activities organized and funded under OICD. Neetz says OICD wants to work toward an "open" system in which representatives of all institutions will have information and opportunity to make proposals, provide participants, etc.

As you will recall, ISEC, like ARPAC, was created under a Memorandum of Understanding between the Secretary, USDA and the President of NASULGC. Unlike ARPAC, ISEC is still in business. OICD is the agency within USDA that has been given the major responsibility under Secretary Bergland to handle USDA's role under ISEC; OICD also handles other programs in the international arena.

It appears there have evolved as many as three separate lines of communication with and within Land-Grant Universities: (1) Title XII representatives; (2) Directors of International Programs; and (3) Deans of agricultural programs. One reason for adding SAES representation to the ISEC Scientific Exchange Committee was to be sure the communications link is closed to the Experiment Stations and their staffs (which include most of the scientists who are/would be involved).

OICD also plans to call on the ISEC subcommittee several times a year for assistance in program planning and for other purposes.

Exchanges with China, 1981

The committee agreed to recommend the following exchanges for 1981:

- Agricultural machinery and its utilization
- Food policy and nutrition
- Water use and management
- Soil management
- Maintenance of productivity on heavily cropped areas-prevention of erosion
- Forest genetics and tree improvement
- Hardy wood plants
- Integrated pest management (forestry)
- Forest education
- Biological control of insect pests by entomophagous microorganisms

Biological control of soybean insects (already underway)
Survey and taxonomic study of natural enemies (follow-up)
Root rot nematode, nematology generally

These proposals were among a much longer list, mostly from specific individuals/institutions/agencies and from the Chinese. They will be reviewed in a meeting to be held in late November among Dale Hathaway and his counterpart from China. My understanding is that the ones finally chosen will be opened up to rewrites, to other institutions etc. For 1982, it is intended that the process be more open still.

2. Animal Agriculture, Research to meet Human Needs in the 21st Century. The first meeting of the Animal Agriculture Research Task Force was held here in Washington, D.C. on October 30. The Task Force is a follow-on from the Conference on Animal Agriculture, Research to meet Human Needs in the 21st Century. A multidisciplinary approach is proposed to the high priority problems identified. The task force seeks additional publicity, interest and funding. A list of task force members is enclosed. (Enclosure 1)

3. Family Farms, Farm Families. A draft report has been prepared by the ESCOP subcommittee. I have sent copies for review and comments to the WDAL committee.

The draft report deals with the underlying causes of the trend to "bigness" in agriculture (and elsewhere in the economy). It contains recommendations, one of which is added emphasis on policy research. Only strong policy action will reverse the trend to bigness - and there are important trade-offs that must be considered carefully. Better policy decisions might be made with improved understanding of the alternatives and probable consequences.

The report deals with the issue of small and moderate-size farms. It should be helpful as further consideration is given to HR 6295, Family Farm Development Act of 1980 and related legislation that deals with symptoms, not causes. It could have a substantial impact on the revision of Title XIV.

The completed report should be available by the end of the year. It will be about 50 pages long; it will contain much of interest to you, in my opinion. I'll see that each of you gets a copy of it.

4. SEA-COPs Session. A meeting on the FY 1983 budget was held on November 6. Present were Bertrand, McCracken and other representatives of SEA, representatives of ESCOP, ECOP, and RICOP and Dale Stansbury of NASULCG. My interpretation of what went on at this meeting follows:

Agenda items included:

- o Review by SEA of FY 1982 procedures and proposals, preliminary thinking regarding FY 1983

- ① Approaches for reaching earlier consensus on areas of emphasis
- ① Approaches for strengthening participation by cooperators
- ① Dates and purposes of future meetings

Bertrand stated that the process for 1983 would build upon that of last year unless or until there are instructions to the contrary from the new administration. This means an integrated, programmatic budget prepared in keeping with the current administration's interpretation of ZBB processes. Each program would encompass research, extension, higher education and other components; each would specify the funding mechanisms and amount(s) proposed under each mechanism.

McCracken explained and discussion further illuminated the current process. It includes several steps. The first of these is the determination of areas of emphasis (e.g. IPM). These may cut across RP, Decision Unit and other program structure elements. Once areas of emphasis are identified ("first cut") staff prepares a description for each; the base program for each is calculated (from CRIS); and beginnings are made toward statements of justification. Later, after decisions regarding areas of emphasis are firmed up "Special Analysis" teams are assigned to each area of emphasis further to describe and to justify the program and to propose increases - by performing unit and by funding mechanism within policy guidelines established by management. The reports of the special analysis teams as finally amended and accepted by management move forward with the budget documents as a "shadow budget". They add to understanding of the budget proposals.

Meanwhile, Decision Unit teams are at work within the established, ZBB process. They deal with minimum, base and incremental levels; they subdivide the decision units into decision packages. Within each, requirements are listed for support of on-going programs and for support of increases and new starts. Ultimately, of course, and after management decisions, the aggregation of these ZBB elements and the "shadow budget" must coincide. Each is a differing view of the same set of conclusions within the parameters specified.

The areas of emphasis achieve especial importance because these become the driving force for redirection and for increases within the overall budget. They represent priorities. They, of course, influence the final outcome of the ZBB process. But, so do the recommendations of the DU teams. Management must make decisions and reconcile the two approaches..

Cooperation - There was agreement that for FY 1983 there should be more emphasis on cooperation and less on competition. Some policy and procedural steps were agreed on:

- 1.) The COPs Legislative/Budget Committee Chairmen will become active participants in the SEA budget process until the time of SEA management decisions regarding specific dollar amounts.
- 2.) The COPs representatives will supply SEA with their proposed areas of emphasis immediately following Land Grant.
- 3.) SEA will meld these with their own and send to the COPs representatives a suggested list of areas of emphasis for review prior to another meeting to be held December 16 and 17.

NOTES FROM WASHINGTON

November 4, 1980

Page four

- 4.) COPs representatives will provide names of persons they may recommend to participate in DU and Special Analysis activities. State-side participants in these activities would be on IPA appointments without dollar commitments. The States would pay the salary costs involved and, if necessary other costs as well.
- 5.) SEA managers again will develop strategy, set caps and share with COPs representatives prior to a meeting to be held soon after the Executive Budget (for FY 1982) is announced. The second meeting dates will be set at the December meeting - probably for February 3-4, 1981.
- 6.) SEA unit staffs and SEA teams will proceed with descriptions, justifications, base program assessments, etc. For each group that is agreed to include state-side participants efforts will be made by SEA-resident staff to do work and prepare documentation and develop group meeting arrangements that will permit maximum state-side input with minimum travel and stay in the Washington, D.C. area. (Summary documentation could be sent in advance by telecopier, for example. Full documentation could be available a day or so in advance of scheduled meetings so state-side folks could have time to study the issues and be briefed by colleagues prior to the beginning of scheduled sessions.)
- 7.) The materials finalized under item 6 would become available to the SEA management team and to COPs representatives for study in advance of a meeting to establish 1st round decisions by SEA managers. Following a day or two for reading the documentation SEA managers and COPs representatives would meet together about May 1, 1981, to discuss the materials, issues, alternatives and strategies. Following this joint session SEA managers would make their 1st round decisions.

Supplemental decisions:

- 1.) The COPs representatives would work together toward identification of areas of common concern and proceed toward combined proposals to SEA. (e.g. IPM).
 - 2.) The COPs representatives will prepare and submit to SEA for review in advance of the December meeting a proposed statement concerning the roles of cooperator participants.
 - 3.) To the extent feasible, ESS, FS, OICD, Office of Transportation and other units of USDA that perform/finance research would be included in the process, especially by the States, either directly or indirectly via SEA.
 - 4.) Attempts would be made by both sides to improve knowledge and understanding of areas of disagreement as well as of agreement (and of actions engendered thereby).
5. COPs Representatives Meeting with OMB, November 6, 1980. Dale Stansbury arranged for the first OMB hearing to be held during the time frame of parti-

NOTES FROM WASHINGTON

November 4, 1980

Page five

Participants' attendance at the meeting with SEA (item 5). The meeting with OMB began as scheduled at 3:00 p.m. on November 6. Ray Miller may report further on this session which was influenced considerably by the outcome of the election, November 4.

6. My Section Report for DALs. A copy is enclosed. (Enclosure 2)

ANIMAL AGRICULTURE: RESEARCH TO MEET HUMAN NEEDS IN THE 21st CENTURY

Task Force

Dr. David P. Anderson, Dean
College of Veterinary Medicine
University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30601
404-542-3461

Dr. Robert W. Bray, Assoc. Dean
College of Agr. and Life Sciences
136 Ag. Hall
University of Wisconsin
Madison, WI 53706
608-262-2397

Dr. Hank A. Fitzhugh
Director of Research
Winrock International Livestock
Research & Training Center
Morrilton, AR 72110
501-727-5435

Dr. Harold D. Hafs, Chairman
Dept. of Dairy Science
Michigan State University
East Lansing, MI 48824
517-355-8434

Dr. Richard E. Hagen
National Food Processors
1133 20th St., N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20036
202-331-5958

Dr. Virgil W. Hays, Chairman
Dept. of Animal Sciences
University of Kentucky
Lexington, KY 40506
606-258-2686

Dr. Norge W. Jerome
Dept. of Community Health
University of Kansas Medical Center
Kansas City, KS 66103
913-588-7357

Dr. David J. Meisinger
National Pork Producers
Box 10383
Des Moines, IA 50306
515-223-2600

Dr. Charles F. Parker
Dept. of Animal Science
Ohio Agr. Research & Dev. Center
Wooster, OH 44691
216-264-1021

Dr. Rodney L. Preston, Chairman
Animal Sciences Dept.
Washington State University
Pullman, WA 99164
509-335-5523

Dr. Keith E. Rinehart
Fieldale Corporation
P. O. Box 558
Baldwin, GA 30511
404-778-5100

Dr. Elwood W. Speckmann
National Dairy Council
6300 N. River Rd.
Rosemont, IL 60018
312-696-1020

Dr. William J. Stadelman
Animal Science Dept.
Purdue University
W. Lafayette, IN 47907
317-749-2480

Dr. Roy N. VanArsdall
Ag. Economist, ESCS/USDA
305 Mumford Hall
Urbana, IL 61801
217-333-0578

Dr. William J. Waldrip, Gen. Mgr.
Spade Ranches, Box 2763
Lubbock, TX 79408
806-765-8536

Dr. Sylvan H. Wittwer, Director
Agricultural Experiment Station
Michigan State University
East Lansing, MI 48824
517-355-0123

Dr. Catherine E. Woteki
Home Economist, USDA
Rm. 324, 6505 Belcrest Rd.
Hyattsville, MD 20782
301-436-8470

Report for DALs - Mark T. Buchanan, Chairman

I have a neighbor who is a Professor of English at the University of Maryland. After we had been neighbors for a year he overcame his Maryland reticence and inquired, "What do you do?" I responded that I serve as a communications link between the Directors of the State Agricultural Experiment Stations in the western region and representatives of organizations, agencies and the Congress in the Washington, D.C. area that have a stake in research related to food and agriculture. I said I assisted in research planning and coordination among the performers of food and agricultural research and that my colleagues and I attempt to provide a think-tank, staff approach to the needs of Directors in our respective regions and, collectively to all Directors. I started to explain that many scientific disciplines contribute to science related to food and agriculture but he interrupted. "Oh, you're a lobbyist," he said.

I have another neighbor who is a Professor of Slavic Languages, also at the University of Maryland. His wife and Jack Sullivan's wife are both recent emigres from Russia. Because he knows Jack knows me and vice versa I get all sorts of questions from this neighbor concerning the identification of what is injuring his trees and shrubs and what to do about them.

I sometimes think it is almost as difficult to report in a meaningful way on the activities of the DALs to you, our employers, as it is to my neighbors.

A listing of specific activities leaves much to be desired. We get involved in one way or another with practically everything that you do, or attempt to do, collectively. Thus, you may take credit for the contributions we make and blame us for what goes wrong!

A number of apparent trends and fairly recent events, however, may provide you with some useful generalizations. The trends include:

- ① Directors' perceptions of the role of the DALs appear to have shifted from one of efforts primarily within the region for the benefit of the individual Directors to one of efforts primarily at the Federal level for the benefit of regional associations and individual Directors.
- ① The emphasis seems to have shifted from "more bang for the buck" to "more bucks for the bang".
- ① Whereas our offices were established initially to provide a central source of information and expertise to do some things the institutional Directors didn't have time to do the present expectation is that the DALs will spend a greater proportion of their time than before in what I, in contrast to my Maryland English Professor neighbor, would call lobbying - i.e., the provision, packaging, and use of information both directly and indirectly to influence decisions in favor of additional funding for the SAES.

Recent activities of the DALs in response to these trends and in an effort to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of our efforts include:

- ① regular meetings among ourselves and with Dr. Bertrand and Dr. Thomas

- ① meetings with the Chairmen of the four associations and the Chairman of ESCOP
- ① preparation and legitimation with each association and with ESCOP of a statement of the role of the DALs
- ① continuing collective review by the DALs of tasks to be done followed by decisions on what will be done by one or more for all and what will require us all to work together
- ① successful fruition of a substantial collective effort to influence the SEA-budget process in the direction of improved cooperation with SAES (reported more fully in association meetings)
- ① continuing recognition of the primacy of regional concerns recognizing that each of our groups has a substantial interest in what each of us and the group collectively do, how we go about doing it and what and how each of us reports back to our associations.

Each of us will be reporting more specifically and more fully on his activities to his association. Collectively, our efforts during the past year have included, among others:

- ① assistance to ESCOP
- ① assistance, especially, to the Legislative Subcommittee of ESCOP
- ① assistance to NISARC. We view NISARC as an especially important organization for the SAES
- ① assistance in representation at significant meetings
- ① assistance in Joint Council activities
- ① assistance toward revision of Title XIV
- ① worked closely with Lowell Lewis as Acting Director of Governmental Affairs for Agriculture, NASULGC. We hope to establish a similar relationship with Dale Stansbury

Among individual DAL efforts, I single out for especial, commendatory mention to this group:

- ① Halpin's sponsorship and management of tours for important Executive, Congressional and other persons and staff; his "covering" of the UAB.
- ① Ronningen's management of Title XIV revision
- ① Huston's and Ronningen's contributions to the OTA studies
- ① I have worked considerably with the Joint Council

When Keith Huston came on board he said to me, "I think this group can make things zing." I believe experience substantiates his prediction.

EXPERIMENT STATION SECTION MEETING

November 17, 1980

W. I. THOMAS

Cooperative Research, SEA

TRANSITION. A SEA team, consisting of members of each unit of SEA, has been named to work with Dr. McCracken (SEA's point of contact to the Secretary's Office on transition matters) and the Management Team in preparing briefing materials for meeting with members of the new administration's Transition Team. We have been advised that space will have to be provided for this team in the Administration Building. We will keep you informed as this process unfolds.

BUDGET. I would like to express appreciation for the selected research examples you have provided in support of the FY 1982 Budget. In addition, I would like to emphasize the importance of these examples and request that this activity be kept in mind throughout the year to make these examples as meaningful as possible so that they have definite impact on each year's budget planning process.

The Legislative Subcommittee of ESCOP met with our staff in early September and worked on developing priorities for the FY 1983 Budget. When these priorities have been approved by the Division of Agriculture we will be working with SEA in discussing them.

The CR staff detailed to the Program Planning Staff of JPE have all completed their assignments and have returned full time to CR. CR staff will, however, have assignments for the FY 1983 Budget development period. We are presently in the process of selecting those to be assigned for the specific areas.

STAFFING IN CR AND TRAVEL RESTRICTIONS. The Senior Executive position of Deputy Administrator, Animal Sciences, has still not been advertised. The process takes time to get appropriate clearances since the SES system is new and SES position slots are limited.

We are making a concerted effort within the constraints we have of staff and travel resources to get better participation of CR staff scientists in the Regional Research Technical Committee meetings. We recognize the importance of attendance of the State scientists involved in these regional efforts, as well as the CR scientists.

We have requests for 130 Special Reviews this year and are looking toward honoring as many of these as possible. Emphasis on these reviews will continue to be to make them as meaningful to the institutions as possible -- and also meaningful to CR. It would be helpful to have critical feedback as we work together for improvement. We would also appreciate feedback regarding action taken by you on the recommendations made in the formal report by the review team. This will assist us in knowing whether you are taking action on the recommendations or whether you are unable to do so.

We are appreciative of the States providing the following IPAs who are currently working with CR:

Robert N. Anderson (Agr.Economist)	Hawaii
Georgianne Baker (Home Economist)	Arizona
Bobby D. Barnett (Poultry Sci.)	South Carolina
Jean Dickersheid (Home Economist)	Ohio
Donald P. Duncan (Forest Ecologist)	Missouri
Madeleine Mitchell (Nutrition)	Washington
Benjamin S. Pomeroy (Veterinary Med.)	Minnesota
Fred Poston (Entomologist)	Kansas
George Templeton (Plant Path.)	Arkansas
Morril Vittum (Horticulturist)	New York Cornell
Samuel C. Wiggans (Agronomist)	Vermont
Larry E. Schrader (Chief, CRGO)	Wisconsin

In addition, CR has added three new permanent staff members, George Allen (Entomologist), David Brown (Rural Sociologist), and John Meadows (Forest Resources Economist) and we expect Charles Smith (Soil Scientist) to be on board soon.

We have had three retirements this year, Edward O. Moe (Rural Sociologist), Arthur Newman (Soil Scientist) and Aubrey Wylie (Forest Products Technology).

NAPIAP. We appreciate your cooperation in providing people needed to keep the pesticide assessment program moving forward. This is an important effort and without the help of your scientists we would not be able to do the job required.

JOINT COUNCIL. Regional Councils have been established and are in place. Some indicate they will include additional organizations, where it appears their needs are somewhat different than for other regions. All Regional Councils have taken steps to set up Regional Functional Committees and membership is currently being established. Membership composition for the permanent National Functional Committees has been agreed upon. Interim National Committees will continue to function until permanent committees are actually in place.