

Minutes of the Meeting of The Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors



**Westin Hotel
Oklahoma City, OK
September 27, 2004**

SUMMARY OF ACTIONS

- 1.0 Approved adoption of Agenda as modified; Approved minutes of June 2004 Meeting . 4
- 2.0 Adopted the amended “Mission, Vision, and Operational Statement. The amended “Mission Statement” is to be “The WAAESD contributes knowledge to address pressing needs in food, agricultural, natural resources, and related sciences in the Western Region.” 10
- 3.0 Approved the change of all WCC projects to WERA projects with immediate implementation 12
- 4.0 Approved the revised publication approval form to reflect approvals by the Administrative Advisor, the Association Chair and the Executive Director. 14
- 5.0 Appointed Greg Bohach and Charles Boyer to the ESCOP Science and Technology Committee 26
- 6.0 Unanimously approved resolution in recognition of Catherine Chan-Halbrendt. 29
- 7.0 Approved that travel expenses by David Thawley on behalf of the Association relating to agro-security eligible to be reimbursed from the Association Special Fund. 30

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Agenda	1
1.0 Introductions and Announcements	3
2.0 Adoption of Agenda, Approval of Minutes, June 2004 Meeting	4
3.0 Interim Actions of Chair	5
4.0 Treasurer's Report	6
5.0 NRSP Review Committee	9
6.0 Follow-up on Values Discussion	10
7.0 Multistate Nomenclature	11
8.0 Electronic Publications	13
9.0 WAAESD-WED Joint Efforts	15
10.0 NIMSS Status	16
11.0 Agricultural Water Security Listening Session	17
12.0 CSREES Grant Workshop	22
13.0 New Deans/Directors Workshop	23
14.0 ESCOP Committee Assignments	26
15.0 Future Meetings	
15.1 Spring Meeting 2005	27
15.2 Joint Summer Meeting 2005	28
16.0 Resolutions	29
17.0 Other Business	
17.1 Experiment Station Related Travel	30
17.2 Partnership Office Relationship	31
18.0 Changing of the Guard	32
19.0 Consent Agenda (discussion optional)	
19.1 Executive Director Report	33
19.2 MRF Justification	37

Attendance:

Alaska	Allen Mitchell	Oregon	C. Y. Hu
Arizona	C. Colin Kaltenbach		Charles Boyer
Colorado	Lee Sommers	Utah	Don Snyder
Hawaii	Doug Vincent	Washington	Sandra Ristow
Idaho	Greg Bohach	Wyoming	Jim Jacobs
Montana	Jeff Jacobsen	Others:	
Nevada	David Thawley	CSREES	Gary Cunningham
	Ron Pardini	W. Exec. Dir.	H. Michael Harrington
New Mexico	LeRoy Daugherty		

Agenda
Fall WAAESD Meeting
8:00 am -12:00 noon
September 27, 2004
Oklahoma City

8:00	1.0	Introductions and Announcements	R. Cavaliere
	2.0	Adoption of Agenda, Approval of Minutes June 2004 Meeting	R. Cavaliere
	3.0	Interim Actions of Chair	R. Cavaliere
8:10	4.0	Treasurer's Report	J. Jacobsen
8:20	5.0	NRSP RC Recommendations	L. Sommers
8:50	6.0	Follow-up on Values discussion	H. Michael Harrington/All
9:00	7.0	Multistate Nomenclature	H. Michael Harrington/L. Sommers
9:15	8.0	Electronic Publications	H. Michael Harrington
9:30	9.0	WAAESD-WED joint efforts	Group Leaders
		Obesity, Rural Community Sustainability, Water	
9:45	10.0	NIMSS Status	H. Sykes/H. Michael Harrington
10:00	BREAK		
10:20	11.0	USDA Agricultural Water Security Listening Session	H. Michael Harrington
10:35	12.0	CSREES Grants Workshop	H. Michael Harrington
10:45	13.0	New Deans-Directors Workshop	H. Michael Harrington

11:00 14.0 ESCOP Committee Assignments R. Cavalieri/H. Michael Harrington

11:15 15.0 Future Meetings:
15.1 Spring Meeting 2005 D. Cooksey
15.2 Joint Summer Meeting 2005 L. Daugherty

11:30 16.0 Resolutions C.Y. Hu/G. Bohach

11:35 17.0 Other Business R. Cavalieri

11:40 18.0 Changing of the Guard R. Cavalieri

11:45 19.0 Consent Agenda (discussion optional)
19.1 Executive Director Report H. Michael Harrington
19.2 MRF Justification H. Michael Harrington

ADJOURN

AGENDA BRIEFS

Agenda Item: 1.0 Introductions and Announcements

Presenter: Ralph Cavalieri

Background:

Sommers (Chair-Elect) called the meeting to order and welcomed the participants. The attendees introduced themselves.

Action Requested: For Information

Agenda Item 2.0
Adoption of Agenda, Approval of Minutes, June 2004 Meeting

Presenter: Ralph Cavalieri

Background:

Sommers indicated modifications to the Agenda, and called for approval of the Agenda and Approval of the Minutes of the June 2004 Meeting.

Action Requested: Approval of Agenda and Approval of Minutes

Action Taken: Approved adoption of Agenda as modified; Approved minutes of June 2004 Meeting

Agenda Item 3.0
Interim Actions of Chair

Presenter: Ralph Cavalieri

Background:

There were no interim actions taken.

Action Requested: For Information

**Agenda Item 4.0
Treasurer's Report**

Presenter: Jeff Jacobsen
Background:

**WESTERN DIRECTOR EXPERIMENT STATION
FINANCIAL STATEMENT
FY05**

21-Sep-04

ASSESSMENTS	FY04 Assessments Outstanding FY04	Payment Received	Balance Due
Am Samoa	600.00	600.00	0.00
Micronesia	600.00	600.00	0.00
Northern Marianas	600.00	600.00	0.00
Alaska	8,790.06	8,790.06	0.00
Arizona	15,274.56	15,274.56	0.00
California	23,422.72		23,422.72
Colorado	17,555.94	17,555.94	0.00
Guam	8,572.64	8,572.64	0.00
Hawaii	11,332.81	11,332.81	0.00
Idaho	13,582.54	13,582.54	0.00
Montana	14,338.74	14,338.74	0.00
Nevada	11,143.76	11,143.76	0.00
New Mexico	11,531.32	11,531.32	0.00
Oregon	17,278.52	17,278.52	0.00
Utah	14,974.55	14,974.55	0.00
Washington	23,063.94		23,063.94
Wyoming	12,911.40	12,911.40	0.00
CSU Rent	-7,800.00	(7,800.00)	0.00
Assessment Total	\$197,773.50	\$151,286.84	46,486.66

INCOME/EXPENSE

Date	Transaction	Income	Expense	Balance
07/01/04	Balance forward			\$10,945.89
	YTD Assessments Received	151,286.84		162,232.73
	July Interest	24.59		162,257.32
	August Interest	27.78		162,285.10
07/01/04	MT Accounting Fee		3,500.00	158,785.10
09/09/04	CSU First Qtr		49,443.38	109,341.72
	CSU Second Qtr			109,341.72
	CSU Third Qtr			109,341.72
	CSU Fourth Qtr			109,341.72
	TOTAL	151,339.21	52,943.38	109,341.72

**WESTERN DIRECTOR EXTENSION ACCOUNT
FINANCIAL STATEMENT
FY 2005**

21-Sep-04

ASSESSMENTS	FY05 Assessments	Outstanding FY04	Payment Received	Balance Due
Am Samoa	1,121.83		1,121.83	\$0.00
Micronesia	1,240.14		1,240.14	\$0.00
Northern Marianas	1,096.72		1,096.72	\$0.00
Alaska	1,344.37		1,344.37	\$0.00
Arizona	2,321.22		2,321.22	\$0.00
California	9,246.38			\$9,246.38
Colorado	3,655.27		3,655.27	\$0.00
Guam	1,192.46			\$1,192.46
Hawaii	1,619.02		1,619.02	\$0.00
Idaho	3,290.07		3,290.07	\$0.00
Montana	3,098.94		3,098.94	\$0.00
Nevada	1,361.06		1,361.06	\$0.00
New Mexico	2,468.71		2,468.71	\$0.00
Oregon	4,400.48			\$4,400.48
Utah	2,013.19		2,013.19	\$0.00
Washington	5,089.55			\$5,089.55
Wyoming	1,843.09		1,843.09	\$0.00
Assessment Total	46,402.50		26,473.63	\$19,928.87

INCOME/EXPENSE

Date	Transaction	Income	Expense	Balance
	Balance forward			\$1,099.57
	YTD Assessments Received	26,473.63		27,573.20
	July Interest	1.14		27,574.34
	August Interest	1.29		27,575.63
09/09/04	CSU First Qtr		11,600.62	15,975.01
	CSU Second Qtr			15,975.01
	CSU Third Qtr			15,975.01
	CSU Fourth Qtr			15,975.01
TOTAL		\$26,476.06	\$11,600.62	\$15,975.01

**WESTERN DIRECTOR ACADEMIC PROGRAMS
FINANCIAL STATEMENT
FY 2005**

21-Sep-04

ASSESSMENTS	FY05 Assessments	Outstanding FY04	Payment Received	Balance Due
Alaska	841.00			\$841.00
American Samoa	200.00		200.00	\$0.00
Arizona	841.00		841.00	\$0.00
California	841.00			\$841.00
Colorado	841.00			\$841.00
Guam	841.00		841.00	\$0.00
Hawaii	841.00		841.00	\$0.00
Idaho	841.00		841.00	\$0.00
Micronesia	200.00		200.00	\$0.00
Montana	841.00		841.00	\$0.00
Northern Marianas	200.00		200.00	\$0.00
Nevada	841.00		841.00	\$0.00
New Mexico	841.00	780.16	1,621.16	\$0.00
Oregon	841.00		841.00	\$0.00
Utah	841.00		841.00	\$0.00
Washington	841.00		841.00	\$0.00
Wyoming	841.00		841.00	\$0.00
Assessment Total	\$12,374.00	\$780.16	\$10,631.16	\$2,523.00

INCOME/EXPENSE

Date	Transaction	Income	Expense	Balance
07/01/04	Balance forward			\$168.03
	YTD Assessments Received	10,631.16		10,799.19
	July Interest	0.11		10,799.30
	August Interest	0.13		10,799.43
9/9/2004	CSU First Qtr		3,093.50	7,705.93
	CSU Second Qtr			7,705.93
	CSU Third Qtr			7,705.93
	CSU Fourth Qtr			7,705.93
TOTAL		\$10,631.40	\$3,093.50	7,705.93

Agenda Item 5.0 NRSP Review Committee

Presenter: Lee Sommers

Background:

The final recommendations of the NRSP Review Committee were finalized via conference call in August 2004. The following recommendations will be presented to the ESS followed by a vote of the individual SAES's.

NRSP 1:

The NRSP Review Committee recommends: (1) that NRSP 1 be renewed for five years (2005 – 2009), (2) that NRSP 1 should receive multistate off the top funding for support since it does not have a constituency or access to grants that will support its activity, and (3) that the FY 05 budget allocation of MRF be set at \$269,707 which preserves the arrangement to have the ESS commitment for funds matched 1 to 3 with CSREES funds.

NRSP 4:

The NRSP Review Committee recommends: (1) that NRSP 4 be renewed for five years (2005 – 2009), (2) that multistate off the top funding in support of NRSP 4 be set at \$481,182 for the period 2005-2009. This is the same level of support as for FY 04, and, over the course of the next five years, multistate support is expected to decrease slightly as a percent of total budget due to increases in funds from other sources.

NRSP 7:

The NRSP Review Committee recommends that NRSP 7 be renewed for five years (2005-2009) with no multistate funding commitment.

NRSP 3:

The NRSP Review Committee recommends that the FY 05, 06, 07, and 08 multistate off the top funding for NRSP 3 be established at \$96K, \$84K, \$72K and \$61K, respectively.

NRSP 5:

The NRSP Review Committee recommends: (1) that the FY 05 multistate off the top funding be \$247,786 (the same as FY 04), and (2) that multistate off the top funding for FY 06, 07 and 08 be set at \$146K, \$96K and \$46K, respectively.

NRSP 6:

The NRSP Review Committee recommends that the FY 06 multistate off the top funds be \$161,575.

NRSP 8:

The NRSP Review Committee recommends that the multistate off the top funding for NRSP8 be \$400K for FY 05 through FY 08.

Several changes to the NRSP Review Committee guidelines will be proposed to clarify operations of the committee as well to provide additional information to the NRSP's. The above recommendations ([http://www.wisc.edu/ncra/NRSPRCmaterials\(9-2004\).htm](http://www.wisc.edu/ncra/NRSPRCmaterials(9-2004).htm)), the guidelines (<http://www.cals.ncsu.edu:8050/escop/NRSP%20Guidelines-revised.pdf>) and a Powerpoint ([http://www.wisc.edu/ncra/NRSP%20Review%20Committee%20Powerpoint\(9-2004\).ppt](http://www.wisc.edu/ncra/NRSP%20Review%20Committee%20Powerpoint(9-2004).ppt)) are available as background information.

Action Requested: For Information

Agenda Item 6.0

Follow-up on Values Discussion

Presenter: H. Michael Harrington

Background:

The core values serve as an integral part of the identity and culture of an organization. As background, a request was sent to all Directors asking to list “Values”, or those Principles, Standards, Morals Ethics and/or Ideals, which are important to them as individuals and central to the operation of an experiment station. There were only five responses to the original survey, but at our summer meeting in Guam there was meaningful discussion of core values and additional suggestions for incorporation. At your request, the synthesis of the discussion and the Powerpoint presentation was sent to all Directors with a request for additional feedback. No additional comments were received. Below is a synthesis of those discussions.

- We value-
 - Cutting edge, peer reviewed, research, discovery and learning
 - Honesty and Integrity
 - Unbiased, science-based information
 - Independent, creative thought
 - Entrepreneurship
 - Active student participation
 - Partnerships and collaborative relationships
- Mission Statement
 - The WAAESD contributes knowledge to address pressing needs in agriculture, food and related sciences in the Western Region
- Vision
 - The WAAESD will facilitate research excellence in member States, the Region and Nation that is responsive to stakeholders needs
- Operational Statement
 - We operate in a open, collaborative manner with each other, with research partners, with Cooperative Extension, and with Academic Programs

Action Requested: Discussion and adoption

Action Taken: The motion was made, seconded and approved to adopt the amended “Mission, Vision, and Operational Statement. The amended “Mission Statement” is to be “The WAAESD contributes knowledge to address pressing needs in food, agricultural, natural resources, and related sciences in the Western Region.”

Agenda Item 7.0 Multistate Nomenclature

Presenter: H. Michael Harrington/Lee Sommers

Background:

The Regional EDs developed a simplified nomenclature for the MRF projects (attached) that has been approved by all regions and will take effect on October 1. Since the RCIC and the Directors have endorsed the nomenclature, committees fit W, CC or the ERA designation by definition, objectives and membership.

While simplifying the nomenclature at the national level, this has served to somewhat complicate our nomenclature in the West. There will be no need to make changes to the “W” or research projects; however, we will need to consider how best to proceed with CCs. Under the new nomenclature, CCs are now described as “Activities that provide a mechanism for addressing critical regional issues where multistate coordination or information exchange is appropriate within a function (i.e. research, education or extension)”. Many of our current CCs are integrated with extension and/or academic programs and are described as an Education/Extension Research Activity or ERA or “Activities that serve to integrate education (academic and/or extension) and research on a particular topic”.

Currently there are 50 CC in the Western Region portfolio; of these, 33 are integrated and should be designated as ERAs. One advantage to taking this step will be to clearly demonstrate that integrated activities are being undertaken in the multistate portfolio.

Implementation Alternatives:

1. Change the designation, if needed, after an informational discussion at the committee's annual meeting. The AA should make sure all members of the committee are provided with the descriptions of Coordinating Committee (CC) and Education/Extension and Research Activity (ERA). The AA should inform the WDO of the discussion so that changes can be made in the NIMSS.

1a. The AA and committee chair may utilize email or other mechanism to facilitate an informational discussion on the appropriate designation for the committee. The AA should inform the WDO of the discussion so that changes can be made in the NIMSS.

2. Change the designation during the committee's normal renewal cycle.

3. In the case of the addition or loss of extension participation in a CC or ERA the committee designation would change during the normal renewal cycle. However, it may be advantageous for the committee designation to be changed when extension participation is added to a CC. In this event, making such a change could be left up to the discretion of the committee.

Descriptions and Regional Designations of Multistate Activities Approved by all regions

Multistate Research Project (NC, S, W, NE) - Projects that involve integrated, potentially interdisciplinary, and multistate activities; have expected outcomes, including original research results; convey knowledge; and are peer reviewed.

500 Series Project (NC-5xx, S-5xx, W-5xx, NE-5xx) – Committees formed, for a maximum of two years, to provide a mechanism for response to acute crises, emergencies, and opportunities

using the multistate research approach. Activities may range from formally organized research on targeted objectives to very informal research coordination or information exchange activity, depending on the circumstances; have expected outcomes; convey knowledge; and are peer reviewed.

National Research Support Project (NRSP) – Activities that focuses on the development of enabling technologies, support activities (such as to collect, assemble, store, and distribute materials, resources and information), or the sharing of facilities needed to accomplish high priority research, but which is not of itself primarily research; funded through off-the-top MRF Hatch appropriations; and are peer reviewed.

Coordinating Committees (NCCC, SCC, WCC, NECC)– Activities that provide a mechanism for addressing critical regional issues where multistate coordination or information exchange is appropriate within a function (i.e. research, education or extension); have expected outcomes; convey knowledge; and are peer reviewed.

Education/Extension and Research Activity (NCERA, SERA, WERA, NEERA) – Activities that serve to integrate education (academic and/or extension) and research on a particular topic where multistate coordination or information exchange is appropriate; have expected outcomes; convey knowledge; and are peer reviewed.

Development Committee (NCDC, SDC, WDC, NEDC) – Committees of duration less than two years for the purpose of developing a Multistate Activity; have the expected outcome of a full proposal for a particular Multistate Activity; and are peer reviewed.

Advisory Committee (NCAC, SAC, WAC, NEAC) – Committees of department chairs/heads from a particular discipline that exchange information and serve a multistate administrative function through review of multistate activities, but are not peer reviewed.

Action Requested: Determination of how and when the nomenclature will be applied

Action Taken: The motion was made, seconded and approved to change all WCC projects to WERA projects with immediate implementation.

Agenda Item 8.0 Electronic Publications

Presenter: H. Michael Harrington

Background:

E-publications approval procedure:

The current procedures for Western Region publications were developed by Lanny Boyd at least 10 years ago (see <http://www.colostate.edu/Orgs/WAAESD/pubguide/pubguide.htm>). These procedures specify that WR publications will be done in electronic form, will be reviewed following the originating station's procedures and will be posted on the server of the originating station. The procedures also include an approval process that requires *all* station directors with faculty involved to approve the publication prior to its release.

We recently received *the first* request for a WR publication number from Colin Kaltenbach. A question has arisen as to the continuing need for approval by all directors. In some cases there are more than 100 participants on regional projects; obtaining approvals in this case would become very unwieldy if not impossible. Based on my discussions with Colin and Lee, this approval process seems excessive.

Accordingly, I have revised the approval form to reflect approvals by the Administrative Advisor, the Association Chair and the Executive Director. Your approval is needed to implement this new procedure.

Publications Guidelines Review Committee:

A small committee be formed to review the publication guidelines and to make recommendations for needed revisions.

Request for Western Region Electronic Publication Number

Date: _____

FROM: _____
ADMINISTRATIVE ADVISOR

SIGNATURE

PROJECT NUMBER and TITLE:

TO: CHAIRMAN -- WESTERN DIRECTORS ASSOCIATION

I hereby request approval for publication of a Western Region Publication entitled:

() This publication has been reviewed using the criteria and editorial capabilities at

(Indicate station)

Title:

Origin:

Publishing State:

The URL of the draft publication is: http:_____

Approved: _____
(Chairman, WAAESD)

Approved: _____
(Executive Director)

Note: Chairman will forward an approved request to the Executive Director for assignment of a series number and an International Standard Book Number (ISBN). The Executive Director will notify the administrative advisor and the other regions of the publication.

Western Region Publication Number # _____

International Standard Book Number (ISBN) _____

Action Requested: Discussion and change of procedure

Action Taken: The motion was made, seconded and approved to accept the revised approval form to reflect approvals by the Administrative Advisor, the Association Chair and the Executive Director.

A small committee was formed to review the publication guidelines and to make recommendations for needed revisions. The committee is: Greg Bohach (Chair), Jeff Jacobsen, and H. Michael Harrington.

Agenda Item 9.0
WAAESD-WED Joint Efforts

Presenters: Ron Pardini - Obesity; Rural Community Sustainability; Jim Jacobs - Water
Background:

Pardini reported that the Nutrition and Obesity project group were to meet with a North Central group that were developing a similar project. There are 20-30 to be involved in the joint meeting.

Linda Fox (the Co-AA) hopes to have a project submitted by January for the Spring RCIC meeting.

Jacobs indicated that there had been no activity on the part if the Water joint effort.

There has also been no activity to report on the Rural Community joint effort since the Summer Meeting.

Action Requested: For Information

Agenda Item 10.0
NIMSS Status

Presenters: Harriet Sykes/H. Michael Harrington

Background:

Sykes reported that version 2.0 of the NIMSS had been operational for approximately one month. There have been a variety of problems and questions involved with learning a new system.

The Directors are asked to refer any questions and problems to the Office of the Western Directors Association so that they can be resolved.

Action Requested: For Information

Agenda Item 11.0
Agricultural Water Security Listening Session

Presenter: H. Michael Harrington

Background:

USDA hosted a listening session on agricultural water security on September 9-10 in Park City, UT. The session was intended to identify potential solutions to issues arising from increasing demands for a limited supply of U.S. water resources. The session also was intended to enhance partnerships with other federal and state agencies and the public and private sector in efforts to protect and improve the Nation's water resources.

Ninety-two representatives from federal laboratories and agencies, universities and tribal colleges, water conservancy districts, nonprofit groups, cities and municipalities, and the Western Governors Association participated in the listening session.

Six key themes were the topics of breakout discussions: drought risk assessment and preparedness, general water conservation, irrigation efficiency, water marketing, rural and urban water reuse, and biotechnology. Each group identified information gaps, limiting steps and 3 high priority actions. Most important of these recommendations was for USDA to assume leadership for the national water effort. There currently is a multi-agency/departmental taskforce on water; however, the group is not well coordinated. A summary is to be released during the week of September 27 with a final report due in November.

The National Academy will soon be releasing a publication entitled "*Confronting the Nation's Water Problems: The Role of Research*". The publication is the work of a committee that was chaired by Henry Vaux. The publication can be read on line at <http://www.nap.edu/books/0309092582/html/>

**JOINT USDA RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND ECONOMICS
LISTENING SESSION ON AGRICULTURAL WATER SECURITY
PARK CITY, UTAH SEPTEMBER 9-10, 2004
ATTENDEE CONTACT INFORMATION**

Keith Admire US Army Corps of Engineers	University of Hawaii, College of Tropical Agriculture and Human Resources
Randy Allen Texas Tech University	Bert Clemmens USDA Agricultural Research Service
Mark T. Anderson US Geological Survey	Steve Connelly USDA Farm Service Agency
Sharon Benes California State University, Fresno	Bill Cook Executive Director for Ogden City Council
Norman Bennett USDA/Maryland Agricultural Statistics Service	Gary Cunningham USDA Cooperative State Research Education &
Steve Bowles WAIMEA Water Services, Inc.	John Cushman University of Nevada, Reno
David D. Breshears University of Arizona	Cassel S. Gardner, Ph.D. (Cass) Florida A&M University
Garry Brown SWVA	Tim Darden New Mexico Department of Agriculture
Karla A. Brown Colorado Foundation for Water Education	Allen R. Dedrick USDA Agricultural Research Service
Rodney J. Brown Deputy Under Secretary	Sam O. Dennis Tennessee State University
Dale A. Bucks USDA Agricultural Research Service	Jim Dobrowolski Washington State University
John J. Burke USDA Agricultural Research Service Bonnie S. Carrig USDA Rural Development	Patti Dobrowolski Alchemy, Inc.
Peggy Caswell USDA Economic research Service	Virgil Dupuis Salish Kootenai College
Nancy Cavallaro USDA CSREES	Lisa Fiorina Duriancik USDA Cooperative State Research Education & Extension Service
Donna R. Ching	Robert (Bob) G. Evans USDA Agricultural Research Service

**JOINT USDA RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND ECONOMICS
LISTENING SESSION ON AGRICULTURAL WATER SECURITY
PARK CITY, UTAH SEPTEMBER 9-10, 2004
ATTENDEE CONTACT INFORMATION**

Leonard Fleckenstein
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Gerrit Hoogenboom
University of Georgia, Griffin

Michael R. Gabaldon
Department of the Interior
Bureau of Reclamation

Carol C. House
National Agricultural Statistics Service

Jurgen Garbrecht
USDA Agricultural Research Service

Ray Huffaker
Washington State University

Sylvia A. Gillen
USDA NRCS

Fen C. Hunt
USDA Cooperative State Research
Education & Extension Service

Jennifer Gimbel
Bureau of Reclamation

Yvonne Y. Izu
State of Hawaii - Commission on Water
Resource Management

Shane Green
USDA NRCS

Earl K. Jackson
Utah State University Extension

Catherine M. Grieve
USDA Agricultural Research Service

Andy Keller
Keller-Bliesner Engineering, LLC

L. Earl Griffin
USDA Agricultural Research Service

Michael P. Kenna
US Golf Association

Gary Grinnell
Las Vegas Valley Water District

Rick Kestle
USDA National Agricultural Statistics
Service

George Hallberg
The Cadmus Group, Inc.

Charles Krauter
California State University, Fresno

William K. Hallman
Rutgers University (Food Policy
Institute)

Dan Kugler
USDA Cooperative State Research
Education & Extension Service

H. Michael Harrington
Western Association of Agricultural
Experiment Station Directors (WAAESD)

Sheryl Kunickis
USDA Natural Resources Conservation
Service

Karen Henry
Wyoming Farm Bureau Federation

Freddie R. Lamm
Kansas State University

Kyle D. Hoagland
University of Nebraska, Lincoln Water
Center

Sue Martin
Communication Strategies

**JOINT USDA RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND ECONOMICS
LISTENING SESSION ON AGRICULTURAL WATER SECURITY
PARK CITY, UTAH SEPTEMBER 9-10, 2004
ATTENDEE CONTACT INFORMATION**

Molly A. Maupin US Geological Survey	University of Wisconsin Madison
Gail McClean USDA CSREES	Richard A. Slaughter Climate Impacts Group
Michael McGirr USDA Cooperative State Research Education & Extension Service	P. Gregory Smith USDA Cooperative State Research Education & Extension Service
Shaun McGrath Western Governors' Association	Tom L. Spofford USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service
Ari M. Michelsen Texas A&M University	Jean L. Steiner USDA Agricultural Research service
Juniper Neill National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration	David Sunding University of California, Berkeley 20
Karen O'Neill Rutgers University	Clark Throssell Golf Course Superintendents Association of America
Michael P. O'Neill USDA Cooperative State Research Education & Extension Service	Johathan Triggs NASA – GSFC
Anna Palmisano USDA Cooperative State Research Education & Extension Service	Audrey Trotman Tuskegee University
Jack Payne Utah State University	Louie Tupas USDA Cooperative State Research Education & Extension Service
Cary Peterson Utah Agriculture and Food	Dan R. Upchurch USDA Agricultural Research Service
Bradley Rein USDA Cooperative State Research Education & Extension Service	Tara T. VanToai USDA Agricultural Research Service
Mary Ann Rozum USDA Cooperative State Research Education & Extension Service	Wynn R. Walker Utah State University
Robin Shepard	Jon Werner USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service

**JOINT USDA RESEARCH, EDUCATION, AND ECONOMICS
LISTENING SESSION ON AGRICULTURAL WATER SECURITY
PARK CITY, UTAH SEPTEMBER 9-10, 2004
ATTENDEE CONTACT INFORMATION**

Brad Wind
Northern Colorado Water Conservancy
District

Donald A. Wilhite
National Drought Mitigation Center
International Drought Information Center

Tony Willardson
Western States Water Council

Carolyn Williams
USDA Agricultural Research Service

Clinton F. Williams
USDA Agricultural Research Service

Doug Wilson
Georgia Water Planning & Policy Center
Albany, Georgia 31701

David Zoldoske
California Water Institute

Action Requested: For Information

**Agenda Item 12.0
CSREES Grant Workshop**

Presenter: H. Michael Harrington

Background:

In March, the University of Nevada, College of Agriculture, Biotechnology and Natural Resources with the assistance of Ron Pardini, Shannon Clopton and our office hosted a USDA-CSREES grant workshop in Reno. CSREES has since informed me that rather than holding four regional workshops as was done this year, they plan to conduct only two workshops each year. One of these will always be held in Washington DC while the other will always be held at a location in the Western Region. They have asked to work through the Western Director's office in setting up and advertising the workshops. We are working to establish a schedule that will lay out the locations several years in advance. Below is the schedule that has been developed to date. We would like to commit a host for the 2006 workshop as soon as possible.

Date	Location	Hosts	Contacts
December 6, 2004	Tucson, AZ	U-AZ College of Agriculture and Life Sciences	Colin Kaltenbach, Judy Smith
Summer 2005	Pullman/Moscow	U-ID College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, WSU College of Agriculture and Life Sciences	Detleff Decker, Sandra Ristow, Greg Bohach
2006	tbd		

Action Requested: For Information

6:00 Reception

Thursday, December 9

7:00 Breakfast

8:15 General Session

Presiding: Kirklyn M. Kerr,
University of Connecticut

The Art and Science of Administration

Charles Laughlin

The Challenges of Sitting at the Top

Panel: Clyde Chesney (ECOP)
D. C. Coston (ESCOPE)
Patricia Jensen (AHS)
Eric O. Hoiberg (ACOP),
moderator

10:15 Break

10:45 Budgeting

Federal Budget Process

Christina C. Buch,
Budget Director, CSREES

The Importance of the Farm Bill

Jeffrey D. Armstrong,
College of Ag and NR,
Michigan State University

How Land-Grants Influence the Budget

Larry LaRocco
Fred A. Cholick

The Role of CARET

Charles A Vandersteen,
Chair, Council on Agriculture
Research, Extension and
Teaching

12:00 Luncheon

Presiding: Gary L. Cunningham,
Associate Administrator,
CSREES

Is the Land-Grant Mission Changing?

Rodney J. Brown
Deputy Under Secretary,
REE, USDA

1:45 An Overview of the CSREES Strategic Plan
and Accountability Standards

Colien Hefferan,
Administrator, CSREES/USDA

3:15 Break

3:45 Introduction of CSREES Executive Staff Colien Hefferan

6:00 Working Dinner Sessions:
AHS; ACOP; ESCOP; ECOP; ICOP Section Chairs

Friday, December 10

7:00 Breakfast

8:15 Getting Money! Moderator: H. Michael Harrington,
Executive Director,
WAAESD

Overview of Funding Programs Thomas A. Fretz
Executive Director,
NERA

Coaching Faculty re. Grantsmanship Panel

10:00 Overview of CSREES Competitive Programs Anna Palmissano,
Deputy Administrator,
Competitive Programs.
CSREES

10:30 CSREES Grant Opportunities – select two 30-minute sessions

- The competitive advantage of small & minority-serving institutions – Mark Poth
- Tips for success with Integrated Competitive Programs – Deb Sheely
- What's new in the NRI? – Chavonda Jacobs-Young

11:30 Adjourn. Have a safe trip home!

Action Requested: For Information

Agenda Item 14.0
ESCOP Committee Assignments

Presenters: Ralph Cavalieri/Mike Harrington

Background:

Current Western Region representative to ESCOP committees are as follows:

ESCOP Committee:

Colin Kaltenbach (AZ), Past Chair

Ralph Cavalieri (WA), Chair

Lee Sommers (CO), Chair-Elect

Budget and Legislative Committee:

LeRoy Daugherty

C. Y. Hu

Communications and Marketing Committee:

Colin Kaltenbach

Ron Pardini

Science and Technology Committee:

Ron Pardini

Vacant

Partnerships Committee:

Lee Sommers

C. Y. Hu

Planning Committee:

LeRoy Daugherty

Ralph Cavalieri

Action Requested: Review and make appointments as needed.

Action Taken: The motion was made, seconded and approved to appoint Greg Bohach and Charles Boyer to the ESCOP Science and Technology Committee.

Agenda Item 15.1
Spring Meeting 2005

Presenter: Donald Cooksey

Background:

The Spring Meeting is scheduled for March 21-13, 2005 at Riverside, CA.

Action Requested: For Information

Agenda Item 15.2
Joint Summer Meeting 2005

Presenter: LeRoy Daugherty

Background:

Daugherty reported that the Joint Summer is scheduled for July 10-13, 2005 in Santa Fe, NM.

Action Requested: For Information

**Agenda Item 16.0
Resolutions**

Presenter: C. Y. Hu/Greg Bohach

Background:

Whereas, Dr. Catherine Chan-Halbrendt, having served as Associate Dean and Associate Director for Research in the College of Tropical Agriculture and Human Resources and the Hawaii Agricultural Experiment Station; and

Whereas, Dr. Chan-Halbrendt provided outstanding contributions to the Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors as a member throughout her tenure as Associate Dean and Associate Director for Research at the University of Hawaii at Manoa; and

Whereas, Dr. Chan-Halbrendt has a distinguished career in Agricultural and Resource Economics; and

Whereas, Dr. Chan-Halbrendt has returned to a faculty position at the University of Hawaii at Manoa; therefore be it

Resolved, That the Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors at their meeting at the Westin Oklahoma City in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma on September 27, 2004 expresses its sincere and heartfelt appreciation to Dr. Catherine Chan-Halbrendt for the significant contributions she has made to our Association, and be it further

Resolved, That the original of this resolution be provided to Dr. Catherine Chan-Halbrendt and that a copy be filed as part of the official minutes of this meeting.

Action Requested: Approval

Action Taken: Unanimously approved resolution in recognition of Catherine Chan-Halbrendt.

Agenda Item 17.1
Experiment Station Related Travel

Presenter: Ralph Cavalieri

Background:

Harrington reported that David Thawley had been representing the Western Directors at many meetings dealing with agro-security, and had been covering his travel expenses from his station funds.

Action Requested: For Information

Action Taken: The motion was made, seconded, and approved that travel expenses by David Thawley on behalf of the Association relating to agro-security eligible to be reimbursed from the Association Special Fund.

Agenda Item 17.2
Partnership Office Relationship

Presenter: Ralph Cavalieri

Background:

Harrington reported that the Western Extension Directors were evaluating the possibility of hiring their own regional Executive Director. He will check with CES to find if they plan to continue their support of the WAAESD office.

Action Requested: For Information

Agenda Item 18.0
Changing of the Guard

Presenter: Ralph Cavalieri

Background:

Sommers assumed the Chair's responsibility in the absence of Cavalieri.

Action Requested: For Information

Agenda Item 19.1 Executive Director Report

Presenter: H. Michael Harrington
Background:

**July-September, 2004
Regional Activities**

WAAESD

Pacific Grants Workshops: After the Joint Summer Meetings in Guam, I conducted grantsmanship workshops for college faculty in Guam (15 participants), at Palau Community College (12 participants) and in Saipan (22 participants). The Guam ½ workshop was followed by mentoring individual faculty on proposals. The Palau and Saipan workshops were 1½ days in length and emphasized integrated and team proposals. Evaluations indicated that participants were highly satisfied with the workshops.

Fall Meeting: Worked with Ralph Cavalieri and Executive Committee members to organize the WAAESD meeting agenda.

Western Region IMP Center Steering Committee and Advisory Committee: I serve as the Western Directors' representative the WRIPMC. Assisted with the development of the special needs RFP that was released in August.

Western Association of State Directors of Agriculture (WASDA): Worked with Don Henderson (NV), current WASDA chair, on developing a more formal interaction with the WASDA. I made a presentation on the Association's activities at the WASDA meeting in Lake Tahoe in late July.

Western Region CSREES Grants Workshops: CSREES has indicated that they would like to hold grants workshop in the western region each year. To this end I have worked with Colin Kaltenbach and his staff to co-sponsor and organize a Western Region Grants Workshop to be held December 6, 2004 in Tucson. Worked with Sandra Ristow, Greg Bohach and Detlef Decker on the 2005 workshop to be held in the Moscow-Pullman area.

State Visits: I visited Idaho and Washington in August.

- Met with Greg Bohach, John Foltz, Charlotte Eberlein, Paul McCawley, Bob Haggerty, Department Heads and administrative services personnel. Met with faculty who are serving on the UI Vision and Taskforce Committee. Toured UI facilities.
- Met with Ralph Cavalieri, Jim Cook, Sandra Ristow, Detlef Decker, and Linda Fox. Discussed plans for a future CSREES grants workshop with Sandra Ristow and Detlef Decker.

WED

Bylaws: Worked with the WED on the formation of a Western Extension Directors Association and developed the final set of approved bylaws.

National Activities

ES COP

MRF Justification White Paper: The EDs (Lund, Fretz, Young and myself) developed a white paper entitled "Multistate Research Fund: A Research Program that Promotes Relevance,

Excellence, and Accountability”. This was shared with CSREES in response to OMB questions about the multistate program.

NASULGC-DOE Partnership project: I serve on the Coordinating Committee for this effort. My role has increased due to Stan Johnson’s stroke in July. I assisted with the organization and planning of a steering committee meeting held Sept 7. Developed the overall presentation and a major portion of the background briefing paper for a Coordinating Committee meeting that was also attended by 3 DOE Assistant Secretaries, Vic Lectenber and Bobby Moser. Drafted memo to Under Secretary David Garman on behalf of NASULGC.

Project 5 DOE Workshops: With Stan Bull (NREL), Sam Donald (ARD) and Sam Baldwin (DOE). Two concurrent workshops on Biomass and Solar energy were held at the National Renewable Energy Laboratory in Golden CO, August 3-4. The workshops were attended by 80 faculty and 22 DOE scientists. Travel assistance was provided to 17 early career faculty and/or faculty representing 1890 and 1994 institutions. Janet Fried and David Glickson (NREL) were instrumental in making the workshops successful.

Agricultural Water Security Listening Session: USDA hosted a listening session on agricultural water security on September 9-10 in Park City, UT. The session was intended to identify potential solutions to issues arising from increasing demands for a limited supply of U.S. water resources. The session also was intended to enhance partnerships with other federal and state agencies and the public and private sector in efforts to protect and improve the Nation's water resources.

Ninety-two representatives from federal laboratories and agencies, universities and tribal colleges, water conservancy districts, nonprofit groups, cities and municipalities, and the Western Governors Association participated in the listening session.

Six key themes were the topics of breakout discussions: drought risk assessment and preparedness, general water conservation, irrigation efficiency, water marketing, rural and urban water reuse, and biotechnology. Each group identified information gaps, limiting steps and 3 high priority actions. Most important of these recommendations was for USDA to assume leadership for the national water effort. There currently is a multi-agency/departmental taskforce on water; however, the group is not well coordinated. A summary is to be released during the week of September 27 with a final report due in November.

The National Academy will soon be releasing a publication entitled “*Confronting the Nation's Water Problems: The Role of Research*”. The publication is the work of a committee that was chaired by Henry Vaux. The publication can be read on line at <http://www.nap.edu/books/0309092582/html/>

BAA-Policy Board of Directors: I serve as the ESCOP staff liaison to the Board on Agriculture Assembly Policy Board of Directors. I assist Colin Kaltenbach with development of ESCOP/ESS agenda briefs and other materials. Also provide ESCOP agenda briefs to Kristin Perry for the CARET Executive Committee.

ESS Annual Meeting, September 26-29: With the other regional EDs and the host institution (Oklahoma State University), serve as the organizing committee for the annual meeting. Organized a workshop session on the “Impact of the Hatch Multistate Research Fund”.

National Institute for Agricultural Security (NIAS): Serve as the Secretary on the Board of Directors. Served as a reviewer of the decision tool that is being developed by the NIAS to aid Directors in making informed decisions on storage of non-select agents and hazardous materials.

Western SARE Administrative Council: I serve as the Directors' representative on this activity

- Served as a primary reviewer for 16 pre-proposals and read all 107 pre-proposals submitted
- Attended the Administrative Council meeting in Spokane, WA during which 27 pre-proposals were selected for full proposal development
- Participated in the orientation of new Council members
- Providing leadership for the review and revision the W-SARE proposal outline

LGU Partnership Working Group: Serve as co-chair of this effort. Worked with Pat Jensen and Gary Cunningham to develop the agenda for the upcoming summer meeting in Orlando. Completed final revisions to the draft rules of operation, organized conference calls for the co-chairs and also for the group.

- **Futuring Subcommittee:** Worked with Pat Sobrero and other members to identify key resources, readings, processes and procedures involved in "futuring". I worked with Dr James Morrison, a futurist and emeritus professor from the University of North Carolina, to develop resources and his presentation at the PWG summer meeting in Orlando.
- The PWG is providing overall leadership for the biannual New Deans/Directors Orientation to again be held December 8-10, 2004, Embassy Row Hotel Washington DC. Worked with Dick Wooton, Ian Maw, Karen Kubena, Cameron Hackney to develop the draft agenda.

Farm Bill Committee: The EDs will be providing assistance to the BAA-Farm Bill Committee. I have recently been asked to assist with the Energy title which is being led by Stan Johnson.

National Multistate Coordinating Committee (NMCC): This group consisting of all of the regional/national EDs (research, extension and academic programs) works to address issues within individual sections and facilitates interactions between the components of the LGU system. I am developing the agenda for the upcoming meeting to be held Oct 5-6 in Estes Park.

Summary of Travel June- September 2004

June 24-25, Guam grants workshop

June 26-30, Palau visit and grants workshop

June 30-July 1, Saipan visit and grants workshop

July 6-8, W-SARE state coordinators meeting, Ft Collins CO

July 24-28, Orlando, FL

 BAA Policy Board of Directors

 Joint COPS

 Partnership Working Group

July 29-30, WASDA Meeting, Lake Tahoe, NV

Aug 3-4, DOE-NASULGC Workshops at NREL, Golden, CO

Aug 5-9, Idaho and Washington state visits

Aug 10-13 W-SARE Administrative Council meeting, Spokane, WA

Sept 6-7, DOE-NASULGC Partnership Coordinating Committee meeting, Washington DC

Sept 8-10, USDA Water Agricultural Security Listening Session, Park City UT

Sept 12-14, Washington DC

 BAA-Policy Board of Directors meeting

 ESCOP Communications and Marketing Committee meeting

Sept 26-29, ESS Annual meeting and Workshop, Oklahoma City, OK

Action Requested: For Information

Agenda Item 19.2 MRF Justification

Presenter: H. Michael Harrington

Background:

Multistate Research Fund:

A Research Program that Promotes Relevance, Excellence, and Accountability

[Daryl Lund, Tom Fretz, Michael Harrington and Eric Young](#)

[August 2004](#)

Background

The Hatch Act of 1888 established in each state an agricultural experiment station for the purpose of carrying out research that is relevant to the agricultural sector of the state. This sector includes but is not limited to agricultural production, environment and natural resources, food and nutrition, and family and rural community development. The Agricultural Research, Extension, and Education Reform Act of 1998 (AREERA) amended the Hatch Act to identify the Multistate Research Fund (MRF) (previously named the Regional Research Fund). The amendment specifies that:

"Not less than 25 percent shall be allotted to the States for cooperative research employing multidisciplinary approaches in which a State agricultural experiment station, working with another State agricultural experiment station, the Agricultural Research Service, or a college or university, cooperates to solve problems that concern more than 1 State. The funds available under this paragraph, together with the funds available under subsection (b) for a similar purpose, shall be designated as the 'Multistate Research Fund, State Agricultural Experiment Stations'."

The Hatch Act specifies that the funds to each state shall be allocated on the basis of a formula that takes into account the agricultural strength of the state. Neither the Act itself nor subsequent amendments specify that the funds be awarded competitively: 1) in contrast as opposed, 2) Specifically, the multistate research portfolio is designed to encourage and increase multistate collaborations on critical issues that have a national or regional priority. Given the current fiscal climate, increasing integrated multistate efforts to meet local, regional and national research goals is critical and will likely increase. Individual states cannot continue to do all things, meet all needs, and are increasingly dependent on multistate, multidisciplinary approaches to research and outreach activity. Indeed many of the problems that today's scientists are trying to resolve require this multistate, multidisciplinary approach.

Total Hatch appropriation is on the order of \$180M with approximately \$45M (25%) expended on multistate activity. A brief description of the process used to identify multistate research projects will demonstrate that this is an important component in the portfolio of funding mechanisms used to carry out federally supported research for agriculture.

Criteria for Multistate Research Projects

The origin of ideas for multistate projects most often begins with a broad group of stakeholders who interact with faculty and staff at the agricultural experiment stations (SAESs) who have very close contact with stakeholders). Consequently, the projects address problems or issues directly confronting stakeholders that require further research for resolution. Faculty and staff then generate a project proposal that is submitted to one of the four geographical regional associations of agricultural experiment station directors. The project is then subjected to the policies and procedures governing the multistate research fund program. The policies and procedures are contained in the National Multistate Guidelines available at

<http://www.cals.ncsu.edu:8050/escop/NRSP%20Guidelines%20Jan%202004-2.pdf>. Each multistate project is required to meet the following criteria (quoting from the Guidelines):

“A Multistate activity involves cooperative, jointly planned research employing multidisciplinary approaches in which a SAES, working with other SAES, the Agricultural Research Service (ARS), or a college or university, cooperates to solve problems that concern more than one state and usually more than one region. In addition, the following must be demonstrated in the project proposal:

1. The objectives are clearly focused.
2. Each participant listed has direct involvement in the accomplishment of the stated objectives.
3. The project is multistate and multidisciplinary.
4. The project proposal has been peer-reviewed.
5. The proposed project is oriented toward accomplishment of specific outcomes and impacts and based on priorities developed from stakeholder input.
6. The project is responsive to CSREES goals.”

Review Procedures for Multistate Research Projects

Multistate research projects are subjected to a two stage review/approval process to become eligible for an experiment station director to allocate Hatch appropriation to a researcher and count the expenditure against the Multistate Research Fund. During the initial stage a pre-proposal is developed and reviewed by a committee of department heads from relevant disciplines and/or a committee of experiment station directors. This review assures that the general approach being proposed has merit, that faculty with appropriate expertise are involved, and that the proposed activity is relevant to current needs of industry and other stakeholders. The second stage involves development of a full proposal and a rigorous peer review for scientific quality. This review is conducted by scientists not associated with the project but knowledgeable in the subject matter. Concerns that are identified in the peer review process must be addressed in subsequent revision of the proposal in order to obtain approval. A committee of experiment station directors again reviews all revisions to assure appropriate responses to the concerns raised in the review process. A final recommendation is then made to the entire group of experiment station directors for that region. The regional association then reviews the project proposal before final approval by the regional association. The ultimate objective of this portion of the peer review process is to demonstrate that the proposed research is of the very highest scientific quality, is multistate, is interdisciplinary, and meets stakeholder needs, and is consistent with regional and national goals.

After approval of the project by the regional association, the project is then submitted to CSREES where one or more CSREES national program leaders subject the proposal to review. This part of the review is to ensure compliance of the project with requirements specified in the National Multistate Guidelines.

There is yet another peer review that occurs within an approved multistate project. Each participant in the project must generate a project proposal that contains one or more of the exact objectives as stated in the multistate project. Each participant then describes within his/her specific proposal the procedures and methodology that will be used in his/her specific project to achieve the objectives. Since the multistate project must be “multistate” and interdisciplinary, the investigator must demonstrate that his/her specific project contributes to achieving these dimensions of the multistate project.

Responsiveness of the MRF

One of the mechanisms that separates and distinguishes the MRF from other funding mechanisms is the rapidity with which research projects can be initiated to meet rapidly emerging needs as identified by scientists and stakeholders is termed rapid response projects. These regional MRF projects can be established within a matter of a few days based on stakeholder needs and scientific interest. Several recent examples of rapid responses to meet emerging needs are cited below.

- Karnal bunt infestation in wheat, a pest infestation that first appeared in 1997 in the US, could cause untold damage to the wheat production system of the US if not held in check. Today a group of scientists from appropriate disciplines are attacking the problem.
- Another rapid response project is addressing the potentially devastating disease of transmissible spongiform encephalopathies. This group of diseases includes “mad cow disease” and “chronic wasting disease” and represents a family of emerging, potentially zoonotic diseases affecting US Agriculture and Wildlife management. While most of these disorders are species-specific, they have the potential to cause massive economic losses due to general concern over the potential consequences of a zoonotic spread.
- In the northeast US, during the last several years, fruit growers in New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey have suffered severe financial losses because infestations by internal fruit feeding *Lepidoptera* have led to numerous loads of apples being rejected by fresh fruit markets and processing plants. The escalating incidence of severe fruit damage in commercial apple orchards caused by internal fruit feeding *Lepidoptera* clearly poses a threat to the continued viability of this industry.
- Finally the disease organism attacking oak trees in the US has been addressed through a rapid response project. *Phytophthora ramorum* is the cause of “sudden oak death” on certain members of the *Fagaceae* and ramorum blight of many nursery crops. The pathogen was first identified in 1993 in Germany and the Netherlands on *Rhododendron* and *Viburnum*. It is now causing widespread disease in nurseries within nine European countries. Research is necessary because the climatological requirements and ecological constraints of this pathogen are not known, and eastern red oak forests are at risk because they contain numerous susceptible hosts including *Quercus falcata*, *Quercus rubra*, *Kalmia latifolia*, and *Rhododendron*.

The MRF rapid response mechanism has allowed the experiment station system to respond with scientists of the appropriate disciplines to address the research needs of these important problems. Each of these projects was established within a matter of a few weeks time. Under no circumstances could a traditionally competitively awarded program have responded to these important problems with the expertise that was needed within such a short time period.

Efficiency and Effectiveness of the MRF

Given the review process that has been detailed above, it should be quite clear that the MRF system of developing and implementing research programs that are responsive to stakeholder needs is efficient and effective. From the outset of a project, a CSREES Program Leader is assigned by CSREES to the project. This assures that the project is aligned with the goals of the agency and USDA. Furthermore, every MRF project must document its effectiveness through submission of the annual SAES-422 form, an accountability statement generated by the scientists that documents the accomplishments and impacts of the project. The CSREES Program Leader on the project and the project Administrative Advisor annually review the impact statement, another form of peer-review. The MRF program has a further advantage lending to its efficiency by having the potential to involve multiple partners without the use of burdensome subcontracts. The call for participation in projects is widely distributed, and most projects have participants from the private sector, federal government laboratories (such as DOE scientists, ARS scientists, etc.), and non-land grant universities. Finally, the MRF program has the ability to not only bring scientists from widely disparate fields together from far-ranging funding sources but also to leverage the investment from these sources to address the research issue. The National Research Support Projects (NRSPs) are a good example of leveraged funding. Currently these 7 projects are undergoing a thorough review by the NRSP Review Committee. In justifying the investment that the MRF is making in the project on atmospheric deposition (NRSP 3), it was demonstrated that an annual investment of \$112,000 was leveraged 27 to 1 (i.e. total research investment of over \$3,000,000). It is doubtful that many NRI, NIH or NSF projects can claim that leveraging power.

Multistate Research Funds as Part of a Portfolio of Funds

Within federally funded research, there are several mechanisms for allocating funds to research projects. Two of the most common are competitive grants programs and Congressional earmarks. In USDA, both of these mechanisms are used along with Hatch funds to support research directed to achieving the goals of the USDA. As noted above, the multistate research funds are mandated under Congressional legislation. Although the Multistate Research Fund is not awarded in a competitive manner similar to the NRI (USDA/CSREES National Research Initiative), NSF (National Science Foundation), or NIH (DHHS National Institutes of Health), it nonetheless seeks to address stakeholder input, to meet high priority regional and national needs that are not easily addressed with other funding sources, and to draw upon the collaborative strength of the land grant universities and their partners. Among all the funding sources mentioned above, the Multistate Research Fund is the only mechanism where 100% of the funds are used to enhance multistate, multidisciplinary research. In addition, these funds are used to leverage a significant amount of funding from other federal, state, and private sources. As shown above, the research is subjected to more peer review by scientists than any other competitively awarded research grant. Finally, this system of projects focuses the unique capacity of the state agricultural experiment stations and their collaborators on important issues facing US agriculture, the environment and natural resources, food and nutrition, and family and rural community development. Currently there are approximately 170 multistate research projects and 7 national research support projects. For the period 2000 – 2004, more than 90% were revised with peer-review input. This is a testament to the quality of the peer-review system employed in the MRF. Furthermore, approximately 8% of all new project proposals and 8% of all renewals were rejected for a variety of reasons. The MRF is an excellent, responsive, effective funding mechanism addressing relevant researchable issues. It is a fundamental cornerstone that complements other competitively awarded research projects.

Action Requested: For information