

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



**Harrah's
Lake Tahoe, NV
September 25, 2006**

SUMMARY OF ACTIONS

1.	Approved Agenda as circulated and posted on the WAAESD web page	3
2.	Approved Minutes of July 2006 Meeting as posted on the WAAESD web page	3
3.	Approved Treasurer's Report as presented	7
4.	Approved the position statement on formula funds with the recommendation that language be inserted regarding concern for base funds and that the statement be provided to the Federal Administration only upon a crisis.	11
5.	Approved revised publication guidelines, pending final changes. Posted document reflects changes	22
6.	A followup survey on the use of formula funds will be developed by Jeff Jacobsen, Carol Lewis, and Don Cooksey.	41
7.	Unanimously approved resolution to Drs. Thawley and Pardini, Ms. Clopton, and their colleagues	42

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Attendance	1
Agenda	1
1.0 Introductions and Announcements	2
2.0 Adoption of Agenda, Approval of Minutes of July 2006 Meeting	3
3.0 Interim Actions of Chair	4
4.0 Treasurer's Report	5
5.0 Formula Funds Position Statement on Formula and Competitively Allocated Federal Funding	8
6.0 Proposed modifications to the By Laws to reflect change in authority for RCIC	12
7.0 Publication Policy Revisions	13
8.0 Executive Director Report, July-September, 2006	23
9.0 WAAESD Potential Budget Priority Issues	27
10.0 State Reports - Use of Formula Funds	28
11.0 Resolutions	42
12.0 NRSP Balloting	43
13.0 Other Business	44
14.0 Future Meetings	45
15.0 Changing of the Guard	46

Attendance:

Alaska	Carol E. Lewis	New Mexico	LeRoy Daugherty
Arizona	C. Colin Kaltenbach	Oregon	Jan Auyong
California	Donald Cooksey		Thayne Dutson
Colorado	Lee Sommers	Utah	Don Snyder
Guam	Greg Wiecko	Washington	Ralph Cavalieri
Hawaii	C. Y. Hu		Sandra Ristow
	Doug Vincent	Wyoming	Steven Miller
Idaho	Greg Bohach		
Montana	Jeff Jacobsen	OTHERS:	
Nevada	David Thawley	CSREES	Larry Miller
	Ron Pardini	W. Exec. Dir	H. Michael Harrington
	Rang Narayan	OWDA.	Harriet Sykes

**Agenda
Fall WAAESD Meeting
Harrah's, Lake Tahoe, NV
September 25, 2006**

1.0	Introductions and Announcements	Don Snyder
2.0	Adoption of Agenda, Approval of Minutes July 2006 Meeting (see http://www.colostate.edu/Orgs/WAAESD/WAAESD/S06Min.pdf)	Don Snyder
3.0	Interim Actions of Chair	Don Snyder
4.0	Treasurer's Report	Jeff Jacobsen
5.0	Formula Funds Position Statement	LeRoy Daugherty, Jeff Jacobsen, Mike Harrington
6.0	Proposed By-Laws Modification to reflect new authority of RCIC	Don Snyder, H. M. Harrington
7.0	Publications Policy	Greg Bohach
8.0	ED Report	H. M. Harrington
9.0	Regional Priorities	H. M. Harrington
10.0	Use of Formula Funds	All
11.0	Resolutions	Greg Bohach/Jeff Jacobsen
12.0	NRSP Balloting	Lee Sommers
13.0	Other Business	Don Snyder
14.0	Future Meetings: Spring Meeting 2006 Joint Summer Meeting 2007	CY Hu Steve Miller
15.0	Changing of the Guard	Don Snyder/CY Hu
16.0	Adjourn	Don Snyder

Agenda Item 1.0
Introductions and Announcements

Presenter: Don Snyder

Background:

Snyder opened the meeting and requested that the attendees introduce themselves.

Action Requested: For information only

Action Taken: None

Agenda Item 2.0
Adoption of Agenda, Approval of Minutes of July 2006 Meeting

Presenter: Don Snyder

Background:

Snyder indicated that the agenda had been circulated, as well as posted on the WAAESD web page.

The minutes of the July 2006 Meeting are posted on the WAAESD web page at:
<http://www.colostate.edu/Orgs/WAAESD/WAAESD/S06Min.pdf>.

Action Requested: Approval of Agenda and approval of Minutes of July 2006 Meeting

Action Taken: Approved Agenda as circulated and posted on the WAAESD web page.
Approved Minutes of July 2006 Meeting as posted on the WAAESD web page.

Agenda Item 3.0
Interim Actions of Chair

Presenter: Don Snyder

Background:

Snyder reported that the only interim action he had taken was working with Harrington on the development of the Formula Funding Allocation survey.

Action Requested: For information only

Action Taken: None

Agenda Item 4.0 Treasurer's Report

Presenter: Jeff Jacobsen

Background:

WESTERN DIRECTOR EXPERIMENT STATION FINANCIAL STATEMENT FY 2007

18-Sep-06

ASSESSMENTS	FY06 Assessments	Outstanding FY06	Payment Received	Balance Due
Am Samoa	600.00	600.00		1,200.00
Micronesia	600.00		600.00	0.00
Northern Marianas	600.00	600.00		1,200.00
Alaska	8,955.96			8,955.96
Arizona	15,570.45		15,570.45	0.00
California	23,881.91			23,881.91
Colorado	18,524.99		18,524.99	0.00
CSU Rent	(7,800.00)		(7,800.00)	0.00
Guam	8,734.19			8,734.19
Hawaii	11,549.69		11,549.69	0.00
Idaho	13,844.53		13,844.53	0.00
Montana	14,615.88		14,615.88	0.00
Nevada	11,356.86		11,356.86	0.00
New Mexico	11,752.18			11,752.18
Oregon	17,614.59		17,614.59	0.00
Utah	15,352.41		15,352.41	0.00
Washington	22,656.45			22,656.45
Wyoming	13,159.92		13,159.92	0.00
Assessment Total	\$201,570.00		\$124,389.32	78,380.69

INCOME/EXPENSE

Date	Transaction	Income	Expense	Balance
07/01/06	Balance forward			\$7,079.94
	YTD Assessments Received	124,389.32		131,469.26
	July Interest	313.65		131,782.91
	August Interest	320.10		132,103.01
	September Interest			132,103.01
	October Interest			132,103.01
	November Interest			132,103.01
	December Interest			132,103.01
	January Interest			132,103.01
	February Interest			132,103.01
	March Interest			132,103.01
	April Interest			132,103.01
	May Interest			132,103.01
	June Interest			132,103.01
07/01/06	MT Accounting Fee		3,500.00	128,603.01
10/01/06	CSU First Qtr		50,392.50	78,210.51
10/01/06	CSU Second Qtr		50,392.50	27,818.01
	CSU Third Qtr			27,818.01
	CSU Fourth Qtr			27,818.01
TOTAL		125,023.07	104,285.00	27,818.01

**WESTERN DIRECTOR ACADEMIC PROGRAMS
FINANCIAL STATEMENT
FY 2007**

18-Sep-06

ASSESSMENTS	FY07 Assessments	Outstanding FY06	Payment Received	Balance Due
Alaska	1,120.21			\$1,120.21
American Samoa	200.00	\$200.00		\$400.00
Arizona	1,120.21		1,120.21	\$0.00
California	1,120.21			\$1,120.21
Colorado	1,120.21		1,120.21	\$0.00
Guam	1,120.21			\$1,120.21
Hawaii	1,120.21		1,120.21	\$0.00
Idaho	1,120.21		1,120.21	\$0.00
Micronesia	200.00		200.00	\$0.00
Montana	1,120.21		1,120.21	\$0.00
Northern Marianas	200.00	200.00		\$400.00
Nevada	1,120.21		1,120.21	\$0.00
New Mexico	1,120.21		1,120.21	\$0.00
Oregon	1,120.21		1,120.21	\$0.00
Utah	1,120.21		1,120.21	\$0.00
Washington	1,120.21			\$1,120.21
Wyoming	1,120.21		1,120.21	\$0.00
Assessment Total	\$16,283.00	\$400.00	\$ 1,402.10	\$5,280.90

INCOME/EXPENSE

Date	Transaction	Income	Expense	Balance
07/01/06	Balance forward			\$5,077.22
	YTD Assessments Received	11,402.10		16,479.32
	July Interest	16.76		16,496.08
	August Interest	17.11		16,513.19
	September Interest			16,513.19
	October Interest			16,513.19
	November Interest			16,513.19
	December Interest			16,513.19
	January Interest			16,513.19
	February Interest			16,513.19
	March Interest			16,513.19
	April Interest			16,513.19
	May Interest			16,513.19
	June Interest			16,513.19
9/15/2006	CSU First Qtr		4,070.75	12,442.44
9/15/2006	CSU Second Qtr		4,070.75	8,371.69
	CSU Third Qtr			8,371.69
	CSU Fourth Qtr			8,371.69
TOTAL		\$11,435.97	\$8,141.50	8,371.69

**WESTERN DIRECTOR'S SPECIAL ACCOUNT
FINANCIAL STATEMENT
FY 2007**

18-Sep-06

ASSESSMENTS			
	FY07 Assessments	Payment	Balance Due
Alaska	\$647.20		\$647.20
Arizona	1,125.20	1,125.20	0.00
California	1,725.82		1,725.82
Colorado	1,338.70	1,338.70	0.00
Guam	631.17		631.17
Hawaii	834.64	834.64	0.00
Idaho	1,000.47	1,000.47	0.00
Montana	1,056.21	1,056.21	0.00
Nevada	820.70	820.70	0.00
New Mexico	849.27		849.27
Oregon	1,272.91	1,272.91	0.00
Utah	1,109.44	1,109.44	0.00
Washington	1,637.26		1,637.26
Wyoming	951.00	951.00	0.00
Assessment Total	\$15,000.00	\$9,509.27	\$5,490.73

INCOME/EXPENSE				
Date	Transaction	Income	Expense	Balance
07/01/06	Balance forward			\$5,567.05
	YTD FY07 Assessment Received	\$9,509.27		15,076.32
	July Interest	\$22.94		15,099.26
	August Interest	\$23.41		15,122.67
	September Interest			15,122.67
	October Interest			15,122.67
	November Interest			15,122.67
	December Interest			15,122.67
	January Interest			15,122.67
	February Interest			15,122.67
	March Interest			15,122.67
	April Interest			15,122.67
	May Interest			15,122.67
	June Interest			15,122.67
				15,122.67
				15,122.67
Total		\$9,555.62	\$0.00	15,122.67

The Office of the Western Directors Association will follow up on the unpaid assessments.

Action Requested: Approval

Action Taken: Approved Treasurer's Report as presented

Agenda Item Item 5.0
Formula Funds Position Statement on Formula and Competitively Allocated
Federal Funding

Presenters: LeRoy Daugherty, Greg Bohach, Jeff Jacobsen, Mike Harrington

Background:

In the President's FY 06 budget 50% cuts in Hatch and McIntire-Stennis formula funds were proposed, with elimination in FY 07, and elimination of Animal Health and Disease funds. This trend was continued in the FY 2007 budget proposal with the movement of 35% of Hatch and 59 % of McIntire-Stennis funds into two nationally competitive multistate grant programs with the elimination of Animal Health and Disease funds. The former program would expand to a total of 55.6% of Hatch allocation over the next 5 years. Significant cuts in Smith-Lever funds have also been proposed in recent past President's budget.

It is clear that these decisions are directed at the manner in which funds are allocated; rather than the result of any analysis of the outcomes, accomplishments, leveraging and impacts of these funds. In fact, the Office of Management and Budget's Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) downgrades programs such as the above formula funds programs because of the funding mechanisms rather than any substantive criterion.

The difficulty in maintaining formula funds and the slow increase in competitive funds over many years has generated discussion about the relative merits of federal funding allocated by formula and by competition. An ESCOP commissioned [Counterfactual Study](#) of formula funds indicated that Hatch funding of public agricultural and natural resource research has benefitted society over the last 30 years with an annual rate of return of approximately 50%, as compared to the S & P 500's average rate of return of 8.5%, while government bonds have experienced a growth rate of just 3% above the inflation rate. There is no similar data or study showing the rate return on scientific merit, curiosity driven competitive research. Thus, the commitment of federal formula funds supporting research and extension has been an outstanding investment for the American Public in its food system.

In addition, ESCOP and ECOP appointed the joint Formula Funds Task Force to make recommendations on how to most effectively advocate for federal formula funds. The Task Force has recommended the use of the term "Base Funds" rather than Formula Funds to more clearly demonstrate the use of the funds by the SAES. Therefore, Base Funds will be used throughout the remainder of this position paper. This Task Force has not yet issued a formal report, however several white papers have been posted from members of this committee (see [Formula Fund White Papers](#)).

From discussion during the WAAESD spring and summer meetings and from other current discussions, it is apparent that there is also a need for proposed rationale and strategy to address on-going education of select groups regarding the use and value of these funds and developing strategies for future budget requests

Action: Following discussion of the status of formula funds for Research and Extension at the WAAESD meeting in March 2006, it was agreed that a position

statement on Base Funds should be developed. Members of writing team were LeRoy Daugherty (NM), Jeff Jacobsen (MT), Greg Bohach (ID), and Mike Harrington (WAAESD-ED)

**Position Statement on Base Funds and Competitive Programs
Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors
September, 2006**

The Hatch, McIntire-Stennis, and Smith-Lever Acts authorize the use of federal funds (Base Funds) for direct payment to each state to support food, agricultural and natural resources research and extension. These Acts also specify how the allocations are to be made and the requirement for state matching funds.

In addition, many federal competitive peer-reviewed funding programs have been established by Congress that provide funds for food, agriculture and natural resources research, including the NRI with USDA, NSF, and NIH. These funding agencies have a highly evolved scientific-merit based selection process that determines allocation of funds within identified priority areas, most of which focus on more curiosity-driven or basic research. Some 20% of these funds may be used for integrated activities including applied research and an even smaller percentage to Extension.

A balanced portfolio of funding sources for agricultural research and extension in the Land Grant University system is essential. Federal, state, local and private funds that support public research and extension programs combine to address a broad range of stakeholder interests that demand significant impacts and high-value return to society. It is also critical that these funds be allocated through both formula and competitive decisions as a way to ensure continuation of local user-guided and locally relevant research and extension.

Competitive peer-review mechanisms for funding decisions, that are scientific, merit-focused and curiosity-driven, help to maintain high program quality and creativity, but provide little assurance that an optimal value return will be derived by society from the investments. By contrast, the highly consultative processes involving federal, state, and local stakeholder interests are used to provide direction on the use of formula allocated funds, help to ensure local societal relevance, but depend on the administration to maintain high quality.

Agricultural and natural resource research programs that receive broad support from public and private sources provide the entire spectrum of discovery through application, but these programs require a stable base of support to maintain focus on specific outcomes over a long time frame. Research and development is inherently an uncertain enterprise of exploring the unknown, testing hypotheses, and trial and error applications, frequently over many years; which is ultimately followed by the extension of technology to stakeholders. Federal funds allocated by formula provide the foundation and continuity from year to year that is required to sustain this process. Base Funds provide the basis for research that requires a longer time horizon and addresses specific priorities of local, state and regional stakeholders. Furthermore, Base Funds support a discovery and dissemination capacity that is capable of responding quickly to new problems and issues.

The Land Grant Universities maximize both the quality of both research programs and the value-returns to society from public investments. A balanced combination of long-term formula allocated base support and short-term competitive funding makes this possible. Both competitive and Base Funds have distinct advantages:

- Competitive mechanisms ensure high quality research, but do not ensure relevance. The customers of competitive funding mechanisms are generally the recipients' professional peers and the granting agency.
- Base Funds promote engagement of the LGU system with its customers -- producers and consumers, while competitive funds encourage interaction with professional peers.

- Research programs that utilize Base Funds increase relevance and quality through stakeholder input and review, while competitively funded programs depend on peer review.
- Base Funds support research that is not supported through competitive mechanisms or by the private sector.
- Competitively allocated funding cannot maintain research infrastructure (buildings, scientific equipment, and trained people) essential to sustainable programs. Stable formula allocated funds provide a continuous base of support necessary for these long-term investments. Few, if any, large institutions have the local funding base that enables them to maintain essential infrastructure without federal funding and still meet the locally prioritized needs of the state/nation.
- Base Funds allow continuation of a system that can provide flexible and timely responses to immediate problems. For example, LGU personnel were able to address the recent Soybean Rust outbreak rapidly without waiting on a competitive funding cycle. Base Funds allow maintenance of a response system to address this type of emergency.
- Formula funding facilitates multistate collaboration that is more efficient, systematic, inclusive, and sustainable than does competitive funding mechanisms (e.g., eXtension and multistate research activities).
- Base Funds leverage funds at a regional average of 4 to 1, while competitive funds are rarely matched more than 1 to 1.
- Base Funds provide the capacity that is “glue” that binds the federal-state partnership with the LGU system together and provides the technological basis of the success of American agriculture.
- The loss of Base Funds, even with an equal increase in competitive funds, will further disadvantage smaller institutions and will have a detrimental impact on regional and national networks of research and extension programs. All states and LGUs will be negatively impacted, but smaller states and institutions will be impacted disproportionately. Competitive-only mechanisms create or exacerbate the “have’s and the have-not’s”.

Accordingly, the Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors herewith affirms its commitment to the continuation of Hatch, McIntire-Stennis and Animal Health and Disease Base Funds as crucial mechanisms that support research and extension within the state agricultural experiment stations.

Action Requested: Approval of the Position Statement on Formula Funds

Action Taken: Approved the position statement on formula funds with the recommendation that language be inserted regarding concern for base funds and that the statement be provided to the Federal Administration only upon a crisis.

Agenda Item 6.0

Proposed modifications to the By Laws to reflect change in authority for RCIC

Presenters: Don Snyder and Mike Harrington

Background:

At the joint 2007 Joint Summer Meeting all regional associations approved the request from RCIC to grant authority to the committee to approve multistate activities. This request was made to streamline the processes already in place and to remove the 4 month lag between recommendations made at the Spring RCIC meeting and the Joint Summer meeting at which time the regional associations take action. The procedure will also facilitate more timely notification to Committees of RCIC action.

The By-Laws need to be altered to reflect this change in policy. The appropriate section can be found under "Article VII - Committees and Designees". The suggested modifications are shown below with new language in bold and underlined.

Regional Coordination and Implementation Committee (RCIC). The RCIC is comprised of members of the WDA, the Western Extension Directors, and the Western Academic Program Directors and other partner agencies and groups. The RCIC is responsible for the review and on-going evaluation of the region's portfolio of multistate activities that are funded in part by the multistate research fund. The RCIC ~~recommends projects for approval to~~ **approves multistate activities on behalf of** the WDA, the Western Extension Directors, and the Western Academic Program Directors and designates Administrative Advisors for projects from among the WDA, and other such administrators within the region consistent with the policies of USDA-CSREES governing the multistate research program. **The RCIC provides regular reports of its activities actions to the WDA, the Western Extension Directors, and the Western Academic Program Directors.**

An additional change to the By-Laws to change the date of service for officers from the first of the calendar year to after the Experiment Station Section Meeting was discussed. This would bring the term of service in line with the other regional associations' officers.

Changes to the By Laws require a 30 day notice before a vote is taken. Any additional modifications that arise for our discussion will be made prior to sending out to the Association for an electronic ballot.

Action Requested: Authorization to proceed with suggested changes in By-Laws.

Action Taken: For information only

Agenda Item 7.0 Publication Policy Revisions

Presenters: Greg Bohach, Jeff Jacobson, Mike Harrington
Background:

The WAAESD Publications Policy was developed a number of years ago. We have worked with member to modify as appropriate the Policy to remove cumbersome language and to reflect updated practices.

WAAESD PUBLICATION POLICY (Revised September 2006)

INTRODUCTION

The Administrative Advisors (AAs) and Technical Committees (TCs) of Western Region Research Projects and Multi-state Integrated Activities are responsible for making available the findings of their projects' activities and results. This is accomplished by prompt publication as electronic regional publications, station bulletins, or scientific papers via professional journals and their sponsoring societies. When a multi-state activity is being planned, consideration should be given to the kinds of publications expected to develop during and following completion of the activity. In choosing the type of publication, consideration should be given to the audience to whom the new information may be of interest and use. Publication through the Western Region of the State Agricultural Experiment Station (SAES) system is done through an electronic process that is deposited on the internet. This process is described below.

PUBLICATION GUIDELINES AND PROCEDURES

Individual Station Publications. Each agricultural experiment station (AES) may generate publications upon the completion of its contribution to a multi-state project. These publications should describe plans for inclusion in relevant regional publications and should not interfere with their development. However, information and research results from individual state contributions, and are therefore not eligible for submission as a regional publication, should be issued separately by the experiment station involved. Such publications should carry the following footnote [Contributions from the "name state" Agricultural Experiment Station (or analogous unit) results from participation in Western Regional Activity W-____ or WCC or WERA-___ entitled "_____"].

These publications should also be produced electronically for the internet and placed on that institution's Web server. The Western Association of AES Directors (WAAESD) has links to all SAES web servers in the Western Region. Therefore, individuals who access the WAAESD website will also be able to access individual station reports.

Western Region Publications. WAES scientists and extension personnel are involved in a variety of Multi-state Research and Multi-state Coordinating Committees (WCCs) or Education/Extension Research Activities (WERA) projects. These cooperative efforts are expected to lead to advances in science or technology and it is expected that these findings will be published and made available to potential users. Such advances are often best expressed via publications that cut across scientific disciplines. This may require special distribution to best reach the audiences for which publications are intended. Western Region electronic publications can serve that need.

WAAESD PUBLICATION POLICY

(Revised September 2006)

These publications are principally, but not exclusively, the result of research and integrated activities accomplished via multi-state projects and sponsored by WAAESD members. These include efforts by WCCs and WERAs to compile and organize separate research findings into unified documentation via conferences and workshops. In the same manner, other less formal cooperative efforts within the region can use the publication series.

The basic requirement for Western Regional publications is that they:

- Involve teams of research and/or extension scientists that have an AA officially appointed by the Western AES Directors, and/or Western Extension Directors Association (WEDA), and/or Western Academic Program Directors Association (WAPDA).

Publications resulting from Western Regional multi-state projects are issued in the Western Region publication series. The Office of the Western Directors Association (OWDA) assigns series numbers in chronological order of acceptance. These publications do not carry individual state series numbers in addition to the regional numbers.

Preparing Publications. General guidelines and forms needed to complete a Western Regional publication are located on the WAAESD website at:

<http://www.colostate.edu/Orgs/WAAESD/Workroom/pubguide/pubguide.htm>.

It is the responsibility of the AA to provide guidance to the TC regarding the procedures for preparing, and requesting approval for, electronic publication through the WAAESD. Publications are prepared, edited, and proofread by the TC of the regional project or by appropriate individuals designated by the TC with approval of the AA. If available, a member of the editorial/publication/communication staff of the institution that will submit the publication (Publishing Institution) may be added as an ad hoc member of the TC early in the manuscript development. This person should become familiar with the WAAESD [Format Guidelines for Electronic Publications](#) at the website listed above. The editorial staff member may assist in developing the publication plan, arranging for illustrative material, editing, and converting to an internet compatible format.

Western Regional publications should recognize all participating institutions and agencies on the bottom of the Cover Page. The lead institution or agency, if any, should be listed first; others should follow in alphabetical order by states.

Only individuals who participate in a scholarly manner and contribute to the publication preparation will be included as authors. Publications can be written entirely by all authors, or authors may be credited with specific chapters or other designated sections. Typically, the principal participants from each cooperating AES and agencies will be joint authors unless otherwise provided for by the TC. The senior or corresponding author(s) is/are listed first or last depending on the tradition in their discipline. Typically, other authors should be listed in alphabetical order. Alternatively, if approved by the AA, an alternative listing protocol could be used and decided on a case-by-case basis.

Style. Standards of style and word usage are based on the Council of Biology Editors Style Manual, Chicago Style Manual, and Websters New Collegiate Dictionary. If a word is not present in Websters New Collegiate Dictionary, the latest edition of Websters Unabridged Dictionary may be substituted. When words have different spellings (e.g., color or colour), use the more frequently accepted spelling (usually first in Websters).

WAAESD PUBLICATION POLICY

(Revised September 2006)

To assist in style, word usage, and other publication preparation aspects, it is desirable that a writer-editor be selected to attend and participate in TC meetings in which cooperative publications are being planned or developed.

Issues. Each Western Regional Publication will be published as a separate issue. In cases where a series of related topics (each a separate publication) requires publication, titles may be used whereby a portion of the title is constant and each member of the sub-series is designated by a Roman numeral and its specific title (example: Marketing Fruit in the Southern United States. I. Apples)

Review and approval process. The AA must also conduct a peer review of the publication as part of the process for determining its suitability for publication. A minimal requirement is that the AA must request and receive written peer reviews from at least three reviewers not directly associated with the regional project and not having conflicts of interest with any of the participants on the project.

Considering the results of the completed review process, the AA should assess the acceptability for publication. In some cases, it may be appropriate for the authors and the TC to consider results of the review and make revisions accordingly. If deemed acceptable, the AA should forward the publication to the OWDA to request approval. This request must include a copy of the peer reviews, a response to the reviews, and a completed application (see [Request for Publication Number](#) form below) which is down-loadable from the website above. If approved by the WAAESD Chair, the OWDA will assign a publication number and enter the title and Publishing Institution in the regional records.

Publication process. If accepted for publication, it is the responsibility of the Publishing Institution shall transmit the publication to the OWDA where it will be placed on the Association's web server and website. It is also the responsibility of the OWDA to notify all participating state AES Directors of the new publication and direct them to the appropriate website. In turn, the AES Directors should inform scientists at their stations. Only one printed copy must be generated by the Publishing Institution. This copy should be forwarded to the National Agricultural Library (NAL) for archiving. This printed copy may be generated from the internet with the cover sheet placed on cardstock and the publication bound as desired.

In summary, the order of procedure is:

1. Preparation and technical review of proposed publication by the AA and scientists responsible for the research.
2. Peer review of the publication.
3. Request for approval and publication number from the OWDA (See [Request for Western Region Publication Number](#) form)
4. Approval by the WAAESD Chair and assignment of a publication number by OWDA.
5. Placing document on the Publishing Institution's internet server and informing the OWDA web server administrator where the document is located.
6. Notifying the appropriate libraries, state AES Directors and agencies of the publication and providing WAAESD's URL for electronic access and printing. QUESTION: Should USDA CSREES be notified too?
7. Forwarding one hard copy to NAL for archive purposes.

WAAESD PUBLICATION POLICY

(Revised September 2006)

Format Guidelines for Electronic Publications

Go to WAAESD Website at <http://www.colostate.edu/Orgs/WAAESD/> select “Workroom”, then “Working Documents”, then “Publishing Guidelines”, and finally chose the HTML template for “Cover”, “First Page”, or “Other Pages”. Download the appropriate HTML file and associated graphics to your computer. These templates contain all the required elements for your publication; simply insert your text, photographs, graphics, etc.

Each Western Region Publication should contain the following in the order listed:

- **Cover Sheet** ([Refer to template and see example](#))
 - Title bar: use abbreviated title.
 - Western Region banner, centered; same size as in template.
 - Title of publication.
 - Series publication number (assigned by OWDA).
 - Publication date.
 - URL.
 - Contact information (AES name, address, phone, etc.).
 - List of cooperating institutions/agencies in alphabetical order by state.

- **First Section** ([Refer to template](#)): (This may be the only section unless the length of the publication calls for separating Table of Contents' sections into separate files).
 - Title bar: use abbreviated title.
 - Western banner: centered at the top; same size as template.
 - Date of publication: flush left under banner.
 - Series publication number: flush right under banner.
 - Title of publication: centered.
 - Cover graphic or photo if desired: title may be part of the graphic.
 - Authors: List senior author(s) first or last, then others alphabetically. Links to researcher websites or biographies are permitted.
 - Abstract: set off with horizontal lines.
 - Table of Contents: link to full text of each item in contents.
 - Foreword or Preface:
 - List cooperating states and agencies in alphabetical order, identifying the publishing institution or agency separately.
 - List TC membership.

WAAESD PUBLICATION POLICY

(Revised September 2006)

- Provide acknowledgements or other recognition deemed appropriate by the TC such as the AA contributions.
- Identify all relevant funding sources.
- Body: Publication text follows in logical sequence, unless separate files are deemed appropriate (by the technical and administrative reviewers) due to excessive length.
- Citation: Reference the regional project (e.g. W-106, WERA-041, etc.) from which publication data were generated and the cooperating AES and agencies (specific wording on template).
- EEO Statement: Provide an equal opportunity statement for "SAES".
- Document Preparer. In small type, list:
 - Prepared by:
 - Name of person, academic title, postal and email addresses
 - Name of AES or agency
- **Subsequent Sections (if needed) ([Refer to template](#))**
 - Depending on length of publication, and according to recommendations made by technical and administrative reviewers, sections within the table of contents may need to be stand-alone files. If so, they should each contain:
 - The publication number (Western #) in the Title Bar.
 - Text and graphics.
 - A link back to contents or title page.
 - Document preparer information as above.
- **Conclusions.** The 'conclusions' section of the publication should include the following:
 - **Brief summary of the study's purpose and goals.**
 - **Summary of the major findings.**
 - **Significance of the study and its findings.**
 - **Impacts and accomplishments.**
 - Future directions if relevant.

WAAESD PUBLICATION POLICY

(Revised September 2006)

Request for Western Region Publication Number

Date: _____

FROM: _____
ADMINISTRATIVE ADVISOR SIGNATURE

TO: CHAIR: WESTERN ASSOCIATION OF AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION DIRECTORS

I hereby request approval for publication of a Western Region Publication.

() Peer review evaluations and responses from the Technical Committee are attached..

Title:

Authors and Affiliations:

Publishing (Submitting) Institution:

Multi-State Committee(s) involved (if any):

The URL of the draft publication is:

http:_____

Approved: _____

(Chair, Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors)

Note: Chairman will forward an approved request to the Executive Director for assignment of a series. The Executive Director will notify the Administrative Advisor and the Chair of Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors of the number assigned.

Western Region Publication Number # _____

WAAESD PUBLICATION POLICY

(Revised September 2006)

Cover Page Template

Abbreviated title:



TITLE OF PUBLICATION

Western Region Publication # _____

Publication Date

Publishing Institution Contact Information

List cooperating institutions and/or agencies: lead institution followed in alphabetical order by state:

WAAESD PUBLICATION POLICY

(Revised September 2006)

Sample Cover Page

Abbreviated title: Growing crops in the west



IMPROVED METHODS FOR GROWING CROPS IN THE WESTERN UNITED STATES

Western Region Publication #_123456____

Publication Date: 9/16/06

Idaho Agricultural Experiment Station

Agricultural Sciences Bldg.

University of Idaho

Moscow, ID 83844

Phone: (208) 885-7173

FAX: (208) 885-6654

Email: agres@uidaho.edu

Cooperating institutions and/or agencies in alphabetical order:

1. University of Idaho
2. Agricultural Research Service
3. University of Alaska
4. University of Arizona
5. Oregon State University
6. Utah State University
7. continue as needed

WAAESD PUBLICATION POLICY

(Revised September 2006)

Subsequent Section Template

Publication number:

TITLE OF SECTION

Text and Graphics formatted as in First Section

XX
XX
XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

| [\(Link to\) Return to Contents](#) |

Document prepared by:

Name of person, postal and email address

Name of institution

Action Requested: Approval

Action Taken: Approved revised publication guidelines, pending final changes. Posted document reflects changes

Agenda Item 8.0
Executive Director Report, July-September, 2006

Presenter: H. Michael Harrington
Background:

REGIONAL ACTIVITIES

WAAESD

Summer Meeting: Worked with Don Snyder to develop the WAAESD meeting agenda and with Wes Holley, Doug Steele and Lyla Houglum, on the joint WAAESD-WED-WAPD agenda.

Fall Meeting: Worked with Don Snyder to develop the WAAESD meeting agenda.

Publication Guidelines: Worked with Greg Bohach and Jeff Jacobson to refine the regional publication Guidelines

Formula Funds Position Statement: Worked with LeRoy Daugherty, Jeff Jacobson and Greg Bohach to refine the draft position statement on Formula Funds.

By Laws Modification: Worked with Don Snyder to develop proposed modifications to the WAAESD By Laws to reflect the new authority of the RCIC.

Spring Meeting 2007: Working with CY Hu to organize the 2007 spring meeting which will be held on the Big Island of Hawaii. Issued invitation to the NCRA to meeting jointly with the WAAESD.

ESCOP Meeting: Worked with Don Snyder to obtain input on the CREATE-21 proposal as part of the discussion at the summer ESCOP meeting July 26-28.

Western SARE Administrative Council: I serve as the Western Directors' representative on this activity. Provided lead or secondary review comments for 27 pre proposals for Chapter 1 Research and Education grant proposals and read all preproposals submitted. Reviewed applications for graduate student grants.

WASDA: Attended the WASDA summer meeting in Estes Park CO. Made presentation on regional activities, priorities and the status of the CREATE-21 effort

WESTERN ACADEMIC PROGRAM DIRECTORS

Western Region Teaching Symposium: Assisted with distribution of registration information

National Academies Leadership Summit to Effect Change in Teaching and Learning: With the other EDs developed a team application to attend the Summit. Developed and deployed a short survey that has been sent to all experiment station and academic program Directors.

NATIONAL ACTIVITIES

ESCOP

ESS Annual Meeting, Lake Tahoe

- Assisted Ron Pardini and his staff in planning for the Fall ESS Workshop in Lake Tahoe.
- Developed the agenda for the annual meeting. Worked with the other EDs to develop the workshop agenda.
- Secured the participation of Thomas Dorr, USDA Undersecretary for the Rural Development
- Organized ESS workshop session on biomass and bioenergy.

Support to Chair-elect: Held initial discussion with Ron Pardini and his staff about the needs and expectations in preparation for his service as ESCOP Chair.

LEAD21: Represent ESCOP on the Board for this program. Serve as the Secretary. Attended Board meeting in Kansas City, August 7-9

Budget and Legislative Committee: I am transitioning into the Executive Vice Chair position for this crucial committee. I will be working closely with B&L Chair LeRoy Daugherty and other members of the committee.

Csrees Grants Workshops: Worked with CSREES staff, Tom Fretz and others to organize 3 grantsmanship workshops. The agenda includes a one day overview of CSREES programs by NRI program staff; the second day is a workshop "Writing Winning Grants" conducted by Tom Fretz and myself.

- University of Puerto Rico August 29. 75 people attended. Evaluations were very positive.
- NERA-SAAESD-USDA Grants Workshop. Renaissance Hotel in Washington DC Sept. 6-7: The first workshop was attended by some 150 people. Workshop evaluations were very positive.
- SAAESD-WAAESD-USDA Grants Workshop. Embassy Suites, Grapevine TX Oct. 17-18: University of Arkansas, Oklahoma State University, and Texas A&M University to organize this workshop. There are currently over 125 participants registered. For complete information please see <http://aaes.uark.edu/csrees/>
- The 2007 western workshop will be held in Denver.

National Institute for Agricultural Security: Serve on the Board of Directors and as Secretary to the Board. Participated in a number of conference calls related to so-called "dual use" technologies and in developing a response for the NIAS to a DHS task force.

CREATE-21: I serve on this activity representing AES directors and the Western Region. Facilitated conference calls for ESCOP (June 5) and the all AES Directors (June 30) and provided feedback to the C-21 Task Force. Led the development of a revised set of FAQs based on the detailed proposal. Participated in a number of conference calls and attended joint C-21 and Farm Bill Committee meeting Sept 6-7.

Development of National Strategic Research and Extension Plans for Vegetable

Crops: The EDs are serving on a steering committee and have begun participating in a series of conference calls facilitated by Tom Bewick (CSREES NPL- Horticulture) aimed at developing a greater awareness of the research and extension needs on vegetable crops. Participated in a number of conference calls aimed at identifying additional members for the steering committee.

The process will be similar to what has been for the berry crop initiative with the steering committee drafting a strategic plan. Workshops are then held during which participants from industry and academia would modify the plan as appropriate such that ownership is gained. The steering committees are composed of key industry leaders, representatives from the land-grant partnership and sister agencies from USDA. Throughout the process, careful attention is paid to insuring that the process is industry driven, with the land-grant system and USDA providing leadership through partnership and coordination.

NASULGC-DOE/EERE PARTNERSHIP: The BAA-Policy Board of Directors was charged with implementing the activities for this partnership effort. I represent the executive directors (both AES and CE) on the Steering Committee which provides guidance and oversight for the project. For fy 2007 there are 4 projects pending. I serve as a co-chair on project 1 and also serve on project 4. Specific details:

- Project 1: Developing Collaborations between Regional Associations and DOE Regional Offices and EERE Program Managers. Worked with Linda Fox, Charlotte Eberlein, , Scott Reed, Tony Nakazawa, Jake Fey, Lyla Houglum and staff of the WSU Energy Extension program to finalize details for the 2006-07 program. The project, Pacific Northwest Extension Energy Initiative, is aimed at informing local government agencies and officials about energy efficiency and renewable energy information.

- Project 5: The mission of Team 5 is two-fold; in Fiscal Year 2006, the mission of Team 5 was expanded to address the curriculum development potential at NASULGC institutions to meet the demands of future hiring needs at DOE. This is a long-term objective and will require guidance and input from DOE on projected hiring needs for the future, as well as guidance and input from faculty and administrators at NASULGC institutions.

The mission of developing and implementing a formal exchange program continues. While this will be ongoing and programmatic, the individual exchange opportunities will be temporary and short-term. The emphasis of the exchange program is the placement of NASULGC faculty/researchers at DOE laboratories and in DOE programs; additionally, the temporary placement of DOE scientists at NASULGC institutions continues as an option. The Team has made strong progress toward the development of an ongoing exchange program and also in laying the foundation for working with NASULGC institutions and DOE on curriculum development to meet the projected hiring needs at DOE.

Summary of Travel, July-September, 2006

July 10-13: Western Region Joint Summer Meeting, Monterey CA

July 24 – 27 Portland, OR
Joint COPS, Portland
Budget and Advocacy Committee
ESCOP Meeting
July 29: WASDA Summer meeting, Estes Park, CO
Aug 6-8: LEAD 21 Board meeting Kansas City, KS
Aug 26-29: Grantsmanship Workshop, San Juan PR
Sept 5-7: Washington DC
 Meeting with Planning and Accountability Staff on logic models
CREATE-21 and Farm Bill Committee meeting
 CSREES Grantsmanship Workshop
 Writing Winning Grants Workshop
Sept 24-27: Lake Tahoe, NV
WAAESD fall meeting
ESS Annual Meeting and Workshop

Action Requested: For information only

Action Taken: None

Agenda Item 9.0 WAAESD Potential Budget Priority Issues

Presenter: Mike Harrington

Background:

ESCOP annually develops a set of priorities that are advanced through its Budget and Legislative Committee to the BAA-Budget and Advocacy Committee which, in turn, develops a set of priority issues for which the system will advocate. This process necessarily assures that all parts of the family are included in the process but may not reflect regional needs and priorities.

A short survey was sent to all Directors asking that up to 16 votes be cast for a list of possible priorities. The ranking shown below reflects the collective responses from 13 states. There were no “other” issues identified.

Priority	Issue	Votes
1	Formula Funds	13
	Food Safety	13
	Water Use	13
2	Biofuels	12
	Invasive Species	11
3	Water Quality	11
	Land Use Issues	11
	Obesity/Nutrition	9
4	Plant Genomics	9
	Animal Genomics	9
	Global Climate Change	8
5	Sustainable Production	8
	Specialty Crops	8
	Bioproducts	7
6	Plant Systems	7
	Threat Detection	7
	Functional Foods	6
7	Urban Audiences	5
	Risk Mgt/Risk Assessment	5
8	Biomass	4
	Microbial Genomics	4
	Facilities	4
9	Bioeconomy	3
	Rural Communities	3
	Public Lands	3
10	Solar Energy	2
	Wind Energy	2
	Energy Security	2
	Rural Entrepreneurship	2
11	Energy Efficient Buildings	1
	Facility And Personnel Security	1
	Minority Audiences	0

Agenda Item 10.0
State Reports - Use of Formula Funds

Presenter: Mike Harrington
Background:

The Association has had several discussions on how formula funds are allocated and used. To obtain an initial understanding of these issues a short survey was conducted. Ten stations responded. The results are summarized in the table below.

<p>Allocation decision point</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">State Wide: 1 (CA)</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Station: 7</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Department: 5</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">(Mixed: 5)</p> <p>Basis for allocation</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Historical: 6</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Competitive: 6</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Project: 4</p> <p>Review Processes</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Station/College: 10</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Departmental: 4</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">External: 2</p> <p>Internal reallocation process</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">Yes: 5</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">No: 4</p>	<p>Distribution of funds</p> <p>Personnel</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">81-100%: 6</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">61-80%: 2</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">40-60%: 2</p> <p>Facilities/upkeep</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">>21%: 1</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">10-20%: 0</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">5-10%: 1</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">1-5%: 2</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">0: 5</p> <p>Operations</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">>30%: 1</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">21-30%: 3</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">11-20%: 3</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">0.1-10%: 3</p> <p>Travel</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">5-10%: 3</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">0.1-5%: 4</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">0: 2</p> <p>Other (specify) 0</p>
---	--

State Report
Use of Formula Funds

I. State/territory: ARIZONA

II. Total formula funds:

Hatch	\$1,097,000
Hatch Multistate	\$ 734,000
McIntire-Stennis	\$ 188,000

III. Where is the allocation decision made? (i.e. station administration, departments, etc.)

Dept and Station (primarily)

IV. What is the basis for allocations?

Historical

Competitive

Project *By Project*

V. What types of review processes are used for competitive programs, Hatch or McIntire-Stennis projects?

Faculty develop a project that is peer reviewed at the departmental level—then peer reviewed again by an independent committee at the Station level.

VI. Do you have an internal reallocation process? If so, how does/did it work?

Not really—at least not a formal one

VII. What percentages of funds are allocated to the following?

Personnel	100%
Facilities upkeep	
Operations	
Travel	
Other (specify)	

State Report
Use of Formula Funds

I. State/territory: University of California, Riverside, College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences

II. Total formula funds:

Hatch	\$845,255
Hatch Multistate	\$358,430
McIntire-Stennis	\$ 19,516

III. Where is the allocation decision made? (i.e. station administration, departments, etc.)

The allocation of Hatch formula funds to the three UC agricultural campuses is made by the Vice President (statewide AES Director), UC Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources, based on a historical split between UC Berkeley, UC Davis, and UC Riverside (~25/50/25). At UC Riverside, all Hatch funds (excluding Multistate) are now allocated directly to faculty for research support as part of an internal competitive grant process (see below). A review committee made up of faculty representing different disciplines makes the funding decisions based on 8 mission and merit-based criteria.

Multistate Hatch funds are allocated on a formula basis at UCR by the Executive Associate Dean to departments, based on the number of faculty in their department who are members of active Multistate Research projects. Departments typically allocate a portion of the Multistate funds to those faculty with active Multistate Research projects and use the remainder for departmental infrastructure needs. A small reserve is held in the College to fund faculty travel to Multistate Coordinating Committees as requested.

IV. What is the basis for allocations?

Historical – none on the UCR campus, but allocations of formula funds statewide to the three campuses is based on a historical split.

Competitive – All Hatch funds (excluding Multistate) at UCR are now allocated on a competitive basis directly to faculty for research support.

Project - Hatch Multistate funds are allocated to departments on a formula basis determined by the number of departmental faculty who are on active Multistate Research projects. McIntire-Stennis funds are allocated to one forest entomology project in the Entomology department at UCR (most McIntire-Stennis funds go to UCB and UCD).

V. What types of review processes are used for competitive programs, Hatch or McIntire-Stennis projects?

Hatch funds at UCR are allocated by our internal, peer-reviewed, competitive grant process, in which faculty compete for a funding level every 5 years as they renew their Hatch projects. The proposal is the Hatch project narrative, with some additional material added to address our 8 review criteria related to AES mission and scientific merit. The faculty review committee assigns one of three funding levels, or zero funding, to each project, which determines the funding for a five-year period. The total funding pool is about \$2.6 million, and includes Hatch, state AES, and state CE funds. Funds for this pool came largely from

permanently-funded technical positions that were pulled back from historic departmental allocations in 2003 to fund this competitive process. Currently, 100 out of about 140 AES/CE faculty have been successful in the competitive process and receive one of the three levels of funding. 65% of funded projects receive the highest level of funding (\$35,000 this year), 16% receive the second highest level (\$25,000 this year), and 19% receive the lowest level of funding (\$15,000 this year). The actual amount allocated to faculty per year is based on a share of the total pool available and may vary somewhat from year to year.

VI. Do you have an internal reallocation process? If so, how does/did it work?

See above

VII. What percentages of funds are allocated to the following?

The majority of Hatch funds are spent by faculty on technical personnel on a temporary basis. Some faculty use the Hatch funds for graduate student support (but not for tuition, etc., which are not allowable Hatch expenditures), and many use some Hatch funds for supplies or equipment. Most of the Multistate funds are used by departments for infrastructure.

Personnel – ~80% of Hatch funds are used this way on a temporary basis

Facilities upkeep – ~ 45% of Multistate funds support departmental facilities

Operations - ~20% of Hatch funds are used for operations of individual faculty research programs. ~ 45% of Multistate funds support departmental and individual faculty operations.

Travel – ~10% of Multistate funds are used for travel to Multistate project meetings

State Report
Use of Formula Funds – FY06

I. State/territory: Colorado

II. Total formula funds:

Hatch: \$1,495,011

Hatch Multistate: \$952,938

McIntire-Stennis: \$352,051

III. Where is the allocation decision made? (i.e. station administration, departments, etc.)
Station administration allocates to colleges/departments who in turn allocate to specific approved projects.

IV. What is the basis for allocations?

Historical – Majority of funds to Colleges/Departments based on history

Competitive – About 2-3% of budget

Project – Funding of centrally initiated projects is either targeted to specific areas and partially competitive. Totals about 5% of budget.

V. What types of review processes are used for competitive programs, Hatch or McIntire-Stennis projects?

Each college/department has a peer review process for all Hatch and McIntire-Stennis projects.

VI. Do you have an internal reallocation process? If so, how does/did it work?

With state or university mandated budget cuts, reallocation decision occurs at the Director on amounts allocated to units. Ongoing reallocation process varies with the unit and is the responsibility of the Dean/Department Head in collaboration with AES Director.

VII. What percentages of funds are allocated to the following?

Personnel: 75.9%

Facilities upkeep: 3.3%

Operations: 18.8%

Travel: 2.0%

Other (specify):

State Report
Use of Formula Funds

I. State/territory: Guam

II. Total formula funds:

Hatch \$684,816
Hatch Multistate \$117,679
McIntire-Stennis \$37,852

III. Where is the allocation decision made? (i.e. station administration, departments, etc.)

All 10 members of AES faculty as well as 15 members of AES staff are paid from Hatch (close to 40% of salaries and fringe benefits come from Hatch, and 60% are local match). There is nothing left to allocate.

Multistate funds are used as operational funds to run AES. Scientists having multistate projects are receiving travel funds and little of research funds (30-35% of the total amount). Allocation decisions are made by Associate Director and approved by AES Director.

McIntire-Stennis funds are used mostly to support projects. If needed, small portion of it is being used to supplement costs associated with running AES. Allocation decisions are made by Associate Director and approved by AES Director.

IV. What is the basis for allocations?

Historical: Hatch (only salaries)

Competitive: Faculty members are encouraged to carry one regional project or McIntire Stennis project. Occasionally the same faculty member carries both.

Project: McIntire Stennis

V. What types of review processes are used for competitive programs, Hatch or McIntire-Stennis projects?

All new research proposals (such as Hatch, McIntire Stennis, and Regional Research) are being submitted to AES Associate Director who checks the proposal for completeness and format. A draft proposal that is ready for review is being submitted to external ad hoc Peer Review Committee. Committee is comprised of three faculty members from other universities who are familiar with the issue addressed by the project. Based on the review, that includes assessment of (1) significance, (2) need, (3) approach, (4) new knowledge to be generated, (5) potential for impact, and (6) potential for success, AES administrators are making decisions regarding allocation of resources. Other competitive programs undergo review suitable for this specific program.

VI. Do you have an internal reallocation process? If so, how does/did it work?

No, we do not.

VII. What percentages of funds are allocated to the following?

Personnel 92%

Facilities upkeep 4%

Operations 3%

Travel 1%

Other (specify)

State Report
Use of Formula Funds

I. State/territory: Hawaii

II. Total formula funds:

Hatch: \$844,366

Hatch Multistate: \$368,498

McIntire-Stennis: \$159,345

Animal H&D: \$3,200

III. Where is the allocation decision made? (i.e. station administration, departments, etc.)
Station administration appropriates to individual units (departments, branch stations, and centers); individual unit leaders distribute unit appropriation to individual projects.

IV. What is the basis for allocations?

Historical

Competitive: small amount of funds are distributed on competitive basis.

Project: a majority of funds are distributed to individual units based on the research FTE in the units.

V. What types of review processes are used for competitive programs, Hatch or McIntire-Stennis projects?

A college review committee is used for the competitive program.

VI. Do you have an internal reallocation process? If so, how does/did it work? No.

VII. What percentages of funds are allocated to the following?

Personnel: 57.5%

Facilities upkeep: 0%

Operations: 38.8%

Travel: 3.7%

Other (specify)

State Report
Use of Formula Funds

I. State/territory: Montana (Montana State University)

II. Total formula funds:

Hatch	\$1,321,584
Hatch Multistate	\$ 641,650
McIntire-Stennis	University of Montana in Missoula

III. Where is the allocation decision made? (i.e. station administration, departments, etc.)
Station Administration

IV. What is the basis for allocations?

Historical Discipline adjusted relative to faculty

Competitive Not a possibility

Project Yes, if there is potential for participation in a regional project

V. What types of review processes are used for competitive programs, Hatch or McIntire-Stennis projects?

Hatch projects review begins at the department level, followed by a peer review with final approval at the Director's level. The MAES Director's Office is responsible for oversight of the review process. The peer review committee, selected by the Director after consultation with department heads, includes the principle investigator's department head, MAES administrator, one department peer reviewer and two additional faculty external to the PI's department. Seminars are presented to the review committee and are open to the public. Reviewers written recommendations are compiled and provided to the PI as endorsed by the MAES administrator and department head. If a significant problem arises, the Director is part of the recommendation process ahead of time. The PI is required to revise the project as recommended by the reviewers. The project is then resubmitted to the MAES administrator and department head for additional review and approval. After the project has been approved by the MAES administrator and department head, it is submitted to the Director for final approval.

VI. Do you have an internal reallocation process? If so, how does/did it work? Not a possibility given our size.

VII. What percentages of funds are allocated to the following?

Personnel	97.9%
Facilities upkeep	
Operations	.1%
Travel	2.0%
Other (specify)	

State Report
Use of Formula Funds

I. State/territory: Nevada

II. Total formula funds: Federal

Hatch	\$783,478
Hatch Multistate	\$351,320
McIntire-Stennis	\$118,847
Total	\$1,253,645

III. Where is the allocation decision made? (i.e. station administration, departments, etc.)
Final allocation decisions are made by the Director and Associate Director, i.e. Station Administration

IV. What is the basis for allocations?

Historical
Competitive: Departmental peer review drives the allocation
Project

V. What types of review processes are used for competitive programs, Hatch or McIntire-Stennis projects?

A departmental peer review process is conducted with external reviewers at the department's discretion with station administration approval. The peer reviews cover all Hatch, Multi-State, McIntyre-Stennis and Animal Health projects. The peer reviews are collated at the Department level and the department chairs submit to the Station Administration a departmental recommendation and justification for approval and funding. In addition, a copy of the reviewer's ratings and comments are submitted with the chair's recommendations. . The Station Administration reviews and makes the final allocation for all Hatch, Multi-State, McIntyre-Stennis and Animal Health projects.

VI. Do you have an internal reallocation process? If so, how does/did it work?

No!

VII. What percentages of funds are allocated to the following?

Personnel: 100%
Facilities upkeep
Operations
Travel
Other (specify)

State Report
Use of Formula Funds

I. State/territory: New Mexico

II. Total formula funds: (FY 05)

Hatch \$1,135,945

Hatch Multistate \$392,815

McIntire-Stennis \$299,181

Animal Health \$38,818

III. Where is the allocation decision made? (i.e. station administration, departments, etc.)

The AES allocates the resources to the Academic Departments. Academic Department Heads, in conjunction with the AES Director allocate the resources based on project proposals and balance the needs with the teaching and extension budgets.

IV. What is the basis for allocations?

Historical Most allocations per department have little change, but personnel allocations and the operations change annually. Federal resources are generally combined with state resources on the same projects.

Competitive Most of the annual competition is done for state resources.

Project All allocations are made based on 5 year project proposals.

V. What types of review processes are used for competitive programs, Hatch or McIntire-Stennis projects?

All projects and programs are competitively peer reviewed.

VI. Do you have an internal reallocation process? If so, how does/did it work?

Most of the internal reallocation of operations is done within academic departments. Generally done in an annual budget meeting between department head and AES Director. The most significant reallocation is done by reallocation of positions. All positions, Faculty through classified, return to the Dean and Directors when they are vacated. The Dean and Director of AES, CES and Academic Programs meet on each position to approve or reallocate.

VII. What percentages of funds are allocated to the following?

Personnel 61%

Facilities upkeep 0%

Operations 27%

Travel 12%

Other (specify)

State Report
Use of Formula Funds Survey

State/territory: Utah

Total formula funds:

Hatch	\$985,805
Hatch Multistate	\$707,264
McIntire-Stennis	\$226,841

Where is the allocation decision made? (i.e. station administration, departments, etc.)

Allocation decisions for total funds (regardless of funding type) are made at the departmental level. Decisions for funding type (i.e, Hatch or state) are made at the state administration level.

What is the basis for allocations?

Allocations by department are basically historical, although some departments (with new department heads) are trying to change to a more competitive basis. More productive faculty are being moved to Hatch funded projects (as opposed to state funded) projects.

Do you have a reallocation process? If so, how does/did it work?

Reallocations are done at the administration level when projects are terminated and not replaced or PIs leave and the replacement is not in the AES system. Reallocations can be done by the department heads if PIs are not being productive. There is now an attempt to "tax" the portion of the salary that is returned to the station when there is a vacancy (5% of open position funds) to build up a reserve for a more competitive allocation of funds.

What percentages of funds are allocated to the following?

Personnel	86%
Operations/ Travel	Combined 14%

State Report
Use of Formula Funds

I. State/territory: Washington Agricultural Research Center

II. Total formula funds:

Hatch:	\$1,994,637.
Hatch Multistate:	\$1,357,945
McIntire-Stennis:	\$290,393

III. Where is the allocation decision made? (i.e. station administration, departments, etc.)
Allocations are made to units by Director. Unit leaders determine individual project allocations.

IV. What is the basis for allocations?

Director's allocations to units are based on historical factors and recent research productivity. A small percentage is held back for competitive funding to scientists.

Unit leader allocation policies to individual projects varies by unit.

V. What types of review processes are used for competitive programs, Hatch or McIntire-Stennis projects?

Our small competitive program has 18 graduate assistantships available and is reviewed by Director, Associate Director, and, technical experts.

We envision, with new money, to have input from grower representatives in a new competitive process.

VI. Do you have an internal reallocation process? If so, how does/did it work?

We have followed an internal reallocation process for units which looks at quantifiable outputs (grants and scholarly publications normalized by the total experiment station input to each unit) plus an annual examination of hiring plan submissions which become prioritized by college administration.

VII. What percentages of funds are allocated to the following?

Personnel:	66.7%
Facilities upkeep	0.00%
Operations	23.4%
Travel	6.5%
Other (specify)	3.3%

State Report
Use of Formula Funds

I. State/territory: Wyoming

II. Total formula funds:

Hatch: \$930,570
Hatch Multistate: \$511,946
McIntire-Stennis: \$172,844

III. Where is the allocation decision made? (i.e. station administration, departments, etc.) Salary and departmental support allocations are made based on time commitment on projects. Additional allocations are made through awards of competitive grants and multi-state projects requiring travel support. All of this is approved under the administration of the AES Director and carried out by the Agriculture Business Office.

IV. What is the basis for allocations?

Historical

Competitive ✓

Project ✓

V. What types of review processes are used for competitive programs, Hatch or McIntire-Stennis projects? Competitive – committee & external review, Hatch or McIntire-Stennis – peer review.

VI. Do you have an internal reallocation process? If so, how does/did it work?
Not a structured process – at the discretion of the AES director.

VII. What percentages of funds are allocated to the following?

Personnel: 49%
Facilities upkeep: 6%
Operations: 25%
Travel: 10%
Other (specify): 10% competitive grants

Action Requested: For information only

Action Taken: A followup survey on the use of formula funds will be developed by Jeff Jacobsen, Carol Lewis, and Don Cooksey.

Agenda Item 11.0 Resolutions

Presenter: Greg Bohach/Jeff Jacobsen

Background:

WHEREAS Dean and Director Dr. David Thawley, Associate Director Dr. Ronald Pardini, Ms. Shannon Clopton, and their colleagues from the University of Nevada were organizers and hosts for the Experiment Station Section and the Agriculture Research Directors Annual Meetings and the Fall meeting of the Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors at Harrah's Resort in South Shore Lake Tahoe, Nevada, September 25-27; and

WHEREAS Drs. Thawley and Pardini, Ms. Clopton, and their colleagues provided such hospitable surroundings in which to meet; and

WHEREAS Drs. Thawley and Pardini, Ms. Clopton, and their colleagues were also outstanding hosts; and

WHEREAS Drs. Thawley and Pardini, Ms. Clopton, and their colleagues arranged excellent joint meetings and excellent presentations, be it

RESOLVED, That the Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors at its meeting at Harrah's Resort, South Shore, Lake Tahoe, Nevada, on September 25, expresses its sincere and heartfelt appreciation to Drs. Thawley and Pardini, Ms. Clopton and their colleagues for their significant contributions to successful individual and joint meetings; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the original of this resolution be provided to Dr. Thawley, and that a copy be filed as part of the official minutes of this meeting.

Action Requested: Approval

Action Taken: Unanimously approved resolution to Drs. Thawley and Pardini, Ms. Clopton, and their colleagues

Agenda Item 12.0 NRSP Balloting

Presenter: Lee Sommers

Background:

Sommers reported that the NRSP Committee had met via conference call and developed recommendations to be approved at the ESS meeting.

He handed out ballots to each of the participating states for them to submit at the ESS meeting.

Action Requested: For information only

Action Taken: None

**Agenda Item 13.0
Other Business**

Presenter: Don Snyder

Background:

No other business was presented.

Action Requested: For information only

Action Taken: None

Agenda Item 14.0 Future Meetings

Presenter: CY Hu/Steve Miller

Background:

Hu reported that the 2007 Joint Spring Meeting of AES Directors from the Western and North Central Regions is scheduled for March 19-22, 2007 at the Hilton Waikaloa Hotel, near Kona, HI. Information on lodging will be provided later.

Miller reported that the 2007 Joint AES/CES/AP/AHS Summer Meeting will be held July 15-18, 2007 at the Snow King Resort in Jackson, WY. Information will be provided later.

Action Requested: For information only

Action Taken: None

**Agenda Item 15.0
Changing of the Guard**

Presenter: Don Snyder/CY Hu

Background:

Snyder provided Hu with a gavel and turned the meeting over to him. Hu adjourned the meeting.

Action Requested: For information only

Action Taken: None