



# WESTERN AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION DIRECTORS

OFFICE OF THE DIRECTOR-AT-LARGE

MARK T. BUCHANAN  
Director-at-Large

August 26, 1971

TO : Western Directors

FROM : Mark T. Buchanan  
Recording Secretary

SUBJECT: Minutes of Meetings at Jackson, Wyoming,  
August 2-6, 1971

Subject minutes are enclosed. If you have corrections or suggestions, please send them to me and I will see that appropriate changes are made.

These Minutes are the product of a team comprised of Boysie Day, Nancy Raphael, Mark Buchanan and each of you who supplied written materials. Particular appreciation is due Boysie who took notes, organized your materials and dictated draft minutes of the Business Meeting; and to Nancy who monitored tapes, organized and typed draft minutes for all the sessions and typed, reproduced and distributed the final product.

MTB/nr

Enclosure

WESTERN ASSOCIATION  
OF AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION DIRECTORS

MINUTES OF SUMMER 1971 MEETING

Wort Motor Hotel  
Jackson, Wyoming

August 4-6, 1971

Index to Minutes

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Page</u>
1.0 Call to Order .....	2
2.0 Adoption of Agenda .....	2
3.0 Introductions .....	2
4.0 Announcements .....	2
5.0 Approval of Minutes of March 1971 Meeting ....	2
6.0 Report of the Chairman .....	2
7.0 CSRS Report .....	4
8.0 DAL Report .....	7
9.0 FPC Report .....	9
10.0 RRC Report .....	17
11.0 ESCOP Report .....	18
12.0 ESCOP Legislative Subcommittee Report .....	21
13.0 ARPAC Report .....	30
14.0 Committee of Nine Report .....	31
15.0 WAERC Report .....	33
16.0 WSWRC Report .....	35
17.0 WHERAC Report .....	36
18.0 WSRAC Report .....	38
19.0 Analysis of Experience with RRC System .....	38
20.0 Communications with USDA .....	39
21.0 CSRS Program Planning .....	41
22.0 Plant Variety Protection Act .....	41
23.0 Southern Corn Leaf Blight .....	42
24.0 Beef Cattle Research Report .....	42
25.0 Travel to WM-59 .....	44
26.0 Occupational Help .....	45
27.0 ARS Space .....	45
28.0 Agricultural Board .....	45
29.0 Resolutions .....	46
30.0 Future Meetings .....	46
31.0 Report of Nominating Committee .....	47
32.0 Adjournment .....	49

Index to Appendix

<u>Subject</u>	<u>Page</u>
6.8 Minutes of Executive Committee Meeting .....	50
10.0 Regional Research Committee Report .....	58
10.1 Task Force Reports .....	58
10.2 Status Report on Projects Due for Termination June 30, 1971 .....	62
10.3 Project Outlines .....	62
10.4 Western Regional Coordinating Committees .....	64
10.5 New Personnel Assignments .....	65
10.6 Other	
10.61 Greenhouse Culture .....	66
10.62 Distribution of Task Force Reports .....	67
10.63 Southern Directors' Proposal to Relieve SRRC of Project Review Responsibility .....	67
10.64 Budget for W-6 .....	67
10.65 Updating Long Range Study .....	68
10.66 Off-the-Top Funding for W-115 ...	68
10.67 Publication on New Crops .....	69
10.7 Adjournment .....	70
12.4 Distribution of Projected Increases of Funds (000) at the \$20 Million Level, SAES, FY 1974 .....	71
15.0 Report of the Committee to Study the Future Role of the Western Agricultural Economics Research Council .....	98
19.0 Discussion of the Western Region Task Force Approach to Regional Research Planning .....	102
29.0 Resolutions .....	113



WESTERN ASSOCIATION  
OF AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATION DIRECTORS

MINUTES OF SUMMER 1971 MEETING

Wort Motor Hotel  
Jackson, Wyoming

August 4-6, 1971

Present:

Arizona	- R. K. Frevert
	- D. F. McAlister
	- H. E. Myers
California	- C. F. Kelly, Chairman
	- B. E. Day, Secretary
	- J. B. Kendrick, Jr.
	- W. M. Dugger, Jr.
	- L. N. Lewis
	- A. F. McCalla
Colorado	- D. F. Hervey
	- Rue Jensen
	- D. D. Johnson
Hawaii	- C. P. Wilson
Idaho	- J. E. Kraus
	- R. D. Ensign
Montana	- J. A. Asleson, Treasurer
	- M. J. Burris
Nevada	- D. W. Bohmont
	- R. E. Ely
New Mexico	- P. J. Leyendecker, Vice Chairman
	- M. L. Wilson
Oregon	- G. B. Wood
	- W. H. Foote
Utah	- D. W. Thorne
	- C. E. Clark
Washington	- L. W. Rasmussen
	- D. L. Oldenstadt
Wyoming	- N. W. Hilston
	- L. C. Ayres
WDAL and Recording Secretary	- M. T. Buchanan
CSRS	- B. F. Beacher
	- J. S. Robins
ARS-WRRL	- A. I. Morgan, Jr.
	- R. L. Olson
ARS	- T. W. Edminster

### 1.0 Call to Order

Chairman Kelly called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m., August 4, 1971.

### 2.0 Adoption of Agenda

The agenda circulated to Directors on July 13, 1971 was adopted with four additions as follows:

- 25.0 Travel to WM-59
- 26.0 Occupational Help
- 27.0 ARS Space
- 28.0 Agricultural Board

### 3.0 Introductions

Chairman Kelly introduced guests T. W. Edminster, Administrator of ARS; and R. L. Olson from the Western Regional Laboratory at Albany. The Chairman welcomed CSRS representatives J. S. Robins and B. F. Beacher.

### 4.0 Announcements

Director Hilston announced local arrangements.

### 5.0 Approval of Minutes of March 1971 Meeting

The minutes of the March 1971 meeting were amended to include a new page 18. The minutes were adopted.

### 6.0 Report of the Chairman

6.1 Chairman Kelly read correspondence from Directors Barton and Acker, the former on regional and national planning, and the latter on details for the Land Grant meetings in New Orleans in the Fall of 1971.

Scheduling problems for the New Orleans meetings were discussed. Chairman Kelly will

notify Arlon Hazen on room arrangements and other details.

- 6.2 A letter from J. C. Williamson, Jr., Chairman of ESCOP was read. This letter requested that the Western Region set up a committee on the Whatley-Warwick Report on Beef Cattle. Chairman Kelly reported that he had referred this matter to the Forward Planning Committee (9.17).
- 6.3 A letter from Director Aldrich, Chairman of the North Central Directors was read. This letter transmitted a resolution on coordinating research with Clay Center. This resolution will be considered when Dr. Warwick arrives at this meeting (24.1).
- 6.4 Chairman Kelly appointed Directors Leyendecker and Hilston to make arrangements for the Spring 1972 meeting of Western Directors. This meeting is to be held in Hawaii jointly with the Extension Directors. See item 30.0.
- 6.5 Chairman Kelly reported that the Executive Committee met on August 3, 1971 to consider these items:
- 6.51 The recording secretary function
- 6.52 The appointment of a nominating committee
- At the request of DAL Buchanan a third was added:
- 6.53 The need to evaluate the job description of the WDAL.

The Executive Committee considered that a key factor is the review of the job description for WDAL. Chairman Kelly reported the appointment of a committee of Directors to review the job description. This Committee is composed of Director Kraus as Chairman, and Directors Wood, Bohmont and Hervey. The Committee is to report by the Spring 1972 meeting. Chairman Kelly outlined factors to be considered in the deliberations of this Committee:

- (1) Need for WDAL
  - (a) Present needs
  - (b) Needs in relation to long range plan
- (2) Problem of the Recording Secretary  
(This problem must be kept in perspective.)

There was brief discussion of this charge. The Committee will be formally charged by Chairman Kelly.

- 6.6 Chairman Kelly appointed a Resolutions Committee composed of Director M. L. Wilson as Chairman, and Director W. M. Dugger, Jr., member.
- 6.7 Chairman Kelly appointed a Nominating Committee composed of Director R. K. Frevert as Chairman, and Directors G. B. Wood and L. C. Ayres as members.
- 6.8 A copy of the Minutes of the Meeting of the Executive Committee is appended. These include financial reports of the DAL and Recording Secretary Functions for the period July 1, 1970 to June 30, 1971 and projections for July 1, 1971 to June 30, 1972. Also included are reports from the Treasurer, Director J. A. Asleson of Montana for the Montana portion of the DAL account and for the Western Directors Special Fund. (Appendix 6.8)

## 7.0 CSRS Report

Associate Administrator J. S. Robins reported for CSRS. He reviewed personnel changes occurring in CSRS including retirements (Neal, McGovran, Sike, Commings, and Minden), new personnel (Dr. Jay Huges, Forestry Program Director; Dr. Charles Coggins, Plant Science), exchange personnel and vacancies. A number of new names and faces will be appearing over the next few months.

The 1971 budget supplement (corn blight) and the 1972 budget (now awaiting the President's signature) were reviewed. The 1972 budget includes increases for the increased costs in Hatch and McIntire-Stennis,

\$500,000 for Corn Blight and Mechanisms of Disease Resistance in Plants (adding to the \$1,000,000 in 1971 Supplement), \$500,000 for Non-Chemical Pest Control Research, \$1,900,000 for Cost-Cutting Research in Cotton, and \$8.6 millions for 1890 Land Grant Colleges and Tuskegee Institute.

CSRS has requested appointment of a small committee (one from each Regional Association and ESCOP) to work with CSRS on communications with NSF, EPA and other federal agencies on program of mutual interest. CSRS is considering a similar committee to work with CSRS on the Specific Grants (P.L. 89-106) program.

Four up-coming conferences were reviewed: The Cut-Flower Marketing Conference, September 1-2, 1971 in Washington, D.C.; the Animal Wastes Conference in Warrenton, Virginia, September 27-29, 1971; a proposed Agricultural Sciences Information Network conferences, probably in October 1971 in Washington, D.C.; and a proposed Rural Services Workshop sponsored by CSRS, the four regional technical committee, and the Regional Centers for Rural Development, probably in the winter of 1971-72. You will hear more on the latter two.

AD-419's were sent on July 29. No forward estimates (FY 1972) are requested. We are asking for a separate summary of projects, funds and SMY's for FY 1971 to expedite review and the programming of the information into CRIS. Estimates of Federal fund application to projects will be requested separately at a later date.

Two Stations are now submitting AD-419 financial information on magnetic tape rather than AD-419 forms. Details have been worked out between the State Station and Mr. John Myers, Director of CRIS. Any Station desiring to explore this approach, please contact Mr. Myers.

Bruce Beacher distributed a summary of Allocations to Regional Research Projects, Fiscal Year Ending June 30, 1972. This document is incorporated as part of the minutes (Table 1).

Dr. Beacher reported on three items of pending legislation as follows:

- (1) Legislation to provide relief from the five per cent limitation on the use of Hatch Funds for retirement benefits.

July 15, 1971

TABLE I. ALLOCATIONS TO REGIONAL RESEARCH PROJECTS, FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1972

	RRF	Hatch	Other	USDA	Total	RRF Percent
North Central Region	\$ 3,542,084	\$ 1,022,889	\$ 2,914,295	\$ 2,495,400	\$ 9,974,668	35.5
Northeastern Region	2,758,554	1,403,093	3,238,464	1,683,600	9,083,711	30.4
Southern Region	3,864,064	1,187,128	2,061,581	3,482,840	10,595,613	36.5
Western Region	3,281,061	746,294	1,596,394	2,104,600	7,728,349	42.5
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$13,445,763*</b>	<b>\$ 4,359,404</b>	<b>\$ 9,810,734</b>	<b>\$ 9,766,440</b>	<b>\$37,382,341</b>	<b>35.9</b>

\*Does not include \$162,800 allocated to IR projects.

- (2) Legislation authorizing release of excess property to State Agricultural Experiment Stations.
- (3) Addition of the words, "and training" authorized for expenditure of funds under P.L. 89-106.

Dr. Beacher suggested that the Western Directors might wish to take action in support of these measures. It was moved by Director Kraus, seconded by Director Leyendecker, that the Western Directors support these measures. MOTION CARRIED.

## 8.0 DAL Report

DAL Buchanan made the following, general report. The time period since our last meeting has been an especially busy and, in many respects, an exciting one. Solid progress has been made nationally, with USDA and with other federal agencies on a number of fronts. Many of the original ideas evolved in the Western Region. I think you will recognize them coming back to you in the form of reports, requests for action and the like from CSRS, ESCOP, ARPAC, ARPF and in other ways. The Regional Directors have provided a communication link in these developments.

May I remind you to look again at OWDAL-66. There is evidence that we will need to be alert to potential sources of federal funding outside USDA. NSF-RANN and EPA are examples.

The superstructure of the State Agricultural Experiment Stations is voluntary. Thus, the Western, North Central, Southern and Northeastern Associations of Agricultural Experiment Stations Directors are voluntary associations of autonomous state institutions, represented by Directors chosen within the institutional procedures unique to each state. By voluntary arrangement there is also an Experiment Station Committee on Organization and Policy, the Experiment Stations' Section of NASULGC and even NASULGC, itself, which originally came into being as an Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors.

In such a society, acceptance of an idea, principle, a plan, or an agreement is dependent not only on the logic of the proposal, itself, but also on

who proposes it, who thinks well of it, etc. Plans improve with each discussion. Passing time mellows the cutting edge of dissidents' early remarks. If the idea is one whose time has come a workable consensus is achieved. So it is, I think, with a number of the items you will hear reports on at this meeting.

The federated type of organization that characterizes the State Agricultural Experiment Stations is in close juxtaposition with what might be characterized as a centralized form of organization in USDA. Within the centralized type, authority appears to replace the voluntary agreement as a means by which decisions are made. As a matter of fact, however, long run success is achieved in either pattern of organization only to the extent that workable consensus are developed.

I would say that on a number of the plans that will come to you today, we have achieved a workable consensus within the voluntary agreement mechanisms of the federated State Agricultural Experiment Stations. In addition to this, we have achieved similar agreements, in principle, with the top management of the USDA in-house research program. We still have a ways to go to achieve workable consensus within the organizational and geographic entities that comprise the total USDA research bureaucracy. We have a start on communications with other federal agencies.

We have still further to go to achieve workable arrangements for exchange of information, joint planning, and the like with industry research. In 1965, this was reported to be of about the same magnitude as SAES and USDA research combined. I shall call this the dispersed system of organization.

So, again, looking at my own activities during the past five months, and at those of my associates in the other regions and in CSRS, I conclude that we have made considerable progress within the federated group, a good beginning with the centralized, and not much headway with the dispersed (industry research groups).

The CSRS, organizationally, is a part of the centralized USDA. Philosophically, it is, at present, oriented to the federation of autonomous units that characterizes the SAES. This, I believe we all believe, is as it should be. However one might

## 9.1 Regional and National Planning

### 9.11 FPC reaffirms the following:

- . That it is in favor of and will recommend to the Western Directors that a planning system be authorized and established
- . That planning be done on a continuous basis
- . That planning be done in active partnership with USDA
- . That the planning system encompass the total agricultural research program, not just RRF
- . That some such statement as the one that will evolve from the review of the "Composition of Planning System Proposed" would be an appropriate method for undertaking the planning process
- . That the West should proceed with planning regardless of what is decided in other regions.

9.12 That the plan adopted by the four regions and USDA should be additive and comprise a system of interacting parts for total agricultural research in the United States. It is desirable that some means be evolved by which the states, USDA agencies, and the regions can proceed in ways that will permit the parts to be considered with respect to each other and with respect to the whole.

9.13 Though FPC prefers the approach utilizing regional planning groups as outlined in the Buchanan-King report, it is recommended that a compromise plan be pursued. (See Planning Structure included at the end of this report.) Thus, task forces and present standing committees could be merged into, say, six RPG's of eight members each.

- 9.14 FPC accepts the Southern Directors' proposal on the constitution of the RPC's and the NPC with the comments that this will entail a major planning assignment to RRC.
- 9.15 FPC accepts the concept of the development of plans by states as a beginning step in the planning process, but suggests that there be substantial subcommittee and staff work done in advance of state by state planning in the interest of maximizing information available to the individual state stations and agencies of USDA.
- 9.16 FPC expresses a strong reaction in favor of the staff support component of the ARPAC Subcommittee proposal which involves assistance in coordination, analysis and in research and development on improved aids to research resource allocation and research management.
- 9.17 FPC recommends that a continuous planning process be initiated. This continuous process would be in lieu of the updating of the Long Range Study. It would also subsume such planning proposals as the Whatley-Warwick proposal for Beef Cattle Research and the proposals that may be forthcoming from ARPF Subcommittees on the Updating of the Long Range Study, Beef Cattle Research, Physical Facilities and Soil and Water Research. All would become parts of an overall, continuing planning system.
- 9.18 Director Leyendecker moved, seconded by Director H. E. Myers, that the Western Directors authorize the Chairman of the FPC, the DAL, and Director G. B. Wood to work with representatives from other regions and with CSRS and other USDA representatives toward the development of a planning system that will meet as many of the above criteria as are mutually agreeable to all parties concerned.

Some of the discussion on this motion is indicated by these comments written in question and answer form.

- Q. Should the Agricultural Extension Service be involved in the planning process?
- A. It is not part of the plan to do this. Extension is only one of many action agencies supported by research conducted by the ARS and SAES. These include the Bureau of Land Management, the Soil Conservation Service, and many other state, federal and private agencies. Thus, the Agricultural Extension Service should not uniquely be a part of the research planning process.
- Q. In the planning process outlined by the Southern Region, what might be the time lag for a planning input to flow through the planning system?
- A. This would depend on the complexity and novelty of the planning input. Routine matters should flow quickly.
- Q. A major problem is that we deal mostly with State money with many constraints on its expenditure. How can we do meaningful, national planning in such a welter of complex detail?
- A. The planning system must be such as to allow for this. The best that can be done is to plan on the basis of broad policy levels and allow for the many exceptions.

Director C. P. Wilson reported on the planning of the planning system now in operation in Hawaii. The planning task forces are composed of the University, industry and other people. This system appears to be functioning well. Interested Directors should contact Director Wilson and/or Associate Director Swindale.

would utilize much common information. Once both programs are fully underway, the budgeting approach would seek to implement the program plans evolved in the regional and national planning process and system.

### 9.3 Whatley-Warwick Report on Beef Cattle Research

FPC recommends that the Western Directors take no action on the report at this time.

### 9.4 Action of ESCOP Recommending that Each Regional Directors' Association Discuss the Need for Updating the Long Range Study.

FPC concluded that the updating of the Long Range Study should be one of the items that would "fall out" of the development of a continuous planning process of the type recommended under 9.1 of this report.

### 9.5 Status of FPC

At the Spring 1971 meeting of the Western Directors FPC recommended that:

"After discussion it was agreed that the present structure could be made a part of the proposed system by utilizing task forces, for example, and advisory committees, as ad hoc groups under the proposed plan. The Forward Planning Committee would be replaced by the revised Regional Planning Committee which also would replace RRC."

However, in light of current recommendation of the FPC regarding planning, the current recommendation is that FPC be continued as presently constituted, and that when a planning system is adopted, the holders of two additional offices be added to its membership: the current chairman and the state-side cochairman of RPC (who would also be the chairman of the four-member RRC as a part of the larger RPC comprised of the expanded four-member RRC plus four federal representatives, the DAL and a representative of CSRS).

No action was taken on this recommendation, pending developments on item 9.18 above.

## PLANNING STRUCTURE

- 98 RESEARCH PROGRAM AREAS (RPA)
- 39 RESEARCH PROGRAMS (RP)
- 6 RESEARCH PROGRAM GROUPS (RPG)

## 1.00 Natural Resources

- 1.01 Soil and Land Use
- 1.02 Water and Watersheds
- 1.03 Fish and Wildlife
- 1.04 Recreation
- 1.05 Environmental Quality
- 1.06 Weather Modification
- 1.07 Remote Sensing

## 2.00 Forestry

- 2.01 Forest Resources

## 3.00 Crops

- 3.01 Corn
- 3.02 Grain Sorghum
- 3.03 Cotton
- 3.04 Tobacco
- 3.05 Rice
- 3.06 Soybeans
- 3.07 Sugar
- 3.08 Wheat
- 3.09 Other Small Grains
- 3.10 New Crops and Minor  
Oilseeds
- 3.11 Forage, Range and  
Pasture
- 3.12 Peanuts
- 3.13 Fruit
- 3.14 Vegetables
- 3.15 Plants to Enhance  
Man's Environment
- 3.16 Bees and Other  
Pollinators

## 4.00 Animals

- 4.01 Beef
- 4.02 Dairy
- 4.03 Swine
- 4.04 Poultry
- 4.05 Sheep
- 4.06 Other Animals
- 4.07 Aquatic Foods

5.00 People, Communities and  
Institutions

- 5.01 Food and Nutrition
- 5.02 Food Safety
- 5.03 Rural Development
- 5.04 Insects Affecting Man
- 5.05 Research on Administration  
of Research

6.00 Competition, Trade, Adjustment,  
Price and Income Policy

- 6.01 Farm Adjustment,  
Prices and Income
- 6.02 Foreign Agricultural  
Trade and Economic  
Development
- 6.03 Marketing and Competition

## 10.0 RRC Report

This report was presented on behalf of the committee by its Chairman, M. J. Burris of Montana. The RRC Report is presented as Appendix 10.0 to these minutes. Director Burris moved, seconded by Director M. L. Wilson, that the report of RRC be accepted.

MOTION CARRIED. Limited excerpts and headings follow.

### 10.1 Task Force Reports

- 10.11 Dairy (not yet received)
- 10.12 Fruit
- 10.13 Poultry
- 10.14 Sheep and Animals Other Than Cattle  
and Swine
- 10.15 Vegetable Crops
- 10.16 Wheat and Other Small Grains

### 10.2 Status Report on Projects Due for Termination June 30, 1971

### 10.3 Project Outlines

- 10.31 Clean West - A systematic Analysis of  
Economic and Social Implications of  
Environmental Problems
- 10.32 Discovery and Control of Natural  
Toxicants in the Food Chain

### 10.4 Western Regional Coordinating Committees

- 10.41 Extension of WRCC-2
- 10.42 WRCC Reports

### 10.5 New Personnel Assignments

### 10.6 Other

- 10.61 Greenhouse Culture
- 10.62 Distribution of Task Force Reports
- 10.63 Southern Directors' Proposal to  
Relieve SRRRC of Project Review  
Responsibility
- 10.64 Budget for W-6
- 10.65 Updating Long Range Study
- 10.66 Off-the-top Funding for W-115
- 10.67 Publication on New Crops

## 11.0 ESCOP Report

Director G. B. Wood reported that a summary of the minutes of the Spring meeting of ESCOP has been distributed to State Agricultural Experiment Station Directors. He reported these highlights:

11.1 ESCOP designated an "1890 Research Subcommittee" of six members from the Land Grant Colleges of 1890 and one from ESCOP. This Subcommittee will regularize and formalize arrangements between the State Agricultural Experiment Station and the Colleges of 1890. It should enhance coordination of research and funding programs. There is also a NASULGC committee on this matter.

### 11.2 Directors' Representatives

A plan is being evolved to name Directors' Representatives to various organizations, for example, Farm Bureau, National Cotton Council, American Soybean Association, etc. ESCOP has tentatively designated individual Directors, specifically, to coordinate with individual agencies. A draft document of this program was provided by WDAL Buchanan to the Western Directors. Copies are available from Director Buchanan.

Director Wood moved, seconded by Director Leyendecker, that the Western Directors authorize this program, in principle. MOTION CARRIED.

Several Directors raised questions concerning the functioning and probable effectiveness of this program. The need for further details on the duties of the individual coordinators and their relationship with the agencies was expressed. Director Wood stated that he would bring this matter to the attention of ESCOP with the suggestion that there be coordination with ECOP and RICOP. There was a comment that the list of organizations should be expanded to include non-farm organizations such as the Sierra Club and that perhaps the program should go ahead on a pilot basis with particular effort directed to agricultural organizations of known effectiveness such as the National Seed Trade Association and the National Cotton Council.

- 11.3 Director Wood reported on the reactions of ESCOP to the FAR Report
- 11.31 ESCOP responded negatively to the proposal that CSRS delegate approval of Hatch projects to the States. The ESCOP Interim Committee agreed to a trial program of this to certain states on a limited basis.
  - 11.32 ESCOP concurred with recommendations of the FAR Report having to do with administration of funds to the Land Grant Colleges of 1890 aimed at coordination of the research programs with the SAES.
  - 11.33 ESCOP concurred with certain recommendations aimed at improving and increasing the effectiveness of the CRIS system.
  - 11.34 ESCOP did not favor recommendation that federal audit of Hatch Funds be delegated to the states in certain instances.
  - 11.35 ESCOP did not favor the recommendation to seek legislation permitting the carry-over of new Hatch Funds into the following fiscal year.
- 11.4 ESCOP Resolution Regarding Executive Vice Chairman of ESCOP

Director Wood reported that ESCOP has faced increasing difficulty in handling its functions within the available meeting time of its members. One remedy considered in the past was to hire a staff member. Two approaches were considered: A Legislative Consultant and a Washington Representative. The Administrative Heads of Agriculture are presently obtaining statements from each state concerning plans for a Washington Office. However, even if this plan is accepted, it will not entirely solve the problems of ESCOP. The current plan of ESCOP is to have an Executive Officer who would be one of the four Regional Directors to hold down the Washington Office and be on duty at all times.

In support of this proposal, Director Wood moved, seconded by Director Ely, approval of the following resolution prepared by ESCOP and now reported to be approved in equivalent form by two of the other regions:

"WHEREAS, There exists at present no formalized mechanism to effect communication and liaison between SAES Directors; CSRS, Office of Science and Education and other offices of USDA; NASULGC; Agricultural Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate and members thereof; and farm and commodity and other agriculturally related organizations on a continuing day to day basis, and

WHEREAS, The geographic distribution of the 53 State Stations precludes timely contact on an individual state basis, and

WHEREAS, The Chairman of the Regional Associations of Station Directors and the Chairman of ESCOP cannot adequately fulfill this role on a continuous basis, and

WHEREAS, The fulfillment of this role necessitates regular, if not continuous, presence on the Washington scene, and

WHEREAS, At least one of the four Regional Directors is in Washington, D.C. for one or more days each week and is accessible to the offices and contacts indicated above,

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED, That the Western Experiment Station Directors Association authorizes the service of its Director-at-Large on a national basis as Executive Vice Chairman of ESCOP to represent and act on behalf of the Chairman of ESCOP and its subcommittees and the regional associations of directors in accordance with the functions and duties prescribed as follows:

The Executive Vice Chairman of ESCOP shall be appointed by the Chairman of ESCOP. The other three Regional Directors will serve as available in

the absence of the Executive Vice Chairman of ESCOP.

Under Policy guidance from ESCOP as expressed by its Chairman, the Executive Vice Chairman of ESCOP is empowered to deal with any and all matters that fall within the purview of ESCOP and its subcommittees. The major thrust of his activities is to assist in maintaining effective communication and liaison with (a) the individual SAES; (b) CSRS, Science and Education, and other offices of USDA; (c) NASULGC; (d) agricultural appropriations and other appropriate committees of the House and Senate and members thereof; and (e) farm and commodity and other organizations. He will perform such other duties as may be requested by the Chairman of ESCOP."

The provisions of the resolution were discussed at length in terms of such questions as potential conflicts of interest, who pays the expenses, and alternate means of accomplishing these same ends.

Director Rasmussen moved to amend the resolution to limit its effectiveness to a two-year period. The motion was seconded by Director Oldenstadt. When called to vote, the MOTION FAILED. The question was called on the resolution as presented and the MOTION CARRIED with one dissenting vote.

- 11.5 Director Wood reported that the new Chairman of ESCOP will be Jim Beattie of Ohio State University.

## 12.0 ESCOP Legislative Subcommittee Report

Director Wood reported on the action of the Legislative Subcommittee of ESCOP. He was joined in this report by Robins and Buchanan, each covering specific aspects of legislative matters.

12.1 Robins reported that there are many new emerging problems in agriculture that increasingly focus national attention on traditional crop production and protection research. These include, for example, Senator Proxmire's report that efficiency in agricultural production is no longer increasing. The corn blight problem has drawn serious repercussions on a national level. Venezuelan Equine Encephalomyelitis has had great impact. African Swine Fever has entered Cuba and threatens to move to the United States. This could prove to be a disaster in swine production. Public attention has been directed to the matter of PCB getting into chicken feed and contaminating the meat and eggs. The effect of these and other issues has been that there is now much less complacency about our agricultural base. This is particularly true with respect to the traditional matters of plant and animal protection. There has been strong expressions of concern in Congress about this.

#### 12.2 Fiscal Year 1973 Budget

Robins reported some confusion in reports from ESCOP, ARPAC, and other agencies on budget needs and priorities in expenditure for research. Buchanan expressed the view that the political and public opinion climate is now better for the support for new funding for production and protection-oriented research than at any time over the past 20 years.

Buchanan distributed a table providing budget estimates at the 20 and 40 million dollar levels of funding. He explained that this is one of a series of tables developed during the past several months as the RD's, CSRS, and Science and Education have worked with the data supplied by Directors within the constraints set by ARPAC. The final, original budget submissions for FY 1973 for CSRS are to go forward August 9, 1971. Table II, supplied by Dr. Robins, summarizes the proposal as submitted by CSRS to the USDA Science and Education Office. Hatch and McIntire-Stennis funding conforms basically to the Directors' and ATR'S statements of intent as collected

by the DAL's. To maintain balance in Forestry research, between Forest Service and the States' programs, the asking is approximately double the ESCOP recommendation. Food Safety is also more than double the States' projections in response to current national concerns. Likewise, the animal disease and the sewage sludge disposal research under P.L. 89-106 respond to current national concerns.

The physical facilities item is documented in a different manner than in previous years. This documentation is provided in Table III.

Buchanan reiterated two budget channels: (1) via CSRS and USDA; (2) via NASULGC. We may participate in the first until the Executive Budget goes under "wraps", at the time the Secretary sends his requests forward to OMB, usually about October or November, and then, again, after the President's Budget Message in January. Channel 2 is open at all times.

### 12.3 Fiscal Year 1974 Budget

Buchanan reported on the collections of data from Directors and their tabulation in a variety of ways with help from CSRS. Having the input data by RPA's and project titles facilitates the accommodation of data to various budgeting structures. Buchanan and Robins passed around summaries of the 1974 data in two formats. These are included in Appendix tables under Appendix 12.4.

### 12.4 Discussion on Physical Facilities Funding

Director Wood reported on the difficulty of getting funding for facilities under P.L. 88-74. He expressed the view that unless funding for facilities under this act can be obtained soon, it will cease to be a viable mechanism for the construction of facilities. He reported that requests for funds for construction of research facilities by the SAES do not receive serious consideration in the Department of Agriculture because of the current surplus of research facilities in the USDA.

Robins reported that there are two basic questions that must be answered in securing

TABLE II. 1973 CSRS BUDGET ASKINGS\*

SUBJECT AREA	HATCH	MCINTIRE- STENNIS	SPECIAL GRANTS		TOTAL
			COMP.	1890	
<b>A. HELPING FARMERS SOLVE CRITICAL PROBLEMS</b>					
1. Controlling Disease, Pests and Other Hazards Effectively Without Environmental Degradation					
a. Fruits and Vegetables	\$ 1,000	\$	\$ 1,000	\$	\$ 1,000
b. Field Crops	800		1,000	100	1,900
c. Livestock and Poultry	600		1,000		1,600
	<u>\$ 2,400</u>	<u>\$</u>	<u>\$2,000</u>	<u>\$ 100</u>	<u>\$ 4,500</u>
2. Operating in a Regulated Environment					
a. Develop Plants Resistant to Pollutants	\$ 100	\$	\$	\$	\$ 100
b. Reduce Soil Losses & Sediment Accumulation	500		700	100	500
c. Prevent Pollution from Animal Wastes	2,000				2,800
d. Prevent Pollution from Food & Wood Processing Operations	1,095		300		1,395
	<u>\$ 3,695</u>	<u>\$</u>	<u>\$1,000</u>	<u>\$ 100</u>	<u>\$ 4,795</u>
3. Combatting Growing Tax, Land Use, Financing, Marketing & Management Problems					
a. Alternative Uses of Land		\$	\$	\$	\$
b. Marketing Firms, Cooperatives, Bargaining Organizations - Operations and Efficiency					
c. Structural Changes in Agriculture					
d. Government Programs	700				700
	<u>\$ 700</u>	<u>\$</u>	<u>\$</u>	<u>\$</u>	<u>\$ 700</u>

SUBJECT AREA	HATCH	MCINTIRE- STENNIS	SPECIAL GRANTS		TOTAL
			COMP.	1890	
4. Expanding Markets & Increasing Returns for Animal & Crop Products Through Improved Production & Marketing Practices	\$ 1,000 600 900 <u>\$ 2,500</u>	\$	\$	\$ 100	\$ 1,000 700 900 <u>\$ 2,600</u>
a. Lower Production Costs					
b. Maintain & Improve Product Quality					
c. Improve Marketing & Distribution					
B. MEETING CRITICAL TIMBER NEEDS					
1. Forest and Range Management	\$	\$2,700	\$	\$	\$ 2,700
2. Forest Protection		1,200			1,200
3. Forest Products & Engineering		1,200			1,200
4. Forest Resource Economics		817			817
	<u>\$</u>	<u>\$5,917</u>	<u>\$</u>	<u>\$</u>	<u>\$ 5,917</u>
C. FOOD AND NUTRITION: HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY					
1. Human Nutrition	\$ 1,600	\$	\$	\$ 500	\$ 2,100
2. Food Safety	<u>\$ 1,600</u>		<u>2,000</u>	<u>300</u>	<u>2,300</u>
			<u>\$2,000</u>	<u>\$ 800</u>	<u>\$ 4,400</u>
D. DEVELOPING AND PROTECTION RURAL AMERICA					
1. Improving Rural Opportunities					
a. Soil Resources	\$ 300	\$	\$	\$ 200	\$ 500
b. Housing	50				50
c. Fish and Wildlife	100				100
d. Recreation	<u>150</u>				<u>150</u>
	<u>\$ 600</u>	<u>\$</u>	<u>\$</u>	<u>\$ 200</u>	<u>\$ 800</u>

SUBJECT AREA	HATCH	MCINTIRE- STENNIS	SPECIAL GRANTS		TOTAL
			COMP.	1890	
2. Solving National Environmental Quality Problems					
a. Water and Watersheds	\$ 250	\$	\$	\$	\$ 250
b. Research to Eliminate Pollution (Sludge)	802		1,000	150	1,952
c. Improve Natural Beauty	200				200
	<u>\$ 1,252</u>	\$	<u>\$ 1,000</u>	<u>\$ 150</u>	<u>\$ 2,402</u>
3. Helping Disadvantaged Farms, Firms, Communities and People					
a. Family Problems	\$ 150	\$	\$	\$ 100	\$ 250
b. Causes of Poverty	200				200
c. Improve Economic Potential	1,100			250	1,350
d. Communication Problems	100			200	100
e. Community Services & Institutions	350				550
	<u>\$ 1,900</u>	\$	<u>\$</u>	<u>\$ 550</u>	<u>\$ 2,450</u>
-----					
PROGRAM	\$14,647	\$5,917	\$6,000	\$2,000	\$28,564
FACILITIES					\$24,000
INCREASED COSTS	\$ 3,985	\$ 295			\$ 4,280
ADMINISTRATION					\$ 636
Program	\$ 453	\$ 183			123
Increased Cost	123				
	<u>\$19,208</u>	<u>\$6,395</u>	<u>\$6,000</u>	<u>\$2,000</u>	<u>\$57,603</u>

NOTE: Figures rounded to thousands of dollars

\*Based on meeting July 27, 1971 (Lvn, Rbs, Tl, Dn)

TABLE III. FACILITY NEEDS OF STATE  
AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENT STATIONS

1. Renovation and Alteration of Unsafe and/or Obsolete Facilities Required for On-going Research
    - a. Federal (722 SMY in SAES Facilities)
      - Present value of physical plant =  
 $722 \times 60,000 = \$43,320,000$
      - Assuming annual cost of 5% =  
 $0.5 \times 43,320,000 = \$2,166,000$
      - At 50% Federal share = \$1,083,000
    - b. SAES (6,000 SMY)
      - Present value of physical plant =  
 $6,000 \times 60,000 = \$360,000,000$
      - Assuming annual cost of 5% =  
 $0.5 \times 360,000,000 = \$18,000,000$
      - At 20% Federal share = \$3,600,000
  
  2. Replacement of Unsafe and/or Obsolete Facilities Required for On-going Research
    - a. Federal (722 SMY in SAES Facilities)
      - Replacement value  $722 \times 120,000 = \$86,640,000$
      - Assuming useful life of 50 years replacement  
 cost per year =  $0.2 \times 86,640,000 = \$1,732,800$
      - At 50% Federal share = \$866,400
    - b. State (6,000 SMY)
      - Replacement value  $6,000 \times 120,000 = \$720,000,000$
      - Assuming useful life of 50 years replacement  
 cost per year =  $0.2 \times 720,000,000 = \$14,400,000$
      - At 20% Federal share = \$2,880,000
  
  3. Provision of Additional Space to Relieve Overcrowding of Existing Staff Conducting On-going Research
    - a. Federal (space for 140 SMY required)
      - $140 \times 120,000 = \$16,800,000$
      - At 50% Federal share = \$8,400,000
    - b. State (space for 853 SMY required)
      - $853 \times 120,000 = \$102,360,000$
      - At 20% Federal share = \$20,472,000
- Total additional space required = \$28,872,000  
 Assuming 5 years = \$5,774,400 per year

4. Provision of Additional Space for New Programs  
Assuming \$20,000,000 New Program and \$70,000 per  
SMY = 286 New SMY

$$286 \times 120,000 = \$34,320,000$$

SUMMARY

	<u>Federal SMY in SAES</u>	<u>SAES-SMY</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
1. Renovation and Alteration	\$1,083,000	\$3,600,000	\$4,683,000
2. Replacement	866,400	2,880,000	3,746,400
3. More Adequate Space	1,680,000	4,094,400	5,774,400
4. New Programs	---	34,320,000	34,320,000
	<hr/>		
Total			\$48,523,800

BASIC ASSUMPTIONS AND DATA

6,000 State SMY in space adequate for 5,147  
(Space required for 853 SAES-SMY)

722 USDA SMY in SAES Facilities in space adequate for 582  
(Space required for 140 USDA-SMY in SAES Facilities)

Average 1969 replacement cost of space = \$120,000/SMY

Present value of existing space = \$60,000/SMY

July 28, 1971

support for facilities under P.L. 88-74. One of these questions has to do with the need and the other has to do with why the federal government should provide these funds rather than the states. Robins outlined four bases that have been evolved in recent discussions with the RD's for ascertaining the needs for facilities funding under P.L. 88-74. (1) For expanded programs requiring new space; (2) New space for on-going programs where current space is inadequate and overcrowded. About 1,000 of the 6,000 or so SAES staff are currently inadequately housed. This is the catch-up category; (3) Replacement of facilities that are beyond repair or are in the wrong place to do the work; (4) Space needed to be remodeled to meet current research requirements. The answer to why federal funds should be provided for these needs is that the states are currently under great financial stress, and regardless of the urgency cannot meet these requirements. A series of questions were directed at the speakers reporting on the facilities funding.

Q. Can P.L. 88-74 funds be used for facilities at the Land Grant Colleges of 1890?

A. No, the law applies specifically to the State Agricultural Experiment Stations.

Q. Can funds under P.L. 88-74 be used to buy major equipment such as electron-microscopes?

A. Yes.

Q. Are there surveys to indicate that certain specific kinds of specific facilities, e.g., livestock research facilities, are in short supply even though there is a surplus of other facilities?

A. This information is not available in this form. A survey was made in terms of facilities to support each RPA. The results were not very helpful.

Q. Is there a coordinated plan for facilities between ARS and SAES?

- A. Yes, through administrative channels and through ARPF and ARPAC. There is a substantial degree of coordination on this.
- Q. Where is the hang-up in facilities funding? Is it in the USDA or Congress?
- A. Both, and also the Office of Management and Budget. All three of these questions the need for federal funding for SAES facilities.
- Q. Are we failing to get federal facilities appropriations because of the excess of USDA facilities?
- A. Not so much anymore. State Directors can help by carefully documenting the case in each state, pointing out those instances in which surplus federal facilities do not meet their needs as well as those facilities that do, in fact, meet their needs.
- Q. Should the Legislative Subcommittee of ESCOP go directly to Congress on this matter?
- A. The existence of the Legislative Committee of the Administrative Heads of Agriculture causes some confusion on what constitutes appropriate action by the Legislative Subcommittee of ESCOP. Director Wood reported that he would carry this proposal to ESCOP and urge more direct means of providing information on facilities needs of the State Agricultural Experiment Stations to Congress.

### 13.0 ARPAC Report

Director Frevert reported that ARPAC has not met since his last report in March.

Director Hervey reported that a resolution was passed at the Great Plains Council meeting, the last week of July, which reiterated its interest in Plant Stress, in the Plains, and the Moisture Laboratory. The resolution requested USDA to consider asking for planning funds for appropriate research facilities on these in the FY 1973 budget.

#### 14.0 Committee of Nine Report

Director C. P. Wilson reported on the actions of the Committee of Nine.

##### 14.1 New Western Regional Research Projects approved since January 1, 1971:

W-113 Improvement of Income for Disadvantaged People in Non-Metropolitan Areas

W-114 Institutional Structures for Improving Rural Community Services

W-115 Western Region Area Development Research Center

W-116 Nutrition and Food Acceptance as Related to Selected Environmental Factors

W-117 Structural Changes in Agricultural Industries: Causes and Impacts

W-118 Economic and Social Significance of Human Migration for the Western Region

W-119 Evaluation of Alternative Land Uses on Forest, Range and Other Wildlands

W-120 Economic and Social Impact to Adjustment in Use of Agricultural Chemicals

14.2 Fiscal Year 1972 RRF Allotments were reviewed and approved. The response of the Stations in providing recommended allotments prior to the June 1971 meeting was much more complete than a year earlier. In 1970 nearly half of the Stations failed to have their recommended allotments to the Committee of Nine in time for the meeting. This resulted in a strongly worded letter from the Chairman of the Committee of Nine to the Directors urging that their recommendations be submitted in time for the June meeting.

14.3 At the April 1971 Committee of Nine meeting, recommendation was approved that CSRS prepare

and distribute all CRIS forms to all participating Stations in new and revised regional projects based on information in the regional project outline. Members observed that the forms did not contain complete information due to inadequate information in the regional project outline.

- 14.4 The Committee of Nine has been attempting to prepare a report on "The Regional Research Fund 1947-72" which would cite specific examples of research accomplishments. The purpose of the report would be to tell the story of what regional research has contributed and can contribute to the goals of agricultural research. The report still lacks the punch or "zap" that is desired. Work will continue on the report.
- 14.5 The Committee of Nine reviewed the reactions of the Regional Associations of Directors to the so-called Buchanan-King Report. Director Barton was assigned the task of soliciting from the Chairman of each Regional Association of Directors the action taken at the summer meetings.
- 14.6 Although manual guidelines will not be altered, it is permissible for a Station to submit more than one contributing project to a single regional project. It is also possible in exceptional cases for a contributing project title to differ from the regional project title.
- 14.7 A subcommittee of the Committee of Nine reviewed the FAR Report No. 9 as it pertains to the RRF program. The following is a brief report of the subcommittee.
- 14.71 The Committee of Nine concurs that it should not involve itself in determining the scientific adequacy of each regional project. This is a responsibility of the Administrative Adviser, Directors of participating Stations and CSRS.
- 14.72 The Committee of Nine concurs that it can play a larger role in advance planning of regional and national research programs.

- 14.73 The Committee of Nine feels it has a responsibility, along with CSRS and the Regional Association of Directors, to study allocation procedures and administrative requirements in a further effort to simplify the RRF program. (A study of present and possible alternative procedures has been initiated. It should be noted that one alternative procedure is the Hatch Formula. Every single Station in the Western Region would receive less RRF funds under the Hatch Formula than under the current allocation procedure.)
- 14.74 The Committee disagrees with the proposal to substitute a Memorandum of Agreement for the Regional Project Outline.
- 14.8 There are 37 Regional Research Projects in which Stations outside the home region are participating. There are 49 instances of Stations crossing regional boundaries with contributing projects. Total funds (not just RRF) amount to \$1.4 millions.

#### 15.0 WAERC Report

The report of WAERC was presented by Director C. P. Wilson. (See also Appendix 15.0.)

#### 15.1 Future Role of the Western Agricultural Economics Research Council

15.11 WAERC proposes to perform the following functions:

- . The identification of emerging economic issues
- . The coordination of non-RRF funded regional research among the Stations and with that of USDA and other agencies
- . The generation of regional research ideas not instituted by the task forces

- . Assuring that a balance be maintained between research involving the social sciences and that centering around production fields
- . The continuing education of members of the Council
- . The Council stands ready to assist the Directors in analyzing economic and social trends that may affect research and education in the West

15.2 In 1969 the WAERC committees were restructured. The four committees on marketing, farm management, water and range were terminated and new committees were established on Commercial Agriculture, Natural Resources, and Community and Human Resources Development. The new committees were advised that they were not responsible for drafting new regional research project proposals which the old committees had assumed as a major responsibility. Having been shorn of this responsibility, the new committees seemed at a loss for something to do. More recently, a productive approach to research planning, including identification and evaluation of priorities, has been taken.

15.21 The Commercial Agriculture committee has concerned itself with development of research goals, efficiency in allocation of research resources, and organizational changes necessary to facilitate a total program of research.

15.22 The committee on Community and Human Resources Development devoted its early attention to the generation of a regional research proposal which, because the proposal was consistent with a priority task force recommendation, made its way through the approval route. More recently attention has been given to professional improvement to gear up for research in this field and to identification of priority subject-matter areas.

15.23 The Natural Resources committee has approached its work by spelling out a seven-step procedure for structuring

priorities. This committee has also set up a cross classification of some 50 problem areas across five natural resource categories.

15.3 The Western Agricultural Economics Research Council adopted a motion or resolution at its July, 1971 meeting recommending that the Western Directors fund W-115, Western Region Area Development Research Center, at Oregon State, in the same manner as the W-6, New Plants Center -- namely from off-the-top of the Western Region Allotment of RRF based on a budget submitted by the Administrative Adviser.

15.4 WAERC requested their Administrative Adviser to explore with the Western Directors the possibility of a half-day joint session at the 1972 summer meeting of the Western Directors to discuss such topics as:

- . Emerging social trends and forces
- . Role of the social sciences in environmental problems
- . Special problems in social science research
- . Communications problems
- . Resource allocation problems

If the Western Directors would look with favor on a joint session, WAERC would propose a joint session, WAERC would propose a joint agenda committee so that the Western Directors could raise questions of special interest to them.

## 16.0 WSWRC Report

The WSWRC Report was presented by Director Frevert. At the annual meeting of WSWRC, April 20 and 21, 1971, at Corvallis, Oregon, the following items were discussed and called to attention for action or information.

16.1 WSWRC recommends that the Western Directors approve a meeting of the Phosphorus Work

Group for the third week of March 1972, in Boise, Idaho. The fertilizer industry pledge support for funds to furnish travel of the states' representatives to this meeting.

- 16.2 WSWRC recommends that the Western Directors approve the request for the Work Group on Soil Fertility and Diagnostic Techniques to meet in July, 1972, following the Annual Meeting of the Pacific Northwest Plant Food Association in Bozeman, Montana. It is expected that the members (or alternates) will be attending the PNWPF meetings.
- 16.3 WSWRC recommends that the Western Directors approve the request of the Soil Survey Work Group to meet in Hawaii, January 22-29, 1972 in connection with the Western Soil Survey Work Planning Conference. Members of the Soil Survey Work Group are all members of this Work Planning Conference and their meeting has been approved.

Director Frevert moved, seconded by Director M. L. Wilson, approval of the three Work Group meetings.  
PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

- 16.4 WSWRC requests that a greater effort be made to insure communication to all members of WSWRC on matters pertaining to Soil and Water. Each WSWRC member would appreciate receiving a copy of each of any additional Soil and Water Task Force reports as they are prepared.

(RRC took action regarding task force reports)

- 16.5 WSWRC recommends that the Western Directors approve a meeting of WSWRC in Riverside, California during the quarter break in March or April 1972.

APPROVED by agreement.

#### 17.0 WHERAC Report

The report of WHERAC was presented by Director Leyendecker. WHERAC met in San Francisco, California March 24-25, 1971.

- 17.1 The special committee of WHERAC, which has been working on inter-institutional doctoral programs, reported that three states, Colorado, Utah and Nevada, had signed the agreement sponsored by WICHE. These three states will accept an interchange of course requirements and students who are working toward the Ph.D. in specialty areas, not common to all institutions. It is anticipated that this cooperative agreement will help to alleviate the severe shortage of Ph.D. trained home economists in the West.
- 17.2 Dr. Buchanan presented two timely items of importance to WHERAC, which will be very helpful in the planning and recommending phases of home economics regional research in the West:
- . Planning and implementation of agricultural research on a regional and national basis;
  - . Approach to getting funds and presenting budget requests.
- 17.3 It was agreed that the statistical information which was gathered three or four years ago, which pertains to home economics programs in the West, would be updated and summarized in a form which would be of assistance to WHERAC in forward planning and decision making concerning all home economics research in the Western Region. Members of WHERAC will also informally over the next year, gather information which would be helpful in preparing state and federal budget requests, as well as other justification requests pertaining to regional home economics research in the West.
- 17.4 Chairman of WHERAC will be responsible for distributing copies of all Task Force reports to the members. Where applicable, members will contact their Director relative to the desirability of home economics participation in the future development of project outlines by technical committees.
- 17.5 Director Leyendecker entered a special plea to the Directors present to increase their support for project W-116.

## 18.0 WSRAC Report

Director Wood reported on the activities of WSRAC. This committee met at Tucson, Arizona in April 28-29, 1971. Principal agenda items were:

- . A one-day seminar on methodology in social research with special application to rural development problems.
- . Considerable discussion was given to the newly established Western Region Area Development Research Center. Special points of emphasis were (a) how to implement its regional thrust; and (b) how WSRAC can assist the Center in its total program.
- . Appointed two rural social scientists to the Center Advisory and Technical Committee: Howard Behr of Washington and Isao Fujimoto of California.

The committee moved to meet jointly for one day with WAERC to review coordination and research needs in social sciences -- probably in the Fall of 1971.

The question was raised on the coordination of extension programs and research activities through WSRAC. Director Wood reported that in his view this constitutes a problem. The research and extension objectives in programs are not adequately coordinated.

## 19.0 Analysis of Experience with RRC System

Director M. J. Burris distributed his "white paper" on Function of the Task Force System of Regional Research Management. (A copy is appended to these minutes as Appendix 19.0)

Following the reading of this report there was discussion of several aspects and a number of suggestions for action and response to the report were explored but not formally presented. One suggestion was that the white paper become a basis for further guidance and suggestions for action by the Directors and the Regional Research Committee. One suggestion was the membership on RRC be enlarged in order to cope with the additional work load that study of the suggestions contained in this document would undoubtedly entail. In the absence of other formal

action, Chairman Kelly directed that the Regional Research Committee review and evaluate the report and recommend appropriate action on issues raised by the report. This action is to be completed by the Spring 1972 meeting.

## 20.0 Communications with USDA

Dr. Edminster, newly appointed Administrator of ARS, spoke on the subject of inter-communication between ARS and SAES. He spoke about the importance of inter-communication among the components of these agencies and of some of the difficulties of achieving a high level of communication between agencies in the ARS and the numerous and diverse State Agricultural Experiment Stations.

Dr. Edminster then surveyed several current, urgent problems in terms of administrative complexities and intercommunication between state and federal agencies.

Research and control measures against Venezuelan Equine Encephalomyelitis (VEE) is a case in point. It took about 30 years for VEE to move from Northern South America to Texas. Yet, the Department and other action agencies were not fully prepared to meet the crisis when it arrived in Texas. An indicated solution for such events is better planning and better coordination of the agencies responsible for such matters.

A cause for similar concern is the current threat of an epidemic of African Swine Fever. This is a devastating disease that has ravaged swine population in Europe. It has recently been introduced to Cuba, and clearly, has the potential of reaching the United States either through traffic into Florida or to the mainland in Latin America. There is no effective vaccine, and research to develop one is clearly indicated. The Cubans have taken drastic measures against this disease and these show initial promise of effectiveness.

Another crisis is the Gypsy Moth. This insect is out of control in the northeastern states.

Accidental contamination of poultry feed with PCB (Polychlorobiphenyl) resulting from a break in a heat exchanger in a fish meal plant has caused much

public alarm. An extensive monitoring program has been put into effect but the full extent of the contamination of broilers has not been determined.

Dr. Edminster reported on proposed regulatory action, by the State of Illinois, to place restrictions on the use of fertilizers and other agricultural chemicals. These regulations are complex and highly restrictive. They were devised largely by Dr. Sam Aldrich. Hearings on these regulations are now in progress.

Dr. Edminster reported that action is under consideration to remove regulatory and action functions from ARS. Currently, ARS has both research and regulatory functions. A decision on this matter is likely within the next two weeks.

Dr. Edminster reported that there will likely be increased emphasis on regional organization of research by the ARS. This should lead to closer relationships with the regional associations of the State Agricultural Experiment Stations.

Chairman Kelly reported that he and Dr. Edminster and Dean Myers of Arizona will act as a Chairman's committee to work on improved communications between Western State Agricultural Experiment Stations, the Western Directors Association, and the ARS. Director Kelly requested letters on this subject from all Western Directors citing specific examples of where improvement is needed and suggesting possible solutions. He specifically solicited letters from Directors Burris, Hervey, Thorne, C. P. Wilson, Frevert, A. I. Morgan, Jr., and J. B. Kendrick, Jr.

#### 20.1 Collaborators' Conference

Director A. I. Morgan, Jr. of the Western Marketing and Nutritional Research Division Laboratory at Albany, California reported on the Collaborators' Conference for Spring 1972. Director Morgan emphasized that the conference is a mutual effort. He reviewed the history and policies of these annual conferences and proposed three possible subjects for the 1972 conference as follows:

- (1) Food Additives
- (2) Recent Advances in Food Processing

### (3) Mechanical Harvesting of Fruits and Vegetables

Dr. Robert Olson of the Albany Laboratory provided background information on these topics. A vote was held on these subjects and the Directors indicated a preference for Food Additives as the conference subject. Director Morgan indicated acceptance of this as the chosen subject of the conference.

#### 21.0 CSRS Program Planning

Director Day reported that on June 29, 1971, the third of a series of seminars on CSRS functions and relations with the State Agricultural Experiment Stations was held by CSRS at the National Arboretum in Washington. Director Day attended as an invited participant from the West. The seminar consisted of prepared speeches and open discussions on policy matters having to do with CSRS "Science Service" to the State Agricultural Experiment Stations. Director Robins reported that these seminars had proven to be helpful to CSRS and should lead to mutual benefits to CSRS and to the State Agricultural Experiment Stations.

#### 22.0 Plant Variety Protection Act

Director Ensign reported on his attendance as a representative of the Western Directors to a meeting at Minneapolis to review implications of the Plant Variety Protection Act. Participants included Directors of the State Agricultural Experiment Stations, personnel from USDA and broad representation from the seed industry. Minutes have been sent to all Directors.

The Plant Variety Protection Act permits registration of varieties with the USDA. These registrations appear to have all the legal aspects of a patent. The actual effect of the Variety Protection Act is highly problematical. There is considerable doubt that the registrations can actually have the force of patents, but may more likely amount to something analogous to trade mark registration.

### 23.0 Southern Corn Leaf Blight

Director Day reported on his attendance on behalf of the Western Directors of a meeting called by CSRS on Allocation of Emergency Funds for Research on Southern Corn Leaf Blight. This meeting was called by CSRS on May 14, 1971. The meeting advised the Administrator of CSRS on allocation of the emergency funds which were in the process of being appropriated at that time for allocation under the provisions of P.L. 89-106.

Dr. Robins explained subsequent events leading to the final allocation of these funds.

### 24.0 Beef Cattle Research Report

Dr. E. J. Warwick was introduced by the Chairman to present a verbal report and commentary on the study, "A Plan for Coordination of Beef Cattle Research by SAES and USDA".

Dr. Warwick of the USDA and Dr. Whatley of Oklahoma were appointed by ESCOP as a two-man committee to prepare this study. The study began in 1969 utilizing as its bases the CRIS print-out for 1968. Each Director of a State Agricultural Experiment Station and the Division Heads of ARS were asked to project their research plans. These projections were on the basis of zero increase, 40 per cent increase, and 75 per cent increase. They were also asked to supply information on ways and means and mechanisms for coordination and planning of research. Among the important findings were:

- (1) The research effort on beef cattle is highly dispersed. It appears as small bits and pieces in 47 states and 8 divisions of ARS.
- (2) The research is highly fragmented, consisting in many instances of part-time inputs by a large number of people.
- (3) There is much evident duplication of effort (73 research units on genetics of feed efficiency, for example).

- (4) There is much trivial research (e.g., nine CRIS units on supplemental feeding for pastural animals with these CRIS units fragmented among many people).

An important finding from the study was that Beef Cattle Research will have high priority in the future with Directors expressing the intent of expanding this effort at the expense of other research programs. The projections for increase are largely in those areas where research is already in progress. Dr. Warwick questioned the wisdom of these allocations in some instances.

According to Dr. Warwick, the regional projects have not been outstandingly effective as a coordination mechanism. Likewise, it is evident from the studies that Directors oppose coordination mechanisms that encroach upon their authority to manage their experimental efforts. However, all research directors were in favor of better coordination. Dr. Warwick feels that the study shows that there is a real opportunity to concentrate effort in certain areas, reduce fragmentation and dispersal of effort.

The study proposes:

- (1) A continuing two-man committee to report to ARPAC.
- (2) As a general principle, this committee and parallel committees should focus sharply on a limited commodity, such as one crop or one animal.
- (3) This two-man committee should direct its attention to all phases of work on its subject.
- (4) There should be three coordinators to form the working arm of the committee. These persons would be coordinators only and have no enforcement power. For beef production, they should be in the subject matter areas of
  - (a) animal protection,
  - (b) production, and
  - (c) processing and economics.

Work groups should be formed on a national and/or regional basis cutting across ARS and SAES. These

should have many of the functions of present regional technical committees. The key and critical conclusion of the Warwick-Whatley report is that there is a pressing need for coordination in our research.

#### 24.1 North Central Directors' Resolution on Clay Center

The Chairman reported that we have on hand a resolution from the North Central Region having to do with coordination of the research programs of the SAES with Clay Center. Kelly reported that ESCOP Interim Committee has already acted on this. No action was taken by Western Directors.

Director Rue Jensen spoke on his 1969 appointment to represent Western Directors on matters related to Clay Center.

Director Leyendecker commented that the Warwick-Whatley report will serve as an input in the planning procedures of Forward Planning Committee as it goes ahead toward the development of interregional and national plans.

Director Wood moved, seconded by Director Leyendecker, and a resolution was duly passed thanking Dr. Warwick for his appearance at the Western Directors' meeting and commending him and Dr. Whatley for their fine effort in the Warwick-Whatley study.

#### 25.0 Travel to WM-59

Director Ayres reported that the WM-59 Technical Committee had met on July 23-24, 1971 and they have requested a meeting to be held in Mid-March, 1972 to finalize a regional publication. The WM-59 regional research project terminates June 30, 1972.

The Mid-March meeting would be a second meeting for Fiscal Year 1972. However, the Technical Committee did not meet during Fiscal Year 1971.

Director Ayres moved, seconded by Director C. P. Wilson, that the Western Directors authorize a March meeting for WM-59, this being an additional meeting for this project in the same fiscal year.  
MOTION CARRIED.

## 26.0 Occupational Help

Director Frevert called attention of the Western Directors to new regulations now introduced into California requiring specified waiting periods following use of certain insecticides before agricultural workers could reenter treated fields. His question had to do with the application of these regulations to research workers. He proposed that this posed a policy question in research management. He reported that Arizona has set 72 hours as an arbitrary rule for their research and extension workers on reentering restricted fields. It was agreed that B. E. Day of California will arrange a meeting with Arizona personnel to exchange information on this matter.

## 27.0 ARS Space

A. I. Morgan, Jr. Director of the Western Utilization Research and Development Division, reported that there continues to be surplus space in the regional laboratory at Albany. This space continues to be available to support SAES research programs in the west. There are some graduate students in Nutritional Sciences from the UC Berkeley Campus now utilizing this space and equipment.

Director Buchanan reported that other facilities are available in the west and that failure to use this space continues to impair our credibility in our quest for funding under P.L. 88-74. He reiterated his prior request for documentation from Directors of conversations and outcome on these matters.

## 28.0 Agricultural Board

Director Thorne reported on the activities of the Agricultural Board. The Agricultural Board is an agency of the National Research Council, National Academy of Sciences. Jim Horsfall, Director at New Haven, Connecticut, is Chairman. The Board has about 15 members. It publishes authoritative reports on various problems of national and international concern in agriculture. SAES Directors should increase their interests, inputs and coordination with the Agricultural Board.

## 29.0 Resolutions

On behalf of the Resolutions Committee, which included Director M. L. Wilson as Chairman, and Director W. M. Dugger, Jr., Director Wilson offered the following resolutions. (See Appendix 29.0 for details.)

### 29.1 Resolution 1

Western Directors express their appreciation to Directors Hilston and Ayres and their wives.

### 29.2 Resolution 2

Western Directors express their appreciation to Manager Dahlquist, Mosley Land and Cattle Company.

### 29.3 Resolution 3

Western Directors express their appreciation to Dr. T. W. Edminster, Administrator of ARS.

### 29.4 Resolution 4

Western Directors express their appreciation and best wishes to Dr. K. W. Hill.

All motions duly made and PASSED.

The Secretary was directed to write a letter to County Agent Michael Schwope thanking him for his help in running the meetings. Likewise to Karen Edwards who is County Extension Home Economist at Jackson.

## 30.0 Future Meetings

30.1 Director Leyendecker reported that arrangements are continuing for the 1972 Spring meeting jointly with the Western Extension Directors. Current arrangements are to meet in Kona, Hawaii. The first one and one-half days would be joint sessions with the Extension Directors. Options are for either the first or third weeks in February. On a motion moved by Director Leyendecker, seconded by

Director Burris, it was voted to meet in Kona on the third week of February 1972. MOTION CARRIED.

Director Leyendecker stated that he had appointed N. W. Hilston and R. F. Frary of Wyoming and J. A. Asleson and T. S. Aasheim of Montana as a joint station-extension group to develop agenda, etc. He assured the group that the joint session would be a good one.

- 30.2 Director Ely extended an invitation to Western Directors to hold their Summer Meetings 1972 in Reno, Nevada. On motion made by Director Wood, seconded by Director Hervey, the Western Directors voted to accept the invitation of the Nevada Station to meet in Reno. The exact date will be determined by Directors Leyendecker and Ely to fit and coordinate with other meetings.

### 31.0 Report of Nominating Committee

Director Frevert reported as follows for the Nominating Committee which consisted of Director R. K. Frevert as Chairman, and Directors G. B. Wood and L. C. Ayres:

#### Officers of WAAESD:

Chairman	- C. P. Wilson
Vice Chairman	- P. J. Leyendecker
Secretary	- B. E. Day
Treasurer	- J. A. Asleson
Recording Secretary	- M. T. Buchanan
Director-at-Large	- M. T. Buchanan
ARPAC Representative	- R. K. Frevert

#### Regional Research Committee:

Chairman	- M. L. Wilson
2 Years	- B. E. Day
3 Years	- W. H. Foote
Alternate	- C. E. Clark

## Committee of Nine:

- |           |                |
|-----------|----------------|
| 1 Year    | - C. P. Wilson |
| 3 Years   | - L. C. Ayres  |
| Alternate | - M. J. Burris |

## ESCOP:

- |           |                 |
|-----------|-----------------|
| 1 Year    | - R. E. Ely     |
| 2 Years   | - G. B. Wood    |
| 3 Years   | - D. W. Bohmont |
| Alternate | - D. F. Hervey  |

## ESCOP Legislative Subcommittee:

- |         |              |
|---------|--------------|
| 1 Year  | - R. E. Ely  |
| 2 Years | - G. B. Wood |

## ESCOP Marketing Subcommittee:

- |                  |                 |
|------------------|-----------------|
| 1 Year as Needed | - J. M. Nielson |
|------------------|-----------------|

## Executive Committee:

- |      |                     |
|------|---------------------|
| 1972 | - C. P. Wilson      |
|      | - P. J. Leyendecker |
|      | - B. E. Day         |
|      | - J. A. Asleson     |
|      | - M. L. Wilson      |

## Forward Planning Committee:

- |      |                     |
|------|---------------------|
| 1972 | - P. J. Leyendecker |
|      | - M. T. Buchanan    |
|      | - R. E. Ely         |
|      | - G. B. Wood        |
|      | - C. P. Wilson      |
|      | - T. S. Ronningen   |

## Administrative Advisors:

- |        |                     |
|--------|---------------------|
| WAERC  | - C. P. Wilson      |
| WSWRC  | - R. K. Frevert     |
| WSRAC  | - G. B. Wood        |
| WHERAC | - P. J. Leyendecker |

On motion by Director Leyendecker, seconded by Director Wood, the Directors voted unanimously to elect all nominees.

32.0 Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 11:10 a.m., August 6, 1971.

## APPENDIX 6.8

## MINUTES OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

Western Association  
of Agricultural Experiment Station DirectorsJackson, Wyoming  
August 3, 1971

Present: C. F. Kelly, Chairman  
J. A. Asleson, Treasurer  
M. J. Burris, RRC Chairman  
B. E. Day, Secretary  
M. T. Buchanan, Director-at-Large and  
Recording Secretary

Chairman Kelly called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m., August 3, 1971 in the Jackson Room, Wort Motor Hotel, Jackson, Wyoming.

Chairman Kelly called attention to his letter of July 14, 1971 listing two agenda items: (1) Recording Secretary position, and (2) Appointment of a Nominating Committee. He said Mark Buchanan had requested a third: Evaluation of role and performance of DAL. In thinking the third item over, enroute, he had come to the conclusion that only the "job description" should be studied at this time, he said. A review of the incumbent would be appropriate only if the position review suggests a continuation of the position. Then, the review of the incumbent should be in relation to his potential for the job description as delineated by the review and as accepted by Western Directors.

#### 1. Recording Secretary Function

Kelly called on DAL Buchanan to proceed with a discussion of the recording secretary function. Buchanan presented a prepared statement on this topic together with statements of expenditures for the Office of the WDAL and Recording Secretary Function, July 1, 1970 to June 30, 1971. Forward budget estimates also were presented by Buchanan. (The financial statements referred to are appended, as are financial statements prepared by the Treasurer for Montana's role in the DAL account and for the Western Directors' Special Fund.)

STATEMENT OF EXPENDITURES  
OFFICE OF THE WESTERN DIRECTOR-AT-LARGE  
JULY 1, 1970 - JUNE 30, 1971

	<u>APPROPRIATION</u>	<u>EXPENDITURE</u>	<u>ENCUMBRANCE</u>	<u>BALANCE</u>
General Assistance	\$32,551.59	\$32,551.59	\$ -0-	\$ -0-
Supplies & Expense	23,992.35	10,295.79**	37.00	13,659.56
Equipment & Facilities	195.44	-0-	-0-	195.44
Employee Benefits	<u>3,648.12</u>	<u>3,648.12</u>	<u>-0-</u>	<u>-0-</u>
Total	<u>\$60,387.50*</u>	<u>\$46,495.50</u>	<u>\$ 37.00</u>	<u>\$13,855.00</u>

*Received from Montana	\$57,761.25
Carried Forward from 1969-70	2,238.75
Encumbrances Carried Forward from 1969-70	<u>387.50</u>
	<u>\$60,387.50</u>

\*\*Itemization of Expenditure:

Central Duplicating	\$ 336.41
Mailing Division	330.74
Telephone Charges	689.89
Travel	8,315.29
Storehouse	135.29
Garage	40.84
Direct Charge, Misc., K#	307.16
Printing	21.00
Library	<u>119.33</u>
	<u>\$10,295.79</u>

FORWARD BUDGET ESTIMATES  
OFFICE OF THE WESTERN DIRECTOR-AT-LARGE  
JULY 1, 1971 - JUNE 30, 1972

APPROPRIATION:            \$65,000.00

PROJECTED EXPENDITURES

General Assistance:

WDAL	\$33,099.96	
Adm. Asst. (60%)	<u>4,867.20</u>	
		<u>\$37,967.16</u>

Employee Benefits:

WDAL	2,999.76	
Adm. Asst. (60%)	<u>543.46</u>	
		<u>3,543.22</u>

Supplies & Expense:

Central Duplicating	300.00	
Mailing Division	330.00	
Telephone	700.00	
Travel	8,500.00	
Storehouse	100.00	
Miscellaneous*	300.00	
Printing	24.00	
Library	<u>120.00</u>	
		<u>10,374.00</u>

\$51,884.38

\*Includes Equipment, Direct Charge, K#, etc.

FORWARD BUDGET ESTIMATES  
OFFICE OF THE WESTERN DIRECTOR-AT-LARGE  
RECORDING SECRETARY FUNCTION  
JULY 1, 1971 - JUNE 30, 1972

APPROPRIATION: \$10,500.00

PROJECTED EXPENDITURES

General Assistance:

Adm. Asst. (40%)	\$3,244.80	
Sen. Typist Clerk-A (60%)	<u>3,290.40</u>	
		<u>\$6,535.20</u>

Employee Benefits:

Adm. Asst. (40%)	281.64	
Sen. Typist Clerk-A (60%)	<u>395.04</u>	
		<u>676.68</u>

Supplies & Expense:

Travel	1,837.08	
Central Duplicating	150.00	
Mailing Division	250.00	
Storehouse	75.00	
Printing	100.00	
Miscellaneous*	<u>876.04</u>	
		<u>3,288.12</u>

\$10,500.00

\*Includes Equipment, Direct Charge, FK#, Library, etc.

FINANCIAL STATEMENTDirector-at-Large

1969-70 Carryover (Bozeman)

\$2,484.50

ESCROW

FY 1968	2,456.24
FY 1969	2,150.00
FY 1970	2,362.50
FY 1971	<u>2,482.50</u>
	9,451.24

## Receipts from states:

Arizona .....	5,002.90
Calif.....	9,824.96
Colorado.....	6,811.18
Hawaii.....	2,471.30
Idaho.....	4,098.75
Montana.....	4,580.96
Nevada.....	2,471.30
New Mexico.....	2,772.69
Oregon.....	6,630.35
Utah.....	4,882.35
Washington.....	6,811.18
Wyoming.....	<u>3,917.93</u>

\$60,275.85

\$60,275.85

10/15/70	Interest on Treasury Bond	160.00
2/18/71	Interest on Treasury Bond	160.00
5/10/71	Interest on Treasury Bond	<u>256.81</u>

GRAND TOTAL INCOME.....\$63,337.16

DISBURSEMENTS:

FY 1971	ESCROW	2,482.50
7/1/70	Regents of Calif.	14,000.00
9/21/70	Regents of Calif.	16,000.00
10/27/70	Cost of Investment	63.48
1/13/71	Regents of Calif.	12,761.25
3/26/71	Regents of Calif.	<u>15,000.00</u>
		60,307.23

-60,307.23

BALANCE JUNE 30, 1971.....3,029.93

ESCROW BALANCE .....9,451.24

TOTAL FUND.....\$12,481.17

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

## Western Director's Special Fund

Cash Balance.....June 30, 1970 364.73

RECEIPTS:

Arizona	498.00
California	978.00
Colorado	678.00
Hawaii	246.00
Idaho	408.00
Montana	456.00
Nevada	246.00
New Mexico	276.00
Oregon	660.00
Utah	486.00
Washington	678.00
Wyoming	390.00

TOTAL---	\$6,000.00	+6,000.00
GRAND TOTAL RECEIPTS.....		<u>\$6,364.73</u>

DISBURSEMENTS:

6/2/70	J. A. Asleson, Chicago & Kansas City	53.99
	ESCOP	
7/10/70	G. B. Wood, St. Louis, Missouri	304.94
	ESCOP Interim - Subcommittee	
7/14/70	J. A. Asleson, St. Louis, Missouri	259.00
	ESCOP Interim - Subcommittee	
10/6/70	J. A. Asleson, Washington, D. C.	334.00
	ESCOP	
10/26/71	R. K. Frevert	300.04
	ARPAC	
10/14/70	R. E. Ely, Washington D. C.	348.60
	ESCOP	
1/29/71	J. A. Asleson, Washington D. C.	289.24
	ESCOP	
2/24/71	K. K. Frevert, Washington D. C.	298.04
3/11/71	D. W. Bohmont, Denver	193.00
	ESCOP	
5/10/71	J. A. Asleson, Washington, D. C.	292.82
	Testify to Senate Committee	
5/17/71	G. B. Wood, Denver	211.37
	ESCOP	
5/20/71	R. D. Ensign, Minneapolis	236.06
	ESCOP Industry Mtg. on seeds	
5/17/71	J. A. Asleson	2.85
	Western Union, Cancel Washington trip	
6/14/71	G. B. Wood, Washington D. C.	423.17
	ESCOP	

GRAND TOTAL DISBURSEMENTS.....	\$3,547.12	<u>3,547.12</u>
--------------------------------	------------	-----------------

BALANCE JUNE 30, 1971.....\$2,817.61

## APPENDIX

## 10.0 REGIONAL RESEARCH COMMITTEE REPORT

Western Association  
of Agricultural Experiment Station DirectorsJackson, Wyoming  
August 2-3, 1971

## Present:

Members:	Montana	- M. J. Burris, Chairman
	New Mexico	- M. L. Wilson
	California	- B. E. Day
	Oregon	- W. H. Foote, Alternate
Others:	WAESD	- M. T. Buchanan, Director-at-Large and Recording Secretary
		- Nancy Raphel, Adm. Assistant
	CSRS	- Bruce Beacher

The meeting was called to order by Chairman M. J. Burris at 9:00 a.m., August 2, 1971.

The Regional Research Committee discussed items in order indicated by this report.

RRC notes a continuing practice of tying technical, ad hoc, and coordinating committee meetings to other scientific meetings. Such practice should be avoided to the extent this scheduling makes cooperative planning less effective. Policy suggests that if these meetings are to be scheduled in conjunction with society meetings the technical committee should precede rather than follow the other meetings.

## 10.1 Task Force Reports

## 10.11 Dairy

A letter from Administrative Advisor R. E. Ely of Nevada stated that the task force members have indicated they desire to spend additional time in developing the final report. RRC assumes that the report will be available for review at its November meeting.

RRC recommends that the Chairman of RRC explore with Director Jensen, Administrative Advisor to W-112, the possibility of inclusion of the area of work on Reproductive Performance of Sheep with W-112 with a title change of W-112 to Reproductive Performance of Ruminant Animals.

(Action of Western Directors: APPROVED.)

In addition, RRC recommends the establishment of an Ad Hoc Technical Committee to develop a regional research project proposal on "Evaluating Management of Predators in Relation to Domestic Animals Including Public Policy Issues" with Director R. E. Ely of Nevada as Administrative Advisor and that the project outline be submitted to RRC not later than February 1, 1972 for review at its Spring meeting. This is the area of work identified by the task force on page 9, item A, except that the area of public policy issues has been added and the subject is predators of domestic animals rather than of sheep, alone.

(Action of Western Directors: APPROVED.)

#### 10.15 Vegetable Crops

The report of this task force was received from Administrative Advisor R. D. Ensign of Idaho. RRC commends this task force and its Administrative Advisor for the preparation of this report. RRC has two recommendations with respect to this task force report.

RRC recommends that an Ad Hoc Technical Committee be established to develop a regional research project proposal under proposal 1 as identified by the task force, "Mechanization and Increased Efficiency of Production of Vegetable Crops". This area of research was also identified as a high priority for regional research by the task force on Farm Labor and Mechanization with Director R. K.

preparation of this report. RRC recommends the authorization of an Ad Hoc Technical Committee to develop a regional research project proposal under priority number 1 as identified in the task force report, "Genotype - Environment Interactions Relating to End Product Use Characteristics in Small Grains" (reference page 1) with Director W. H. Foote of Oregon as Administrative Advisor and that the project outline be submitted to RRC not later than February 1, 1972 for review at its Spring meeting.

(Action of Western Directors: APPROVED.)

10.2 Status Report on Projects Due For Termination  
June 30, 1971

These projects are listed on pages 37-38 of the March 1971 minutes of WD. Administrative Advisors of these projects are reminded that termination reports are due in CSRS by February 1, 1972. They will receive reminders from CSRS.

10.3 Project Outlines

10.31 Clean West - A Systematic Analysis of Economic and Social Implications of Environmental Problems

A regional research project proposal was received from Administrative Advisor A. F. McCalla of California who appeared before the committee to explain the proposal and to answer questions concerning it. After discussion internally and with Dr. McCalla, RRC recommends approval of this project proposal for the period January 1, 1972 to June 30, 1977 as revised by Dr. McCalla at this meeting. RRC recommends that Dr. McCalla continue as Administrative Advisor.

(Action of Western Directors: APPROVED.)

10.32 Discovery and Control of Natural Toxicants in the Food Chain of Natural Toxicants

A project proposal bearing this title was received from Administrative Advisor C. E. Clark of Utah. RRC commends the Ad Hoc Technical Committee and its Administrative Advisor for the preparation of the proposal. RRC notes the need for additional development of procedures, more specific assignment of responsibilities and a time table for the achievement of objectives. More specifically, RRC notes that the section on division of effort on page 3 is insufficiently specific and complete. Since contributing project outlines are no longer required, the needed information should be provided in the regional project statement. RRC recommends that the project outline be returned to the Administrative Advisor with the request that it be revised and returned to RRC for review at its November meeting.

(Action of Western Directors: APPROVED.)

10.33 Status Report on Projects Recommended for Submission by Chairman (after revision) to Committee of Nine

The seven projects in this category have been recommended by the Committee of Nine and approved by CSRS. Specific notations have been sent by CSRS to the concerned Administrative Advisors:

W-114 Institutional Structures for Improving Rural Community Services (7/1/71 - 6/30/74)  
-- G. B. Wood

W-115 Western Region Area Development Research Center (4/14/71 - 6/30/74) -- G. B. Wood

W-116 Nutrition and Food Acceptance as Related to Selected Environmental Factors (7/1/71 - 6/30/76)  
-- P. J. Leyendecker

W-117 Structural Changes in Agricultural Industries: Causes and Impacts (7/1/71 - 6/30/74) -- C. P. Wilson

- W-118 Economic and Social Significance  
of Human Migration for the  
Western Region (7/1/71 - 6/30/76)  
-- C. P. Wilson
- W-119 Evaluation of Alternative Land  
Uses on Forest, Range and Other  
Wildlands (7/1/71 - 6/30/76)  
-- J. A. Zivnuska
- W-120 Economic and Social Impact to  
Adjustment in Use of Agricultural  
Chemicals (7/1/71 - 6/30/76)  
-- D. W. Bohmont

#### 10.4 Western Regional Coordinating Committees

##### 10.41 Extension of WRCC-2

A request for the extension of WRCC-2 was received from Administrative Advisor D. W. Bohmont of Nevada. RRC noted that the request for extension did not make reference to RRC'S action in establishing WRCC-2 (Minutes of WD, February 1970, p.29). RRC recommends, however, that due to the ground work that has been laid, WRCC-2 be extended one year with the request that the Administrative Advisor and the committee review RRC'S original comments with respect to the establishment of this coordinating committee.

(Action of Western Directors: APPROVED.)

##### 10.42 WRCC Reports

RRC reminds Administrative Advisors that in accordance with policy action of Western Directors, minutes of meetings of WRCC's are to be taken and distributed to each Director. The following is quoted from the Minutes of the July 1969 meeting of Western Directors:

"Minutes of each committee meeting are to be compiled and distributed among the Western Experiment Station Directors.

At the time of the final meeting of any such coordinating committee, a concise statement of benefits and accomplishments of the committee is to be prepared and distributed among the directors."

It is RRC'S interpretation that the purpose of WRCC'S is to coordinate research. RRC'S criterion for recommending approval of a WRCC then becomes one of reaching a judgment on the anticipated benefits of the coordination of the research involved. Thus, it is necessary to know the problem, the interdisciplinary involvement, what research is included (preferably including research project titles) and how the coordination is proposed to be achieved.

#### 10.5 New Personnel Assignments

- 10.51 RRC recommends that James M. Nielson of Washington replace J. A. Zivnuska as the Western Region's representative on the ESCOP Marketing Subcommittee.

(Action of Western Directors: APPROVED.)

Appreciation is expressed for Dr. Zivnuska's service on this committee.

- 10.52 RRC recommends the following Administrative Advisor replacements for K. W. Hill:

W-45 - B. E. Day  
W-67 - L. D. Swindale  
IR-4 - L. W. Rasmussen

(Action of Western Directors: APPROVED.)

- 10.53 RRC recommends that M. L. Wilson and D. L. Oldenstadt be continued as appointees to the Western Regional Rural Development Center Advisory and Technical Committee for project W-115.

(Action of Western Directors: APPROVED.)

- 10.54 Recommendations for Administrative Advisors to Ad Hoc Technical Committees recommended for activation at the August 2-3, 1971 meeting of RRC:
- Improve Production Efficiency by Regulating Climate, Fruit Set and Plant Spacing - D. D. Johnson
- Economics and Marketing Efficiency of Fruit Crops - D. L. Oldenstadt
- Evaluating Management of Predators in Relation to Domestic Animals Including Public Policy Issues - R. E. Ely
- Development of Equipment and New Techniques for Mechanized Production Systems to Reduce Labor Requirements, Costs, and Pollution from Wastes - W. M. Dugger, Jr.
- Genotype - Environment Interactions Relating to End Product Use Characteristics in Small Grains - W. H. Foote
- 10.55 Recommendation for Administrative Advisor to Technical Committee:
- Clean West - A Systematic Analysis of Economic and Social Implications of Environmental Problems - A. F. McCalla
- 10.56 Recommendation for Administrative Advisor to Western Regional Coordinating Committee:
- Diseases and Insects of Beans and Related Vegetables - R. D. Ensign
- 10.6 Other
- 10.61 Greenhouse Culture
- RRC notes that this topic received attention in the Farm Labor and Mechanization Task

of \$63,000 for Fiscal Year 1972. This will provide for the return of \$2,661 for other allotments among the Western States. CSRS will make the necessary readjustments in quarterly payments to each of the 12 Western States.

(Action of Western Directors: APPROVED.)

10.65 Updating Long Range Study

It was agreed that this was a matter for the Western Directors, as a whole.

(See item 9.4 of these minutes.)

10.66 Off-the-Top Funding for W-115

A letter from Administrative Advisor G. B. Wood of Oregon was received requesting off-the-top funding for the rural development research center. Discussion of WD action at the March 1971 meeting suggested that funding be provided from Special Grant Funds. Additional information should be available from the Administrative Advisor based on the results of the forthcoming meeting of the Center Advisory and Technical Committee. RRC makes no recommendation on this request and are transmitting this request to WD.

Action of Western Directors:

The item on funding of the Western Region Area Development Research Center was called by Chairman Kelly for discussion. Director Wood, Administrative Advisor for W-115, reported on the status of the Center. He emphasized the need for some assurance of continuity of funding before he can attract a qualified Director.

Leyendecker moved, seconded by Thorne, that the Western Directors support the Western Region Area Development Research Center at Oregon State University from Special Grant

and/or "off-the-top" regional funds at an annual budget level of \$100,000 for fiscal years 1973 to 1976. This motion was discussed at length.

A substitute motion was made by C. P. Wilson, seconded by L. W. Rasmussen, that the Western Directors agree to support the Western Region Area Development Research Center based on an annual budget submitted by the Administrative Advisor, to be approved each year by Western Directors, not to exceed \$75,000 from an allotment from off-the-top RRF from July 1, 1972 to June 30, 1976.

Following further discussion, the meeting was recessed until 8:30 a.m., Friday, August 6.

At the resumption of business on Friday, the substitute motion was called and FAILED to pass.

The following substitute motion was then moved by Director Leyendecker, seconded by Director Hervey: In furtherance of its policy favoring the establishment and support of the Western Region Area Development Research Center at Corvallis, the Western Directors declare their intention to support the basic program of the Center until June 30, 1976 subject to the following: (1) Acceptance and approval of appropriate programs, projects and budget recommendations; (2) Favorable critical review at the end of Fiscal Year 1974. When these constraints are met, the Western Directors will support the Center at an annual budget level of not less than \$75,000 from Special Grants and/or off-the-top funding. This MOTION CARRIED with one dissenting vote.

#### 10.67 Publication on New Crops

As you recall \$1,000 of off-the-top regional money was allocated last year to W-6 to pay

their share of the cost of a national publication pertaining to the history and accomplishments of the new crops research program. Quite recently the publication has been completed and each station will receive copies soon.

#### 10.7 Adjournment

RRC adjourned its formal meeting at 1:00 p.m., August 3, 1971. Most of the members of RRC were present, however, for further informal discussions with Dr. A. F. McCalla, Administrative Advisor for proposed project "Clean West - A Systematic Analysis of Economic and Social Implications of Environmental Problems" from 2:00 to 3:30 on August 3.

HATCH

RANK	RPA	NO. STATES	INCREASE	% TOTAL
13	410 New & Improved Meat, Milk, Eggs, & Other Animal Food Products	8	324	2.21
14	208 Control of Diseases and Nematodes of Field Crops & Range	8	320	2.18
15	305 Mechanization of Fruit & Vegetable Crop Production	8	314	2.14
16	312 Environmental Stress in Production of Livestock, Poultry & Other Animals	6	287	1.95
17	205 Control of Diseases & Nematodes of Fruit & Vegetable Crops	6	244	1.66
18	105 Conservation & Efficient Use of Water	4	211	1.44
19	702 Protect Food & Feed Sup- plies from Harmful Microorganisms & Naturally Occurring Toxins	5	205	1.40
20	318 Non-Commodity-Oriented Biological Technology & Biometry	4	200	1.36
20	904 Fish & Other Marine Life, Fur-Bearing Animals & Other Wildlife	4	200	1.36
21	701 Insure Food Products Free of Toxic Contaminants Including Residues from Agricultural & Other Sources	4	199	1.35
22	113 Remote Sensing	4	192	1.31
23	304 Improvement of Biological Efficiency of Fruit & Vegetable Crops	6	190	1.29
24	207 Control of Insects, Mites, Snails & Slugs Affecting Field Crops & Range	4	188	1.28

HATCH

RANK	RPA	NO. STATES	INCREASE	% TOTAL
25	803 Causes of Poverty Among Rural People	3	180	1.23
26	210 Control of Insects & External Parasites Affecting Livestock, Poultry, & Other Animals	3	158	1.08
27	102 Soil, Plant, Water, Nutrient Relationships	3	128	.87
27	112 Improvement of Range Resources	3	128	.87
28	806 Individual & Family Adjustment to Change	3	127	.86
29	802 Individual & Family Decision Making & Resource Use & Family Functioning	3	125	.85
30	309 Production Management Systems for Field Crops	2	123	.84
31	109 Adaptation to Weather & Weather Modification	3	122	.83
32	316 Farm Business Management	2	110	.75
32	503 Efficiency in Marketing Agricultural Products & Production Inputs	2	110	.75
33	412 Quality Maintenance in Marketing Animal Products	2	106	.72
34	402 Production of Fruit & Vegetable Crops with Improved Acceptability	2	104	.71
35	103 Management of Saline & Sodic Soils & Salinity	2	100	.68
35	403 New & Improved Fruit & Vegetable Products & Byproducts	2	100	.68
35	409 Production of Animal Products with Improved Acceptability	2	100	.68

HATCH

RANK	RPA	NO. STATES	INCREASE	% TOTAL
35	506 Supply, Demand & Price Analysis- Crop & Animal Products	2	100	.68
35	509 Performance of Marketing Systems	2	100	.68
35	807 Structural Changes in Agriculture	2	100	.68
36	906 Culture & Protection of Ornamentals & Turf	2	95	.65
37	101 Appraisal of Soil Resources	2	90	.61
38	204 Control of Insects, Mites, Slugs, & Snails on Fruit & Vegetable Crops	5	85	.58
39	106 Efficient Drainage & Irrigation Systems & Facilities	1	75	.51
39	805 Communication & Education Processes	1	75	.51
40	404 Quality Maintenance in Storing & Marketing Fruits & Vegetables	2	73	.50
41	808 Government Programs to Balance Farm Output & Market Demand	2	70	.48
42	107 Watershed Protection & Management	2	65	.44
43	501 Improvement of Grades & Standards--Crop & Animal Products	1	64	.44
44	510 Group Action & Market Power	1	61	.42
45	306 Production Management Systems for Fruits & Vegetables	2	57	.39

HATCH

<u>RANK</u>	<u>RPA</u>	<u>NO. STATES</u>	<u>INCREASE</u>	<u>% TOTAL</u>
46	206 Control of Weeds & Other Hazards to Fruit & Vegetable Crops	1	50	.34
46	213 Protect Livestock, Poultry & Other Animals from Toxic Chemicals, Poisonous Plants, & Other Hazards	1	50	.34
46	314 Bees & Other Pollinating Insects	1	50	.34
46	317 Mechanization & Structures Used in Production of Livestock, Poultry & Other Animals	1	50	.34
46	507 Competitive Interrelation- ships in Agriculture	1	50	.34
46	508 Development of Domestic Markets for Farm Products	1	50	.34
46	513 Supply, Demand & Price Analysis--Forest Products	1	50	.34
46	703 Food Choices, Habits, & Consumption	1	50	.34
46	801 Housing	1	50	.34
46	902 Outdoor Recreation	1	50	.34
47	707 Prevent Transmission of Animal Diseases & Parasites to Man	1	40	.27
48	201 Control of Insects Affecting Forests	1	35	.24
49	108 Economic & Legal Problems in Management of Water & Watersheds	1	32	.22
50	704 Home & Commercial Food Service	1	20	.14
51	406 New & Improved Food Pro- ducts from Field Crops	1	15	.10

HATCH

<u>RANK</u>	<u>RPA</u>	<u>NO.</u> <u>STATES</u>	<u>INCREASE</u>	<u>%</u> <u>TOTAL</u>
52	308 Mechanization of Production of Field Crops	1	<u>9</u>	.06
	TOTAL		<u><u>14687</u></u>	

MCINTIRE-STENNIS

<u>RANK</u>	<u>RPA</u>	<u>NO. STATES</u>	<u>INCREASE</u>	<u>% TOTAL</u>
1	111 Biology, Culture & Management of Forests & Timber-Related Crops	8	309	12.78
2	401 New & Improved Forest Products	7	266	11.01
3	303 Economics of Timber Production	6	243	10.05
4	903 Multiple Use Potential of Forest Land & Evaluation of Forestry Programs	10	239	9.89
5	301 Genetics & Breeding of Forest Trees	6	206	8.52
6	901 Alleviation of Soil, Water & Air Pollution & Disposal of Wastes	5	174	7.20
7	902 Outdoor Recreation	3	163	6.74
8	202 Control of Diseases, Parasites & Nematodes Affecting Forests	3	141	5.83
9	302 New & Improved Forest Engineering Systems	3	139	5.75
10	201 Control of Insects Affecting Forests	4	121	5.01
11	104 Alternative Uses of Land	4	117	4.84
12	107 Watershed Protection & Management	2	111	4.59
13	106 Efficient Drainage & Irrigation Systems & Facilities	2	66	2.73
14	909 Trees to Enhance Rural & Urban Environment	2	34	1.41
15	904 Fish & Other Marine Life, Fur-Bearing Animals & Other Wildlife	1	30	1.24

MCINTIRE-STENNIS

<u>RANK</u>	<u>RPA</u>	<u>NO. STATES</u>	<u>INCREASE</u>	<u>% TOTAL</u>
16	112 Improvement of Range Resources	2	29	1.20
17	109 Adaptation to Weather & Weather Modification	1	20	.83
18	113 Remote Sensing	1	<u>9</u>	<u>.37</u>
	TOTAL, SAES		2417	80.33
	TOTAL, OTHER FORESTRY SCHOOLS		<u>592</u>	19.67
	TOTAL, MCINTIRE-STENNIS		<u><u>3009</u></u>	

PROJECTED DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS (000) AT \$20 MILLION LEVEL OF INCREASE, SAES, FY 1974  
(RD-CSRS STRUCTURE)

PACKAGE AND RPA'S	HATCH				MCINTIRE-STENNIS				SPECIAL GRANTS	TOTAL	
	NE	S	NC	W	TOTAL	NE	S	NC			W
1. <u>Environmental Quality</u>											
a. Waste Management & Disposal											
901 Alleviation of Soil, Water & Air Pollution & Disposal of Wastes	542	694	309	288	1833	44	35		43	122	1955
b. Avoiding Chemical Pollution											
901 Alleviation of Soil, Water & Air Pollution & Disposal of Wastes	155	198	88	82	523	13	10		12	35	558
214 Protection of Plants, Animals & Man from Harmful Effects of Pollution	50	102	100	100	352	13	10		12	35	352
	205	300	188	182	875						910
c. Improving Physical & Aesthetic Features of Environment											
901 Alleviation of Soil, Water & Air Pollution & Disposal of Wastes	77	99	44	41	261	6	5		6	17	278
905 Trees to Enhance Rural & Urban Environment											
906 Culture & Protection of Ornamentsals & Turf	95	54			149						34
	172	153	44	41	410	6	5		16	24	149
											461
TOTAL - ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY	919	1147	541	511	3118	63	50	16	79	208	3826







PACKAGE AND RPA'S	HATCH				MCINTIRE-STENNIS				SPECIAL GRANTS	TOTAL					
	NE	S	NC	W	TOTAL	NE	S	NC			W	TOTAL			
409 Production of Animal Products With Improved Acceptability	50			50	100										100
410 New & Improved Meat, Milk, Eggs, & Other Animal Food Products	59	87	159	28	333										333
412 Quality Maintenance in Marketing Animal Products			50		50										50
501 Improvement of Grades & Standards -- Crop & Animal Products		56			56										56
503 Efficiency in Marketing Agricultural Products & Production Inputs	23	64	88		175										175
506 Supply, Demand & Price Analysis -- Crop & Animal Products			50		50										50
507 Competitive Interrelationships in Agriculture		50			50										50
508 Development of Domestic Markets for Farm Products		50			50										50
509 Performance of Marketing Systems		50			50										50
510 Group Action & Market Power			61		61										61
513 Supply, Demand & Price Analysis -- Forest Products				50	50										50
808 Government Programs to Balance Farm Output & Market Demand				70	70										70
	120	622	458	297	1497										1497
TOTAL - MEETING PRODUCER & CONSUMER NEEDS IN ASSURING FOOD & FIBER SUPPLIES	475	2618	2673	575	6341	2	27			29				500	6870

TOTAL - MEETING PRODUCER & CONSUMER NEEDS IN ASSURING FOOD & FIBER SUPPLIES



PACKAGE AND RPA'S	HATCH				MCINTIRE-STENNIS				SPECIAL GRANTS	TOTAL
	NE	S	NC	W	TOTAL	NE	S	NC		
806 Individual & Family Adjustment to Change	25	52	50	127						127
	100	52	175	327						327
c. Housing										
801 Housing	50			50						50
TOTAL - PROBLEMS OF RURAL PEOPLE	100	102	215	267	684					684
6. Resource Conservation & Use										
a. Physical & Biologic Resource Conservation & Use										
101 Appraisal of Soil Resources	50		40	90						90
103 Management of Saline & Sodic Soils & Salinity			50	50						50
104 Alternative Uses of Land	125	60	150	90	425	49	50	18		542
105 Conservation & Efficient Use of Water		144	50	194						194
106 Efficient Drainage & Irrigation Systems & Facilities		65		65					66	131
107 Watershed Protection & Management	15	50		65					111	176
108 Economic & Legal Problems in Management of Water & Watersheds			32	32						32

PACKAGE AND RPA'S	HATCH				MCINTIRE-STENNIS					SPECIAL GRANTS	TOTAL	
	NE	S	NC	W	TOTAL	NE	S	NC	W			TOTAL
109 Adaptation to Weather & Weather Modification	22		100		122	20				20		142
113 Remote Sensing	42	50	100		192			9		9		201
904 Fish & Other Marine Life, Fur-Bearing Animals & Other Wildlife	100	100		200		30				30		230
	304	519	350	262	1435	99	227	27		353		1788
b. Developing Recreational Resources												
902 Outdoor Recreation		50		50		50	113			163		213
TOTAL - RESOURCE CONSERVATION & USE	304	569	350	262	1485	149	340	27		516		2001
7. Meeting Needs for Forest Products												
a. Disease & Insect Control												
201 Control of Insects Affecting Forests	35			35		71	50			121		156
202 Control of Diseases, Parasites & Nematodes Affecting Forests						12	95	34		141		141
	35			35		83	145	34		262		297
b. Improvement of Production & Management Practices & Systems												
111 Biology, Culture & Management of Forests & Timber-Related Crops						30	126	153		309		309

PACKAGE AND RPA'S	HATCH				MCINTIRE-STENNIS				SPECIAL GRANTS	TOTAL			
	NE	S	NC	W	TOTAL	NE	S	NC			W	TOTAL	
301 Genetics & Breeding of Forest Trees						68	138			206			206
302 New & Improved Forest Engineering Systems						50	89			139			139
303 Economics of Timber Production						59	88	96		243			243
401 New & Improved Forest Products						36	140	90		266			266
						175	511	324	153	1163			1163
-----													
c. Multi-Use Forest Land													
903 Multiple Use Potential of Forest Land & Evaluation of Forestry Programs						56	20	113	50	239			239
-----													
TOTAL - MEETING NEEDS FOR FOREST PRODUCTS	35					314	676	471	203	1664			1699
-----													
TOTAL - SAES						526	1066	489	336	2417			16969
TOTAL - OTHER FORESTRY SCHOOLS						72	72	127	340	611			611
GRAND TOTAL	2578	5237	4373	2364	14552	598	1138	616	676	3028	2000		19580

PROJECTED DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS (000) AT \$20 MILLION LEVEL OF INCREASE, SAES, FY 1974  
(S & E STRUCTURE)

PACKAGE AND RPA'S	HATCH				MCINTIRE-STENNIS					SPECIAL GRANTS	TOTAL	
	NE	S	NC	W	TOTAL	NE	S	NC	W			TOTAL
1. <u>Helping Farmers Solve Critical Problems</u>												
a. Controlling Disease, Pests & Other Hazards Effectively Without Environmental Degradation												
204 Control of Insects, Mites, Slugs, & Snails on Fruit & Vegetable Crops	84	130			214							214
205 Control of Diseases & Nematodes of Fruit & Vegetable Crops	44		50		94							94
206 Control of Weeds & Other Hazards to Fruit & Vegetable Crops			50		50							50
207 Control of Insects, Mites, Snails, & Slugs Affecting Field Crops & Range	38	150			188							188
208 Control of Diseases & Nematodes of Field Crops and Range	43	50	228		321							321
210 Control of Insects & External Parasites Affecting Livestock, Poultry & Other Animals		138			138							138
211 Control of Diseases of Livestock, Poultry & Other Animals		206	150	50	406							406
213 Protect Livestock, Poultry & Other Animals from Toxic Chemical, Poisonous Plants, & Other Hazards		50			50							50

PACKAGE AND RPA'S	HATCH				MCINTIRE-STENNIS				SPECIAL GRANTS	TOTAL	
	NE	S	NC	W	TOTAL	NE	S	NC			W
510 Group Action & Market Power			61		61						61
807 Structural Changes in Agriculture			50	50	100						100
808 Government Programs to Balance Farm Output & Market Demand			70	70	70						70
	125	320	261	210	916	49	50	18	117		1033
d. Expanding Markets & Increasing Returns for Animal & Crop Products Through Improved Production & Marketing Practices											
102 Soil, Plant, Water, Nutrient Relationships	50	78			128						128
103 Management of Saline & Sodic Soils & Salinity			50	50	50						50
105 Conservation & Efficient Use of Water		144		50	194						194
106 Efficient Drainage & Irrigation Systems & Facilities		65			65		66			66	131
109 Adaptation to Weather & Weather Modification	22	100			122	20					142
112 Improvement of Range Resources		50		78	128			2	27	29	157
304 Improvement of Biological Efficiency of Fruit & Vegetable Crops	18	50	82	40	190						190
305 Mechanization of Fruit & Vegetable Crop Production	7	234	47	10	298						298

PACKAGE AND RPA'S	HATCH				MCINTIRE-STENNIS				SPECIAL GRANTS	TOTAL	
	NE	S	NC	W	TOTAL	NE	S	NC			W
306 Production Management Systems for Fruits & Vegetables	7		50		57						57
307 Improvement of Biological Efficiency of Field Crops		100	492		592						592
308 Mechanization of Production of Field Crops		9			9						9
309 Production Management Systems for Field Crops		73	50		123						123
310 Reproductive Performance of Livestock, Poultry & Other Animals	50	217	94		361						361
311 Improvement of Biological Efficiency in Production of Livestock, Poultry & Other Animals		192	200		392						392
312 Environmental Stress in Production of Livestock, Poultry & Other Animals	24	63	200		287						287
313 Production Management Systems for Livestock, Poultry & Other Animals		224	194		418						418
314 Bees & Other Pollinating Insects		50			50						50
317 Mechanization & Structures Used in Production of Livestock, Poultry & Other Animals			50		50						50
402 Production of Fruit & Vegetable Crops With Improved Acceptability		55	49		104						104
403 New & Improved Fruit & Vegetable Products & Byproducts			50		50						100

PACKAGE AND RPA'S	HATCH				MCINTIRE-STENNIS				SPECIAL GRANTS	TOTAL	
	NE	S	NC	W	TOTAL	NE	S	NC			W
404 Quality Maintenance in Storing & Marketing Fruits & Vegetables	23	50			73						73
406 New & Improved Food Products from Field Crops	15				15						15
409 Production of Animal Products with Improved Acceptability		50		50	100						100
410 New & Improved Meat, Milk, Eggs, & Other Animal Food Products	59	87	159	28	333						333
412 Quality Maintenance In Marketing Animal Products			50		50						50
501 Improvement of Grades & Standards -- Crop & Animal Products		56			56						56
503 Efficiency in Marketing Agricultural Products & Production Inputs	23	64	88		175						175
506 Supply, Demand & Price Analysis -- Crop & Animal Products			50		50						50
	248	1883	2034	405	4570	20	66	2	27	115	4685
TOTAL - HELPING FARMERS SOLVE CRITICAL PROBLEMS	1286	3780	3374	1147	9587	69	116	2	45	232	10819

PACKAGE AND RPA'S	HATCH				MCINTIRE-STENNIS				SPECIAL GRANTS	TOTAL	
	NE	S	NC	W	TOTAL	NE	S	NC			W
<b>2. Meeting Critical Timber Needs</b>											
<b>a. Diseases &amp; Insect Control</b>											
201 Control of Insects Affecting Forests	35				35	71	50			121	156
202 Control of Diseases, Parasites & Nematodes Affecting Forests						12	95	34		141	141
	35				35	83	145	34		262	297
<b>b. Improve Production &amp; Management Practices &amp; Systems</b>											
111 Biology, Culture & Management of Forests & Timber-Related Crops						30	126	153		309	309
301 Genetics & Breeding of Forest Trees						68	138			206	206
302 New & Improved Forest Engineering Systems						50	89			139	139
303 Economics of Timber Production						59	88	96		243	243
401 New & Improved Forest Products						36	140	90		266	266
513 Supply, Demand & Price Analysis -- Forest Products									50	50	50
						175	511	324	153	1163	1213
<b>c. Multiple Uses of Forest Lands</b>											
903 Multiple Use Potential of Forest Land & Evaluation of Forestry Programs						56	20	113	50	239	239

PACKAGE AND RPA'S	HATCH				MCINTIRE-STENNIS				SPECIAL GRANTS	TOTAL		
	NE	S	NC	W	TOTAL	NE	S	NC			W	TOTAL
TOTAL - MEETING CRITICAL TIMBER NEEDS	35			50	85	314	676	471	203	1664		1749
3. <u>Food &amp; Nutrition, Human Health &amp; Safety</u>												
a. Food & Nutrition												
703 Food Choices, Habits, & Consumption		50			50							50
704 Home & Commerical Food Service		20			20							20
708 Human Nutrition	203	267	209		679							679
	203	337	209		749							749
b. Food Safety												
701 Insure Food Products Free of Toxic Contami- nants Including Resi- dues from Agricultural & Other Sources		79	100		179							179
702 Protect Food & Feed Supplies from Harmful Microorganisms & Naturally Occurring Toxins	80		50	75	205							205
707 Prevent Transmission of Animal Diseases & Parasites to Man			40	267	307							307
	80	79	190	342	691							691
TOTAL - FOOD & NUTRITION, HUMAN HEALTH & SAFETY	283	416	399	342	1440						500	1940

PACKAGE AND RPA'S	HATCH				MCINTIRE-STENNIS				SPECIAL GRANTS	TOTAL			
	NE	S	NC	W	TOTAL	NE	S	NC			W	TOTAL	
c. Disadvantaged Farms, Firms & Communities													
802 Individual & Family Decision Making & Resource Use & Family Functioning	75		50		125								125
803 Causes of poverty Among Rural People	30	65		85	180								180
804 Improvement of Economic Potential of Rural People	105	160	50	367	682								682
805 Communication & Education Processes			75		75								75
806 Individual & Family Adjustment to Change	25	52	50		127								127
907 Improved Income Opportunities in Rural Communities	277	160	100	135	672								672
908 Improvement of Rural Community Institutions & Services	50		85	87	222								222
	562	437	410	674	2083								2083
TOTAL - DEVELOPING & PROTECTING RURAL AMERICA	974	1041	600	826	3441	143	274	16	88	521			4462
TOTAL - SAES	2578	5237	4373	2365	14553	526	1066	489	336	2417			16970
TOTAL - OTHER FORESTRY SCHOOLS						72	72	127	340	611			611
GRAND TOTAL	2578	5237	4373	2365	14553	598	1138	616	676	3028	2000		19581

## APPENDIX 15.0

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE TO STUDY THE FUTURE ROLE  
OF THE WESTERN AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS RESEARCH COUNCIL

The recent action of the Western Directors in setting up task forces in agricultural research areas to plan regional research programs has caused several directors to question the need to continue subject matter councils of the nature of the Western Agricultural Economics Research Council and the Western Social Research Advisory Committee. Although it appears at present that there is no immediate intention of the Western Directors to terminate the WAERC, it may be well for the Council itself to review and to re-evaluate its functions.

The Western Agricultural Economics Research Council was organized in 1947 under a memorandum of agreement between the agricultural experiment stations of the eleven western states and the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the United States Department of Agriculture. The general purpose as set forth by this memorandum was that of "facilitating, strengthening, and integrating research relationships in the field of agricultural economics, with particular reference to those economic and marketing problems of special concern to the western states."

After the inauguration of the Council the Western Directors delegated to it the responsibility for recommending regional marketing research projects and for recommending for their support the allocation of the regional funds which were provided by the Research and Marketing Act of 1946. These responsibilities absorbed most of the time of the Council during its semi-annual meetings.

Council members felt that too much time was being devoted to these functions and that as a consequence the Council was not accomplishing the main objectives of the organization. At the June meeting in 1950, therefore, Council members were asked to suggest areas of research of a non-marketing nature which were important to the West and which required study and research on a regional basis. The areas of research suggested were water resources and range land development. The Council delegated Dr. M. M. Kelso, Vice-Chairman of that body, to request funds from the Farm Foundation to pay expenses of experiment station personnel to travel to meetings at which these subjects would be explored and research projects could be generated. Two committees on water and

range resources were established with Farm Foundation support. Committees on farm management and marketing were added later. These committees acted as advisory adjuncts to the Council in developing regional research projects, but more significantly they became vehicles for exploring in depth the subject matter areas. Their published proceedings were widely distributed and the papers contained in them were recognized as authoritative studies.

The Council took on more of the nature of a coordinating body in agricultural economics in such functions as evaluating and recommending to the directors research projects generated by the Council committees, and in turn recommending to the Council committees new areas of research to explore and research subjects to develop into projects.

When in 1963 a new method of handling research funds was adopted, the Council was relieved of the responsibility of recommending the allocations of research funds to regional projects. The time previously devoted to this function was used to conduct seminars on new areas of economic research and education activities and to meet with the Council committees in order better to understand and to evaluate their work. One meeting was held with the directors to consider the relevance of agricultural economics research in general to the emerging economic issues facing agriculture.

The non-project evaluation activities of the Council were, in the opinion of this committee, productive of significant benefits to agricultural research in the West. The Council committees were over-hauled and restructured to bring their activities closer to the emerging issues in agriculture. Specific studies arising out of the seminars have produced meaningful insights into such issues as socio-economic problems relating to rural areas, the relevance of the program planning and budgeting procedures to the evaluation of agricultural research, and the problems and issues arising from the manpower training programs.

From the foregoing statements it is apparent that the Council's functions were not confined to the evaluation of research projects or to recommendations for regional funding. With the passing of these responsibilities the Council will be free to devote more of its time to the types of activities which it was originally organized to consider. The following are functions which the Council can perform:

1. The identification of emerging economic issues.

At the time the Council was founded the significant economic problems related to efficiency of agricultural production and resource allocation in the farm firm, agricultural demand and price, marketing structure and marketing costs. Much of the research was centered around these fields. Today new economic and social issues are emerging which require research. Problems relating to rural poverty, to the quality of rural institutions and rural life, to the effects of out-migration of rural people upon rural and urban communities, and the quality of rural and urban environment are examples. Any structuring of task forces and regional technical committees in the future as in the past will have to be re-evaluated and reconstituted recurrently in the light of such emerging problems. Just as the Council discovered it was necessary to restructure the Council committees, it will be necessary in the future to restructure the current task forces and technical committees in the light of the changing environment of agriculture. The Council can act as an advisory group to the Directors in pointing out the need to restructure research groups and the form which such restructuring should take. At the same time it can coordinate the work of the Council committees to insure the relevance of their activities to the changing rural and urban environment.

2. The coordination of non-RRF funded regional research among and with that of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and other agencies. Not all regional research is supported by Regional Research Funds. As pointed out above, the original intent of the founders of the Council was to identify and coordinate research of a regional nature. Prior to the founding of the Council the regional offices of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics helped perform such a coordinating function. After the elimination of these offices other means for effecting coordination were needed. The need is at least as great, if not greater, now than ever before. The Council may well expand its activities in that direction. In doing so, the Council may discover that such regionally coordinated projects may become an important source of additional research funds.

3. The generation of regional research ideas not instituted by the task forces. It is naive to assume that task forces, no matter how well devised, will originate projects which will cover all the needs of western agriculture. The experience of technical committees seems to indicate that their areas of interest narrow rather than broaden as the committees suggest additional research

to replace old projects. In fact, it becomes difficult to terminate research projects and to dissolve the technical committees in order to initiate new areas of research. If terminating old projects and initiating new ones is a criterion of "goodness", the record in agricultural economics is superior to the record in production fields. The task forces comprising members from a variety of scientific fields will be even less prone to terminate old projects and move outside their subject matter areas to consider research of a new type.

4. Assuring that a proper balance will be maintained between research involving the social sciences and that centering around production fields. The Council should give this matter continuing attention for research generally with particular attention being directed to regional research. It is particularly important, in task forces in which the social sciences will be represented by only one or two members, to have an organization such as the Council to review the projects and to advise the committees on the proper balance between production research and social and economic analysis. The Council should not hesitate to insist upon a greater emphasis on social and economic analysis in regional projects where it feels such action is necessary to provide a balanced and meaningful regional research endeavor.

5. The continuing education of members of the Council. Council members cannot be specialists in all areas of subject matter and methodology in agricultural economics. They need to be generalists in their subject. There is a need for an in-service type of training for this body, both disciplinary and administrative in nature in order to help insure a well-balanced research program in agricultural economics in the land grant universities in the West. In this connection the current interest in multi-disciplinary research requires further exploration and understanding. The Council can from time to time bring before it scientists from other disciplines who can help it in identifying important multi-disciplinary research areas.

6. Finally, the Council stands ready to assist the Directors in analyzing economic and social trends and policy issues that may affect research and education in the West. By virtue of both their professional training and positions, members of the Council are required to keep abreast of current developments in many areas. To the extent this knowledge is useful in a broader context, the Council could serve as a device for organizing and making this expertise available.

## APPENDIX 19.0

Discussion of the Western Region Task Force  
Approach to Regional Research PlanningPresented at Western Directors Summer 1971 Meeting  
Jackson Hole, Wyoming

Martin J. Burris

I believe all Station Directors are in agreement with the purpose of RR as presented in the Manual of Procedures, "Regional research supported by section 3 (c) of the Hatch Act is a joint effort for the region directed toward the solution of definite problems of important concern to agriculture. It must have two characteristics distinguishing it from other types of research:

- (1) The research must focus on a specific and important problem of concern to two or more States, which can be attacked more effectively by a regional approach than by individual stations working independently along the same lines;
- (2) The research must be planned and conducted as a concerted team effort in which the participating scientists are mutually responsible for accomplishing the objectives."

This statement implies that RR monies are more than simply another source of funds to be used as the individual station Director decides or to become an inflexible part of the individual experiment station budget. It implies also, the need for both planning and conduct of concerted team effort involving scientists having mutual responsibility.

If we can assume agreement with this purpose of RR (and I believe we can) there still exists great differences in attitudes (and capabilities) of Directors in the use of RR funds within this purpose. Various proposals (and in some cases practices) have been set forth for research planning and coordination, particularly in regards to the regional efforts. These proposals have varied widely in the requirements for time and dollars. It is also likely they would vary widely in outcome, acceptance and usefulness, and that these virtues might be not closely related to the costs of executing new approaches to research planning. The directors seem to be faced with two horns

of a dilemma: (1) being not in a position to understand, evaluate and trust systems which attempt to program research needs and priorities versus (2) a continuing pressure to make research more desirable in cost-benefit ratios or other measures of productivity. Experience with study groups, task forces, research inventories, cost-benefit evaluations and similar activities has impressed me strongly with the cost of these activities. Failure of committee members to understand fully the opportunities and cost of competing areas of research may result in bias appearing in any recommendations. With current restriction on budgets it may be very questionable if we can afford to pay scientists to do this activity instead of research or if alternately we can afford to hire specialists to do such planning for us.

Rumor has it, that while cost-benefit ratios may have some value in substantiating effort in regards to development and applied research efforts, they are totally worthless, and even misleading in any evaluation of basic research. We cannot effectively use a tool which evaluates only part of a research program.

On the other hand the Regional Task Force reports suffer from one of the same shortcomings as the National Task Forces reports. That is the request for additional research effort or concentration is based to a very high degree on intuitive reasoning. Such as "This paid off before, it should pay off in the future", "we will always need research in this area", "more jobs are needed". Little or no attempt was made to put any parameters on possible benefits either in dollars or human values.

Perhaps there is a natural reluctance to spend time on such niceties when dollar support for research often becomes pigeon holed, may depend entirely on personal wishes of prominent legislators, on a good selling job or on staff personalities. In addition there are frequently vastly different levels of benefits from a particular research finding whether one considers the local, state, regional or national consumer.

It seems to me that the task force approach in the west was some sort of compromise effort. We wanted a more effective regional research program, we were not in a position to involve ourselves in elaborate planning procedures, we had confidence in our research staff. We felt a somewhat different mix of specialists would give a better look at research needs, we wanted a more widespread look at regional research needs, we desired a reduction in number of projects and administrative activities, we had the set of national Task Force Studies, and we wanted to try something different. So we took a flier.

Reactions indicate that the task force approach to the development of regional projects in the Western Region was neither an unqualified success or an unqualified failure. We lost some of our strongest supporters of regional research who saw productive regional projects closed out by the moratorium, without any real attempt at evaluation. On the other hand we may have gained support from many scientists who had not previously had an opportunity for regional research cooperation. Some of the projects which were recommended for initiation are better, some are poorer, than projects which were terminated in the moratorium.

In the following pages I shall attempt to categorize the task force approach as a mechanism to achieve the purpose of RR as set forth previously in this paper and elsewhere. This presentation shall consist of the following sections (1) Chronology of the Task Force approach as it developed in the Western Region with annotations (2) Chronology of the Task Force Procedure in Successful Development of a Regional Project (3) What has Task Force Approach done; with input from various western directors (4) Suggest change in procedures within the Task Force approach (5) General comments.

Chronology of Task Force Approach to Determining Areas for Regional Projects. (Showing how the Task Force approach evolved.)

- (1) Discussions of the program of RR, both formal and informal over the years and continuing to the present time; too numerous to mention or summarize.
- (2) A National Program of Research for Agriculture (including National Task Force Reports), published from August 1, 1966 until all Task Force Reports were completed.
- (3) Proceedings, June 7, 1968 meeting on Philosophy of RR held at the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C. Opinions of RR were expressed by numerous people representing the four regions, CSRS and the USDA.
- (4) Minutes, C-9 of the 79th meeting held on June 23-26, 1968 at Newport, Oregon. The Western Representatives on C-9 gained stimulus for a new approach to the RR.

- (5) Minutes, WD July 1968 meeting, pages 14-16. Discussion of the C-9 meeting at Newport, evoked further suggestions on RR including; (1) "an ad hoc committee to work and devote all their effort to this matter of philosophy of regional research program".
- (6) Minutes, WD November 1968 meeting, pages 11-12. RRC suggests and WD establishes, "a special committee to come up with suggestions to follow in the area of regional research philosophy." This was called the Ad Hoc Committee on Regional Research Philosophy (CRRP). RRC also made several other suggestions.
- (7) Minutes, WD February 1969 meeting, pages 46-47. The first report of CRRP is recorded, indicating establishment of a Task Force approach to identify high priority, interdisciplinary RR problems and included designation of the first six Task Force areas. Pages 16-21 include extended discussion of the CRRP report including the moratorium on RR projects currently existing or arising from outside the Task Force system. A suggestion for coordinating committees was made but was not adopted at this time.
- (8) Minutes, WD July 1969 meeting, pages 35-43. RRC discussed the first group of Task Force reports and made note of problems encountered with suggestion to CRRP for improvements. Areas for development of RR projects from the first Task Force reports designated. Pages 19-28 contains a report of the CRRP including a proposal for Western Regional Coordinating Committees (WRCC) and designation of additional Task Forces.
- (9) Minutes, WD November 1969 meeting, page 14. Progress of the second group of Task Forces is noted. Pages 8-11 discusses the establishment of WRCC-1 on Beef Cattle Breeding and a report of CRRP which removed from advisory committees the responsibility of making recommendations on regional research proposals.
- (10) Minutes, WD February meeting 1970 page 57-58 (appendix d) contained a series of suggestions from CRRP to Administrative Advisors

of Western Regional Task Forces which capitalized on experience gained previously and also emphasized USDA participation. Pages 55-56 (appendix c) contained a listing of subsequent task force assignments recommended by CRRP and due dates and further suggested that the CRRP be dissolved. On pages 26-29 RRC recommended several areas for regional project development from the second series of task forces, including one area synthesized from several task force reports. A review of all previously submitted task forces was made but no new areas for development of regional projects were recommended. Pages 19-20 raised a question regarding the great reduction in RR marketing projects, apparently resulting from the task force approach.

- (11) Minutes, WD July 1970 meeting, pages 2-4. Appendix E. Shortcomings of RR proposals coming in under the task force system were reported. In addition the Southern Region's proposal of having RR projects go directly from the technical committee to the C-9 was discussed and tentatively rejected by WD till the task force system was amply evaluated.
- (12) Minutes, WD November 1970 meeting, pages 1-3. The review of the third series of task force reports was reported noting that each AA was again present to discuss his report. Of special interest was the review of the Remote Sensing Task Force report which represents a tool rather than a discipline or a commodity. On pages 6-7 special consideration was given to the Food and Nutrition Task Force report. Despite approval of an area of work by RRC and WD and two Ad Hoc committee meetings a research proposal was not developed. This seemed evidence that, despite the interest of directors in an area, without willingness on part of the scientists a suitable research project will not evolve.
- (13) Minutes, WD February 1971 meeting, page 3. WD Chairman Kelly requested Burris, Chairman of RRC to prepare a "white paper" analyzing experience with the system now in operation (this refers to the task force system for RR as described herein). Pages 6-7 describe

review of RR outlines under the task force system as well as review of all task force reports received to date, with some indication of shortcoming of outlines and problems of their timely receipt by RRC. Pages 46-47 reflect the recommendation of AA of Task Forces on "Sugar Crops" and "Corn and Grain Sorghum", that there is limited interest in these areas on a regional basis in the west and that their Task Force assignment be withdrawn.

#### Chronology of Task Force Procedure in Successful Development of a Regional Project.

- (1) Designation of Regional Task Force area and AA by WD.
- (2) AA develops Task Force membership and convenes meeting.
- (3) Regional Task Force reviews subject area including National Task Force and recommends RR areas and priorities for Western Region.
- (4) Regional Task Force report sent to RRC and WD.
- (5) RRC reviews Task Force report and recommends area for development of regional project.
- (6) WD approves RRC recommendation for RR area.
- (7) Ad Hoc Committee authorized for development of RR project and AA named by WD.
- (8) Each Director names Station representative on Ad Hoc Committee.
- (9) Each Director discusses proposed support of research with Station representative.
- (10) Ad Hoc committee assembled by AA to write regional project.
- (11) AA transmits RR project outline to RRC for review.
- (12) RRC recommends RR outline to WD.
- (13) WD recommends RR outline to C-9 and usually continues AA assignment.

What has Task Force approach done.

- (1) Provided for some indepth thinking on research problems at the overall commodity level.
- (2) Identified high priority problems for the development of regional projects.
- (3) Gave Ad Hoc committees guidelines for a RR proposal which has a high probability for approval.
- (4) Changed the source of new RR proposals.
- (5) Virtually eliminated the direct origination of high interest RR from the scientist level.
- (6) Prevented the extension of continuing RR efforts or initiation of new projects arising from outside the Task Force system.
- (7) Placed a high priority on interdisciplinary research in regional projects.
- (8) Attempted to force interdisciplinary approach into projects on an interstate basis despite the difficulty in achieving this within a state.
- (9) Provided for coordinating committees (WRCC) as an added effort in coordination of research.
- (10) Created some unsympathetic feelings on certain scientists and administrators because of termination of long enduring RR projects.
- (11) Accomplished evaluation of certain areas of research which previously had been avoided.
- (12) Omitted an effective evaluation of some problems because they are of secondary or lessor interest to any one Task Force.
- (13) Become a mechanism whereby focus on an important problem to the WD can be made stimulated.
- (14) Proposed some RR areas which are difficult to develop into a meaningful RR project because they cannot be divided so that individual states cooperate and make maximum total contributions.
- (15) Proposed some RR areas which are overly diverse and inclusive order to accommodate an interdisciplinary concept.

- (16) Achieved in the Western Region some correlation of RR problems with the National Program of Research in Agriculture.
- (17) Encountered difficulty in achieving adequate participation in RR areas designated by the WD.
- (18) Has lost some continuity between Ad Hoc Committee and Technical Committee related to the RR Project outline because of changes in personnel occurring between these two committees.
- (19) Provided the mechanism for more relevant investigations at each station in several disciplines rather than relying on only one or two disciplines for each project.
- (20) Encouraged planning inputs from both federal agencies and industry to a greater degree than previously.
- (21) Designated research areas based in part on priorities which may reflect much individual thinking rather than the goal of group evaluation and which may have been achieved with inadequate preparation and evaluation.
- (22) Reduced the number of marketing projects and perhaps actually directed effort away from marketing research, thus accentuating problems in meeting the marketing requirement.
- (23) Reduced the total number of regional research projects with an as yet unevaluated effort on total program.

Suggested changes in procedures:

- (1) AA should ask that participating stations designate their Technical Committee representatives to RR projects and send this man to the Ad Hoc committee meeting for planning RR project. Stations or agencies should not participate in Ad Hoc committee meeting if participation in the project is not contemplated.
- (2) Directors should develop an increased awareness of the content and scope of research areas recommended by RRC for development of regional projects.
- (3) Task Force members, Ad Hoc committee members and Technical Committee members should be well informed as to such items as their responsibility, plans of their parent station, resources available for research, needs for cooperation, etc.
- (4) There should be greater degree of critical evaluation of RR projects at intermediate stages (2-3 years) by AA and other Directors.
- (5) Administrative Advisor should determine if his WRCC is being effectively used as a coordinating tool and recommend such changes as are necessary to do this or request termination of project.
- (6) Better guidelines should be provided to RRC for evaluation of petitions for WRCC.
- (7) The WRCC concept should evolve away from that of a continuation committee for defunct regional projects and into special function committees of limited duration to attack problems which may not fit as regional research projects.
- (8) Provisions should be made for consideration of high priority areas which have been missed by the Task Force system.
- (9) CSRS should be asked to notify stations in other regions of areas designated for development of regional projects and their administrative advisors so that interested states can inquire prior to the Ad Hoc Committee meeting.
- (10) Some financial incentive should be provided for participation in regional research, especially those areas deemed high priority.

- (11) Off the top allocations for regional research projects should be reevaluated with the consideration of other alternatives including (1) elimination of this practice or (2) expanding the practice for special purposes.

## APPENDIX

## 29.0 RESOLUTIONS

## 29.1 Resolution 1

WHEREAS, The Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors, including CSRS representatives and guests, have completed a successful and enjoyable meeting from August 4-6, 1971 at Jackson, Wyoming,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors and the CSRS representatives, express their sincere appreciation to Directors Hilston and Ayres and their wives, for their special efforts in arranging excellent facilities and services for the business meeting, and for the highly enjoyable social activities.

## 29.2 Resolution 2

WHEREAS, The Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors and CSRS representatives were provided excellent refreshments by Mr. Nels Dahlquist, Manager of the Mosley Land and Cattle Company, on the night of August 4, 1971,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors and the CSRS representatives, express their appreciation to Manager Dahlquist, of the Mosley Land and Cattle Company for the hospitality extended, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Secretary be instructed to forward this resolution to Mr. Dahlquist.

## 29.3 Resolution 3

WHEREAS, the Administrator of ARS, T. W. Edminster graciously participated in the August 1971 meeting of the Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors and contributed to a more thorough understanding of ARS' efforts regarding the nation's agricultural research program,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors express their grateful appreciation for his participation in the August 1971 meeting of the Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors.

## 29.4 Resolution 4

WHEREAS, Director K. W. Hill of the Utah Agricultural Experiment Station served faithfully the Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors in various capacities,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors express to Director Hill its grateful appreciation for his contributions to the Western Region, and direct that the appropriate Director Emeritus Certificate be presented to Director Hill, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Western Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors express its very best wishes for the future in his new assignment.