

Experiment Station Section Meeting

Coeur d'Alene, Idaho
Tuesday, September 25, 2001
8:00 a.m. - 12:00 noon

Agenda

8:00	✓ 1.	Call to order - McArthur Floyd
8:05	✓ 2.	Approval of Agenda and <u>2000 ESS Meeting Minutes</u> - McArthur Floyd
8:10	✓ 3.	Approval of <u>Rules of Operation Changes</u> - T. J. Helms
8:15	✓ 4.	ESCOP Budget and Legislative Committee - Tom Payne
8:20	✓ 5.	ESCOP Advocacy and Marketing Committee - Colin Kaltenbach
8:25	✓ 6.	ESCOP Science and Technology Committee - Randy Woodson
8:30	✓ 7.	ESCOP Partnerships Committee- D. C. Coston
8:35	✓ 8.	ESCOP Planning Committee- Eric Young
8:40	✓ 9.	NRSP Survey Results - David MacKenzie
9:00	✓ 10.	Science Roadmap - David MacKenzie
9:20	✓ 11.	CSREES Update - George Cooper
9:35	✓ 12.	AESOP Update - Terry Nipp
10:00	~	<i>Break</i>
10:30	✓ 13.	Proposed new NRSP - T. J. Helms, Art Cosby, Jay Ritchie
11:15	✓ 14.	Multiple Activity Programs (MAPS) - Colin Kaltenbach
11:25	✓ 15.	Impact Assessment Proposal - David MacKenzie and T. J. Helms
11:35	✓ 16.	Nomination Committee Report - Richard Jones
11:40	✓ 17.	Resolutions Committee Report - LeRoy Daugherty
11:50	✓ 18.	Passing the Gavel - McArthur Floyd
11:55	✓ 19.	Final remarks/announcements - Richard Heimsch
12:00	~	<i>Lunch</i>

Agenda Briefs

Agenda Item 1. Call to Order

Presenter: McArthur Floyd

Information: ESCOP Chair, McArthur Floyd, will call the 2001 annual meeting the Experiment Station Section to order.

Agenda Item 2. Approval of Agenda and 2000 ESS Meeting Minutes

Presenter: McArthur Floyd

Background: Minutes from the 2000 ESS Meeting are available on the web at <http://www.escop.msstate.edu/minutes/ESS900.htm>.

Action Requested: Approval.

Agenda Item 3. Approval of Rules of Operation

Presenter: T. J. Helms

Background: Suggested changes in the ESCOP Rules of Operation were endorsed at the August ESCOP meeting and were made available for general review by ESS members via e-mail. The document with suggested changes highlighted, bolded, etc. may be viewed at <http://www.escop.msstate.edu/rules/RULESdraft7-01.pdf>.

Action Requested: For approval.

Agenda Item 4. Budget and Legislative Committee Annual Report

Presenter: Tom Payne

Fiscal Year 2002 Budget:

House

The House Agriculture Appropriations Committee Budget for CSREES in FY 2002 included discretionary funding totaling \$993,936,000. This represents an increase of \$124,264,000 over the FY 2002 President's Budget Request of \$869,672,000 and an increase of \$7,432,000 over the FY 2001

post-rescission amount of \$986,504,000. The FY 2002 Budget will fund most programs, including formula programs, at the FY 2001 level. Funding is also provided for earmarked Special Research Grants, Extension and Research Federal Administration projects and grants, Critical Agricultural Materials, Supplemental and Alternative Crops, Farm Safety, and Rural Health and Safety.

Language is included in the bill that prohibits use of funds to carry out the Fund for Rural America and the Initiative for Future Agricultural and Food Systems.

Senate

The Senate Agriculture Appropriations Committee Budget for CSREES in FY 2002 totaled \$1,026,068. This represents an increase of \$156,396,000 over the FY 2002 President's Budget request of \$869,672,000, an increase of \$32,132,000 over the FY 2002 House Bill of \$993,936,000, and an increase of \$39,564,000 over the FY 2001 appropriated post rescission amount of \$968,504,000. The FY 2002 Budget will fund most formula programs and most other research, education, and extension programs at the FY 2001 post rescission level. An increase to \$137 million over the FY 2001 level is proposed for the National Research Initiative. Increases are also proposed for IR-4, Minor Crop Pest Management Special Research Grant, Sustainable Agriculture Research and Extension Programs, Rural Development Centers Special Research Grant and Smith Lever 3(d), Renewable Resources Extension Act, 1890 Facilities, and the Organic Transition Program. Funds are also provided for earmarked Special Research Grants, and Federal Administration research grants and extension projects.

Language is included which prohibits the use of FY 2002 funds to carry out the Initiative for Future Agricultural and Food Systems but allows for the use of FY 2001 funds for this program in FY 2002. The Senate also prohibits the use of funds to carry out the Fund for Rural America but makes funds available for the purpose of administering and conducting oversight of grant awards and obligations incurred through FY 2001.

Congressional Action

On May 16, the leadership of the Land Grant President's Food and Society Initiative sent a letter to the Chairmen of the House Budget and Appropriations Committees requesting that they provide adequate funding to the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee to support funding for research, extension and education through USDA/CSREES. A similar letter in support of agricultural research, extension and education was sent by the National Coalition for Agricultural Research. A Dear Colleague letter was circulated in the House that called for a doubling of funding for research, extension, and education. The letter was authored by Reps. Dooley and Pickering and signed by 49 members, including 29 authorizers on the Agriculture Committee. The Dear Colleague letter was delivered to the full House Appropriations Committee.

On June 13, the House Full Appropriations Committee approved the Agriculture Appropriations Bill. Essentially, special grants were reestablished without harming any of our national programs. Several specific funding lines saw modest increases, including sustainable agriculture and the rural development centers. An amendment to expand the Northeast Dairy Compact was withdrawn and an amendment addressing agro terrorism did not pass. An amendment to fund USDA promotion of biofuels was also voted down. Rep. Meek made an appeal to the committee to increase funding for land grant universities.

After the July 4th recess, the House passed the Agriculture Appropriations Bill on the floor. None of the amendments adversely affected the CSREES accounts. Congresswoman Eva Clayton had prepared several amendments; one was to increase 1890 formula funds, using the NRI as an offset. Clayton

withdrew the amendment after Agriculture Appropriations Chairman Bonilla (R-TX) provided assurances that he would work with her on this issue through the conference process.

Letters were requested from Deans and Directors in key states to support the IFADS/FRA programs, to increase the formula funds and to increase the NRI. Letters were gathered and delivered to Senator Kohl (D-WI) and Senator Cochran (R-MS). Discussions continued with the National C-FAR group. The Senate held a markup of the FY 2002 Agriculture Appropriations Bill on July 18. No date has been set for Senate floor action yet.

NASULGC Budget Development: The Board on Agriculture Budget Committee developed simplified documents to present the budget request. A one-page document was developed and made available at the CARET meetings. This document identifies the total increase that is proposed for USDA/CSREES. Four critical issue areas that warrant increased expenditures are identified as follows: Revitalizing Communities; Dependable Food Supply; Educated Workforce; and Environmental Balance. In addition to the single, one-page brief, individual single page briefs were developed for each of the four areas, however, without a budget figure for each. The approach is similar to that used by NSF, i.e., one budget figure and several targeted areas for the new funding. The goal is to develop teams of CARET members working with a "champion" in the House or Senate to promote one of the four targeted areas. The March CARET meeting was a workshop to develop the approach and identify people to make up the teams. The following team leaders have been committed: Revitalizing Communities - Tom Payne; Dependable Food Supply - Ed Hiler and Reg Gomes; Educated Workforce - Larry Cote; Environmental Balance - Bobby Moser.

During the May, 2001 ESCOP Executive Committee meeting, David MacKenzie noted the need for an accountability mechanism. Discussions regarding budget activities resulted in the need for a strategy for moving forward and recognition that timeliness is critical. It was also stressed that increases must be targeted. To facilitate this direction, the a proposal to create Multiple Activity Programs (MAPS) was presented by Colin Kaltenbach and approved. (See Agenda Item 14 for additional information.)

The Farm Bill Task Force Report: The Task Force has been appointed by Tom Fretz, Maryland, and is similar to the 1998 group but with an expanded charge. The decision was made to look broadly on the total portfolio and not just the Research and Education Title. The Task Force decided to review the existing Farm Bill and look at opportunities for our system and handle technical corrections through the appropriate mechanisms.

A working group, which is a subset of the Task Force, was asked to develop a "white paper" to serve as a starting point for our deliberations.

Stan Johnson, Iowa, led the working group and developed a paper, which attempts to put in perspective the various titles in the existing bill and the respective funding mechanisms. At present, the final draft of the white paper has undergone an extensive number of reviews. Key leaders have been contacted to flesh out and provide details on each of the titles in the white paper.

Milo Shult, Arkansas, on behalf of the Board on Agriculture, put together a "white paper" which was presented at the CFERR session during the NASULGC Annual Meeting. The most recent draft of the "white paper" was distributed during the ESCOP July meeting.

David Chicoine testified at a Senate Agriculture Committee on the Research/Extension Title on behalf of the Board on Agriculture. Sam Curl testified before the House Agriculture Conservation Subcommittee when they held a hearing on the research, extension, and education title. The turnover in the leadership

in the Senate has confused the timing of the Farm Bill debates. It is expected that the Senate may start drafting in the Fall. The House has proceeded with developing a bill, which will likely be marked up on July 26th and reported out of Committee by August 2nd. Because of the accelerated schedule in the House, AESOP has developed draft legislative language based on the priorities identified in developing the "white papers." This language has been discussed with Congressional staff and discussed at the recent Western and North Central regional meetings. ESCOP was represented by Dr. Charles Scifres at the public workshop on May 22-23, 2001 hosted by the Board on Agriculture and Natural Resources of the NRC. A committee chaired by Frank Loew "conducted Opportunities in Agriculture, a study to evaluate the quality, relevance and effectiveness of the research, education, and extension activities of the ARS, CSREES, ERS and NAS. "

House

In the first outline of House Farm Bill, the House extended the authorization of the IFAFS program at \$94 million a year, which is lower than the current level of \$120 million a year. In the second draft, the House increased IFAF Funding to \$120 million a year. In the Committee mark-up, Congressman Dooley (D-CA) and Congressman Osborne (R-NB) offered amendments to bill to increase funding for research, extension and education. By the end of these efforts, IFAFS was increased to \$140 million a year. The Fund for Rural America was not reauthorized. A number of provisions proposed by the NASULGC Farm Bill Task Force were included in the language passed by the House Committee. The House planned to take the Farm Bill to the floor the week of September 10th, but the attacks in New York and Washington have pre-empted these discussions. There were already questions being raised as to whether the Farm Bill could be passed on the Floor and there is increasing speculation that the bill will be deferred until next year.

Senate

Senate Agriculture Committee staff began working on drafting Farm Bill language over the August recess. AESOP has met with majority and minority staff to review our Task Force proposals. Again, recent events may delay action in the Senate. Plans for moving the Farm Bill forward, or not, may become more clear in the coming several weeks.

Action Requested: For information.

Agenda Item 5. Advocacy and Marketing Annual Report Annual Report

Presenter: Colin Kaltenbach

Background:

Action Requested: For information.

Agenda Item 6. Science and Technology Committee Annual Report

Presenter: Randy Woodson

Background:

Action Requested: For information.

Agenda Item 7. Partnerships Committee Annual Report

Presenter: D. C. Coston

Background: The Partnerships Task Force completed its activities in July with reports to the Land Grant system of the results and recommendations from the partnerships activities, including the February workshop in Baltimore. These recommendations along with suggested means and timelines for implementation may be found on the ESCOP web site. The Task Force was disbanded with completion of its work.

One of the major recommendations (made in May) to the Chairs of ESCOP and ECOP and the CSREES Administrator is to lead the formation of a follow-on group to oversee implementation of the other recommendations. Included were suggestions to broaden participation to include academic and international programs areas. The Task Force suggested that the leaders above approach the chairs of ACOP and ICOP to ascertain their interest in participating and if there be interest, to ask them to identify participants. Dr. Hefferan has implemented many suggestions arising from the work of this initiative within CSREES and has named the participants from CSREES for the follow-on activity. We await the naming of participants by the ESCOP and ECOP leadership as well as the results of their discussions with the chairs of ACOP and ICOP.

Vice Chair Lee Sommers and I continue to seek counsel and to discuss the future activities of the Partnerships Committee. We are working on a set of recommendations.

Action Requested: For information.

Agenda Item 8. Planning Committee Annual Report

Presenter: Eric Young

Background Information:

The minutes of all Committee meetings and various working documents are available on the Committee web site accessible from the ESCOP homepage or using the direct URL of <http://www.escop.msstate.edu/committee/plan00.htm#Action>.

Continuing the Committee's charge of linking planning with budget development, future research

priorities (2005-2010) that were identified by the Directors at the September, 2000 SAES/ARD Workshop in New Orleans. The resulting ESS research priority list is available on the ESCOP Workroom web site at <http://www.escop.msstate.edu/draftdoc.htm>. During this year's Workshop, budget priorities for the FY2004 ESCOP budget will be identified.

The Committee has developed a flow chart outlining the interaction of ESCOP Core Committees in developing program and budget initiatives. This flow chart is available at <http://www.escop.msstate.edu/committee/pl-joint-initiative.pdf>.

The ECOP / ESCOP Joint Planning Committee (JPC) develop an action plan to address recommendations made in the Strategies for Enhanced Engagement report (available at <http://www.escop.msstate.edu/committee/engage.pdf>). This plan has been completed (available at <http://www.escop.msstate.edu/committee/engagement-action-plan.pdf>) and covers four aspects of implementing the report's recommendations:

- a. Strengthening authentic partnerships with stakeholders
- b. Creating a culture for engagement
- c. Achieving funding for effective engagement
- d. Enhanced accountability

The plan is intended to be used as a roadmap for enhancing engagement at the institutional, state, regional, and/or national levels by the research and extension system in conjunction with its partners.

The JPC has been asked to follow-up on two priority action items from the Partnership Workshop held in February 2001:

- a. Develop a shared vision for the partnership.
- b. Establish a formal joint priority and initiative setting process.

This will be addressed at the next meeting in October, 2001.

The JPC has also recently developed a document outlining the charge, roles, and responsibilities of the joint committee. This document is available at <http://www.escop.msstate.edu/committee/planjointcharge.htm>.

Action Requested: For information.

Agenda Item 9. NRSP Survey Results

Presenter: David MacKenzie

Background: Following discussion with the Partnership Office on the desirability of evaluating the National Research Support Project (NRSP) portfolio it was decided to conduct a survey of SAES directors. A web-based survey instrument was developed and announced to the SAES community, with two versions; a long and a short set of questions. Each region was asked to encourage a few directors to complete the long form (53 question). Others could opt for either version. 32 directors responded (for the 21 long version). Open-ended comments were encouraged, in addition to YES or NO responses to the stated questions. The general results of the survey follow.

- There is broad agreement on the fact that individual stations benefiting from NRSP activities; but there is a need to be doing something different than the current mix, either through expansion of the portfolio or more appropriate addressing of priority needs. There is also a perceived need for better procedures for priority setting, and the sun-setting of activities.
- There is little or no interest in providing NRSP support for any additional programmatic accountability (e.g., Plans of Work); regulatory compliance support (e.g., human subjects); genetic resource conservation; environmental monitoring; analytical services (e.g., soil testing); or expanded services in information technology (e.g., REEIS).
- There is positive interest in: providing better accountability for individual NRSPs; more strategic approaches to NRSP partnerships; better mechanisms for allocating money to NRSPs; and “graduating” some (not all) NRSPs to alternative funding sources (e.g., grant, endowment, check-off money).

Suggestion: ESCOP should give consideration to forming a permanent steering committee of SAES Directors for NRSP oversight that is empowered to manage the NRSP portfolio for the SAES system. (This proposal was evident throughout the comments.)

Action Requested: Refer the suggestion to ESCOP.

Agenda Item 10. Science Roadmap

Presenter: David MacKenzie

Background:

Agenda Item 11. CSREES Update

Presenter: George Cooper

Background:

Agenda Item 12. AESOP Report

Presenter: Terry Nipp

Background:

Agenda Item 13. Proposed new NRSP:

National Agricultural and Natural Resources Data Support Project

Presenters: T. J. Helms, Arthur Cosby, and Jay Ritchie

Background: This proposal for establishment of a new NRSP (National Agricultural and Natural Resources Data Support Project) is an outgrowth of the first meeting of the National Multistate Coordinating Committee held in April 2001. The Executive Directors heard a presentation by the leadership for a similar project sponsored by the Southern Association of Agricultural Experiment Station Directors (SAAESD). Through this project, member Directors of the SAAESD have had access to a wide variety of data from numerous sources (CRIS, NAS, EPA, U. S. Census Bureau, and others) to support their engagement, planning, and communication efforts with numerous audiences.

Action Requested: The appended proposal also appears as an agenda item for the meetings of the Northeastern, North Central and Western Associations. Its inclusion herein and the demonstration are presented for informational purposes in support of discussion during those meetings.

Agenda Item 14. Multiple Activity Programs (MAPS)

Presenter: Colin Kaltenbach

Background: During the ESCOP Executive Committee (Denver, May '01) a proposal was developed to address the apparent impasse we face with increasing formula funds. As we understand the issues, The White House would like to be able to track any increases in the formula funds. Priority topic areas such as food safety, biotechnology, or environmental protection, while of interest to OMB, could not be tracked as new outlays, according to a study done by CSREES staff. That study recommended linking financial outlays with institutional programs and the agency's performance plan, a task not now possible. Moreover, 'base-lining' the current activities in a priority area was thought to be challenging.

To address this management need a proposal was developed to create a series of multistate programs that align with current budget priorities, and are present within each region. Called MAPs (for Multiple Activity Programs), these functionally integrated, multistate, interdisciplinary entities would serve as the organizing frameworks for tracking any new funding (e.g., formula, competitive, special) and for reporting results and accomplishments. Individualization to regional and institutional needs would be encouraged through modification of the specific objectives within each region.

Four draft demonstration program proposals were developed by the Executive Directors (EDs). The four topics are those of the '01 BOAA Budget Committee initiatives. These draft documents have been shared with the ESCOP Chair's Advisory Committee. Additionally, the EDs met with the Administrator of CSREES to describe the concept, and solicit her support.

An ad hoc Task Force has been appointed to discuss and further refine development of the MAPS. In addition to the following ESCOP and ECOP representatives, the CSREES Administrator has been invited to participate or to name another CSREES representative to the task force.

ESCOP representatives: Colin Kaltenbach, Randy Woodson, Eric Young, Tom Helms

ECOP representatives: Oscar Butler, Mary Gray, Keith Smith, Ron Brown

Action Requested: For information.

Agenda Item 15. Impact Assessment Proposal

Presenters: David MacKenzie and T. J. Helms

Background: At the last meeting of ESCOP it was proposed that a study be made of the impact of formula funding on American agriculture and the U.S. economy, society, and environment. A similar “counterfactual” study has been completed for the Green Revolution, using a computer model developed at IFPRI, in Washington, DC. Originally, the model was used as the basis for the IFPRI 2020 program, which just won the 2001 World Food Prize for the Center’s Director General Per Pinstrup-Anderson.

Project leader Mark Rosegrant of IFPRI has agreed to engage in planning the application of the 2020 model to study the impact U.S. formula funding. Additionally, the Social Science Research Center at Mississippi State University has agreed to collaborate on the project. This would add analytical capacity and data access to the collaboration.

The initial agreement with ESCOP was to consider a more developed proposal that may be funded up to \$100,000 from the existing SUNEI account. The constraint we now face is the need to get together to plan an analysis and get agreement on the process and assignments. Some commitment of funding is needed to get collaborations established.

We are asking for approval to move ahead with expending funds from the SUNEI balance to meet and develop a more complete proposal, and to authorize the Chair of ESCOP to approve the implementation of the plan, with funding up to \$100,000 once the plan has been completed and approved by the ESCOP Executive Committee.

Action Requested: Approval to have ESCOP move ahead with assessing the impact of formula funding.

Agenda Item 16. Nomination Committee Report

Presenter: Richard Jones

Background: The following nominee was accepted by ESCOP for presentation to ESS:

- Chair-Elect, ESCOP: Scott Angle, MD

Action Requested: Approval.

Agenda Item 17. Resolutions Committee Report

Presenter: LeRoy Daugherty

Background: Resolutions will be presented for those Directors who have retired or otherwise left the ranks of the Experiment Station Section.

Action Requested: Approval.

**Agenda Item 18.
Passing the Gavel**

Presenter: McArthur Floyd

Background: Dr. Floyd's term as Chair ends with the close of the Section business meeting, thus the gavel will be officially turned over to incoming Chair, Richard Heimsch.

Action Requested: For information.

**Agenda Item 19.
Final Remarks and Announcements**

Presenter: Richard Heimsch

Background: Remarks from new Chair Richard Heimsch and any additional announcements will precede adjournment.

Action Requested: For information.

[END]