

2004 Summer ESCOP Meeting
July 25, 2004 - July 27, 2004
Embassy Suites Hotel, Orlando-Downtown
191 East Pine Street, Orlando, Florida 32801

AGENDA

Tuesday, July 27, 2004

TIME	AGENDA ITEM	TOPIC
8:15 – 12:00		<i>ESCOP Meeting</i>
8:15	1.0	Call to Order – Ian Gray
	<u>2.0</u>	Approve of Agenda Approval of Minutes: March 2-3, 2004 Approval of Interim Actions
8:25	<u>3.0</u>	Budget and Legislative Committee – Darrell Nelson/Daryl Lund 3.1 - Overview of Activities 3.2 - Preliminary FY 2005 House Mark Compared to Prior Years and President's Request 3.3 – Farm Bill: Challenges and Opportunities 3.4 - FY2006 Priority Rankings
8:35	4.0	Communications and Marketing Committee – Jerry Arkin/Tom Fretz
8:55	5.0	Partnership Committee – Lee Sommers/Mike Harrington
9:10	<u>6.0</u>	Planning Committee - Virginia Clark Johnson/Sam Donald
9:20	7.0	Science and Technology Committee – Nancy Cox/Eric Young
9:30	<u>8.0</u>	NRSP Review Committee – Gary Lemme/Daryl Lund
9:45	9.0	NIMSS Update – Eric Young
10:00		<i>Break</i>
10:30	10.0	NASULGC-DOE Collaboration – Mike Harrington
10:45	11.0	NIAS Update - DC Coston
11:00	12.0	New Leadership Development Program – Eric Young
11:10	13.0	N-CFAR Update - S. Pueppke
11:20	14.0	Nominations Committee Report – Scott Angle
11:30	15.0	Upcoming Meetings: Experiment Station Section Meeting – Ian Gray SAES/ARD Workshop – Eric Young/DC Coston
12:00		<i>Adjourn for Lunch</i>
1:30 – 3:30		<i>Joint ECOP/ESCOP Meeting</i>
1:30	J1	USDA/CSREES Update: Colien Hefferan

- 2:00 J2 Formula Funds: Daryl Lund (Counterfactual study); ECOP survey results
- 2:10 J3 Civil Rights Reviews Status: ESCOP chair Ian Gray and ECOP chair Keith Smith
- 2:20 J4 Multistate Activity Reporting Status: ESCOP chair Ian Gray and ECOP chair Keith Smith
- 2:30 J5 Farm Bill Priorities (including working with other agencies): Chairs of Farm Bill activity for ESCOP (LeRoy Daugherty) and ECOP (?)
- 2:40 J6 e-Extension status: ECOP chair Keith Smith

3:30 – 5:00

ESCOP Meeting

- 3:30 16.0 ESCOP Liaison Reports/Discussions (5-8 mins each):
 - 16.1 ICOP - Edwin Price
 - 16.2 CARET - Kristin Perry
 - 16.3 ECOP - Elbert Dickey
 - 16.4 NAPFSC - Perry Brown
- 4:00 17.0 Regional Reports (5-8 mins each)
 - 17.1 ARD - Al Parks
 - 17.2 Northeast – Bill Trumble
 - [17.3 North Central](#) – Wendy Wintersteen
 - 17.4 Southern - Greg Weidemann
 - 17.5 Western – Ralph Cavalieri
- 4:50 18.0 Other General Business
- 5:00 ***Adjourn***

AGENDA BRIEFS

Item 2.0: Interim Actions of the Chair

Presenter: Ian Gray

- Sent a letter to Gary Cunningham and Colien Hefferan to volunteer ESCOP in working with CSREES to redefine the operational procedures of the MRF Office.
- Sent a letter to Wendy Wintersteen regarding ESCOPs response to her query (on behalf of the NCRA) on multistate efficiency. The letter included the following replies:
 - Motion 1: Task Force on the MRF:
 - We were reminded that the MRF Guidelines were updated and submitted for approval through CSREES as recently as 2001. We are still awaiting final approval through the agency. This is required before the proposed guidelines can be subjected to the Congressional Record process for comment and eventual enactment. The updated guidelines were accepted by vote of the Experiment Station directors and were intended to simplify the processes for MRF. It is our thought that the concerns that were outlined in the special subcommittee report that you chaired should be first considered internally within NCRA. In that process, we would encourage you to bring forward to ESCOP those issues that you feel are of interest and should be considered nationally.
 - Items 5 and 6 in the special report deserve additional comment. Item 5 asks the question about what counts toward the 25% multistate funding. I have instructed Daryl Lund to check with Gary Cunningham regarding the establishment of a mechanism to count multistate activities not reported in NIMSS toward the 25% multistate requirement. This would apply to organizations such as the Dairy and Poultry Consortiums, etc.
 - Item 6 suggests that NIMSS be examined to ascertain if the email message load can be reduced. I am asking Eric Young, Chair of the NIMSS Oversight Committee, to take this question under advisement. This is good timing since NIMSS is undergoing reconstruction now and version 2.0 will be activated in mid-August.
 - Motion 2: Input into CSREES's reformulation of the Plan of Work and Annual Report formats:
 - This is an excellent suggestion. However, instead of taking concerns directly to BAA and the Farm Bill Committee, I have asked Daryl to communicate directly with the agency that we are interested in participating in the process as it formulates its approach to the reporting requirements (POW and AR). We understand that there will be substantive changes in the POW and AR that will make them easier to complete, more consistent with AES planning activities, and more useful in obtaining information on the portfolio. We will be communicating to all the regions the response that we receive to our offer.
- Sent a letter to CSREES regarding the desire of the 4 SAES regions to utilize attachments in the NIMSS system. This action was accepted by CSREES and will be utilized with proposal submissions as soon as possible.

- Checked into possibility of Plan of Work and Annual Report working group (facilitated by CSREES) and appointed two representatives.
- Sent a letter to Policy Board regarding the length of term for the Policy Board ED Back-up. The current back-up will have a three-year term and after that, each back-up will serve a four-year term.
- Communicated to NASULGC that two BAA Policy Board Representative nominees have been confirmed. They are Scott Angle and Wendy Wintersteen.

Item 3.0: Budget and Legislative Committee

Presenter: Darrell Nelson/Daryl Lund

Item 3.1: Overview

FY 05 Budget: The House passed the Ag Approps Bill June 23. The bill as it affects CSREES and our programs is detailed in the attachment. Clearly the system did not get everything it wanted especially in the area of minority serving institutions and in restoration of all the cuts from FY 04. However, there is a significant increase (\$16M) in the NRI and the Hatch budget was not axed. Given the budget situation, the requirement for allocation of funds to the new Department of Homeland Security, and the funds needed for DOD, the net result of the House budget is very favorable. By the time we meet, the Senate will have marked up and passed its version of the Ag Approps Bill.

FY 06 Budget: ESCOP has submitted its priorities to the BAC. The priorities are very general (see attachment). The plan is to have a greater degree of specificity by the NASULGC annual meeting in November followed by really specific recommendations within a week following the release of the President's FY 06 budget (scheduled for early to mid-February). ESS has a session planned for the Fall Workshop to discuss budget priorities (Sam Donald, Chair).

Rural Renaissance Act: Senator Norm Coleman (MN) introduced a bill in support of rural economic development (S.1796) entitled: A bill to revitalize rural America and rebuild main street, and for other purposes (sponsor: Sen Coleman, Norm [MN] (introduced 10/29/2003); cosponsors: Sen DeWine [OH], Sen Graham [SC], Sen Pryor [AR]). The NASULGC Presidents' Council has embraced the bill and is fully supportive of the bill. The President of the University of Minnesota is leading the charge and will call on all members of the NASULGC family to support the bill as need arises. Basically, the Bill amends the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to establish the Rural Renaissance Corporation to authorize issuance of rural renaissance bonds for financing qualified projects. Furthermore the bill amends the Internal Revenue Code to allow a limited credit to the holder of a rural renaissance bond, sets an annual rural renaissance bond limit, and provides for allocation among the States. Qualified projects include: (1) a water or waste treatment project; (2) a conservation project, including any project to protect water quality or air quality (including odor abatement), any project to prevent soil erosion, and any project to protect wildlife habitat, including any project to assist agricultural producers in complying with Federal, State, or local regulations; (3) an affordable housing project; (4) a community facility project, including hospitals, fire and police stations, and nursing and assisted-living facilities; (5) a value-added agriculture or renewable energy facility project for agricultural producers or farmer-owned entities, including any project to promote the production or processing of ethanol, biodiesel, animal waste, biomass, raw commodities, or wind as a fuel; (6) a rural venture capital project for, among others, farmer-owned entities; (7) a distance learning or telemedicine project; (8) a project to expand broadband technology; and (9) a rural teleworks project. According to the BRT, nothing has happened with the bill in the Senate nor has a companion bill been introduced in the House.

Farm Bill: All of the COPs are now working on the Farm Bill. Current thinking in Congress is that the Farm Bill will come up sooner than its 2007 expiration date. The BAA has established a Farm Bill Committee chaired by MSU Dean Jeffery Armstrong. There are five subcommittees for

the five most relevant subtitles. ESCOP has already recommended the appointment of ESCOP members to each of the subcommittee and the Steering Committee. Those recommendations are: Conservation - Henry Vaux (CA); Rural Development - Alfred Parks (Prairie View A&M); Energy - Kevin Kephart (SD); Research and Education - Bill Brown (LA); Forestry - Bruce Wiersma (ME); Steering Committee – LeRoy Daugherty (NM) and Tom Fretz (NERA). The deans have enlisted the assistance of the staff support of the members of the NASULGC family (i.e. EDs, etc.). Preliminary analysis of issues that are relevant to us is included in the attached report of the BRT. Jeff has called for a teleconference of the five groups addressing the most relevant titles for August. LeRoy Daugherty and Tom Fretz will be coordinating ESCOP's engagement in this process.

Action: We need a new representative to the Farm Bill Subcommittee on Research and Education. One member of the B/L Committee has suggested Lee Sommers.

3.2: To view the preliminary F.Y. 2005 House Mark Compared to Prior Years and President's Request, visit www.wisc.edu/ncra/FY2005BLC-budgetcomparisons.xls.

3.3: Challenges and Opportunities

Presented by: Congressional Consideration of “Farm Bill” Programs

NASULGC has established a Farm Bill Committee (FBC) to consider how its member universities might protect and advance their varied interests in the context of congressional consideration of the next farm bill. It is true that the bulk of the provisions of the 2002 farm bill do not expire until the 2007 “crop year” for each of the major commodities. However, for the reasons touched on in this brief paper, it would be prudent for the FBC to be prepared for the consideration of farm bill issues beginning in 2005, if not before.

Budget Resolution May Require Mandatory Agriculture Spending Reductions

The F.Y. 2005 Budget Resolution passed by the House of Representatives included a requirement that the House Agriculture Committee “reconcile” mandatory agriculture spending reductions by approving legislation to do so not later than July 2004. The Resolution would require legislative changes to mandatory spending accounts within the Agriculture Committee’s jurisdiction to achieve savings of \$110 million in F.Y. 2005, and \$371 million over the five fiscal years 2005 through 2009. The Senate Budget Resolution did not include any similar reconciliation instructions to its Agriculture Committee. As of the writing of this paper, the Budget Resolution is pending in conference and the outcome of this issue is undetermined.

It is true that the House’s agriculture reconciliation numbers are small against the backdrop of USDA’s mandatory spending of as much as \$60 billion annually. However, even these minimal spending reductions could pose significant challenges to the interests of NASULGC institutions. Let’s consider a specific example.

As you know, the president’s budget as well as recent appropriations measures have zeroed out the mandatory funding of the Initiative for Future Agriculture and Food Systems (IFAFS). In order to free up funds for other priorities, it might make sense for the Agriculture Committees to beat the Appropriations Committees to the punch by saving the entire required amounts by reducing the funding authorized for IFAFS.

Such a course of action would allow the Agriculture Committee to meet its reconciliation obligation without having to make any cuts in direct assistance to farmers or food assistance program recipients. In addition, capping IFAFS spending could be characterized as a “cut with little real world effect” since funding for the program has been prohibited for many years through the appropriations process.

However, reducing the mandatory authorization of funds to IFAFS would then require the Appropriations Committee to go elsewhere to find spending “offsets” to fund its other priorities, especially in the current dismal budget climate. The result could be reduced net funding for NASULGC research, education, and extension priorities.

This example serves to demonstrate the seamless and dangerous situation that the current budget and programmatic challenges present to NASULGC’s interests.

Budgetary and other Pressures will likely Force the Opening of the Farm Bill Before 2007

Working to prepare for protecting and advancing the interests of NASULGC institutions in the 2007 Farm Bill is an important goal. However, it is highly likely that one or more issues will force the opening or dramatic rewrite of the Farm Bill or its underlying programs before 2007. A brief discussion of some of the more likely of these issues follows.

1. Major Budget Reconciliation Legislation.

President Bush has announced his intention to reduce the federal budget deficit by 50 percent over the next five years. Some in Congress have embraced this goal, while others have assailed it as too little, too late. Senator John Kerry continues to make the budget deficit a campaign issue.

These factors make it likely that 109th Congress will consider major budget reconciliation legislation when it convenes in early 2005. Consideration of further budget reconciliation legislation may also be necessary in 2006 and beyond.

To make matters worse, there is a lingering sense among members of Congress that the 2002 Farm Bill’s \$79 billion increase in spending over 10 years was “too generous”. If this view is allowed to prevail unchallenged it is possible that agriculture could be singled out for budget reductions disproportionate to its budgetary size in any serious reconciliation effort.

Any reconciliation legislation of the magnitude necessary to make these budget reductions will drive major changes in any number of Farm Bill programs. This includes everything from basic commodity programs to conservation programs to agricultural research. In fact, indications are that House Agriculture Committee Chairman Bob Goodlatte’s (R-VA) view of such budget reconciliation legislation would be to look at everything within the committee’s jurisdiction for possible contributions toward deficit reduction.

Agricultural research, extension, teaching, and other NASULGC priorities would clearly be at risk in such an environment. At the same time, as the array of Farm Bill programs are reduced or fundamentally changed, it could arguably create opportunities for NASULGC to advance its priorities in light of the reduced support that may be given to farmers, conservationists,

feeding program participants, and others. The FBC would be well advised to look closely at the various alternatives and identify possibilities for enhancing the role that university research and related activities may play in the changing environment that reduced spending may bring on.

2. Brazilian WTO Challenge.

The World Trade Organization is considering a challenge against the U.S cotton program and USDA's GSM export credit guarantee program brought by the Government of Brazil. A decision adverse to the United States in the dispute could force the United States to make fundamental changes in the operation of the cotton program, other basic commodity programs, and the export credit guarantee program. Separately, or in conjunction with budget reconciliation or other legislation, these changes would need legislation to be made effective.

3. The Conclusion of a Multilateral Agreement in the WTO.

If an agreement is reached in the World Trade Organization liberalizing trade and domestic supports in agriculture, it will require a fundamental rewrite of U.S. commodity and related programs. Total U.S. spending on these so-called "amber box" trade-distorting domestic support programs would likely need to be reduced from the current \$19 billion ceiling to something in the neighborhood of \$10 to \$12 billion. This would require major budget reductions and a likely fundamental restructuring of the basic commodity programs.

While some of this spending might be lost, much of it could also be shifted to non-trade-distorting agriculture programs, including conservation and research programs. There should be opportunities for the university community to enhance its federal funding in this environment, to the extent that the community is well prepared with a credible case for doing so.

Conclusion

In light of the above described circumstances, more forward-looking commodity and farm groups are already cataloging their policy options and strategies to protect and advance their interests well before the expiration of the 2002 Farm Bill. NASULGC's Farm Bill Committee should be doing no less. A successful overall strategy and any credible individual proposals will have to be carefully developed and buttressed by accurate economic and policy analysis well before the crisis of legislation arrives.

6.2.4: ESCOP FFY 06 Priorities - Initial Ranking

Primary Category	Rank	Sub Category	Rank
Environment	1	Water	1
		Invasive Species	2
		Global Climate Change	3
Food and Health/Consumer Behavior	2	Food Safety	1
		Obesity	2
		Agricultural use of antibiotics	3
Genomics	3	Plant systems	1
		Animal systems	2
Rural Community Vitality	4	Land use policy	1
		Product-based agriculture	2
		Entrepreneurship and Leadership	3
Homeland Security	5	Facility and personnel security	1
		Energy security	2
		Risk Assessment	3
		Rapid Detection of Pathogens	4
Facilities	6		

Item 6.0: Planning Committee

Presenter: Virginia Clark Johnson/Sam Donald

1. The Planning Committee met by conference call on April 28, 2004 (CST).
2. The Operational Plan for the Science Roadmap follows. The plan has been finalized by the committee and reviewed by the Chair's Advisory Council.

OPERATIONAL PLAN FOR THE SCIENCE ROADMAP DRAFT DOCUMENT CREATED 2/24/04 BY ESCOP PLANNING COMMITTEE

The purpose of this plan is to identify an operational plan that can be used to meet the seven challenges identified in the Science Roadmap. One overall goal has been identified for the plan; four topics were identified that are important to the achievement of that goal, with strategies for each topic. The Plan was intentionally written to provide broad, simple and basic guidance, with the realization that regions and stations would need to build goals to meet their particular challenges and needs.

GOAL: CREATE OPPORTUNITIES FOR FEDERAL, STATE AND LOCAL RESEARCH ENTITIES TO WORK TOGETHER, AND WITH EXTENSION AND EDUCATION, TO ADDRESS THE SEVEN CHALLENGE AREAS IDENTIFIED IN THE SCIENCE ROADMAP: BE COMPETITIVE IN A GLOBAL ECONOMY; ADD VALUE TO OUR FUTURE HARVESTS; ADJUST AGRICULTURAL PRACTICES TO A CHANGING CLIMATE; BE GOOD STEWARDS OF THE ENVIRONMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES; MAKE OUR FAMILIES AND COMMUNITIES STRONG; AND, IMPROVE FOODS AND PROCESSING FOR BETTER HEALTH.

TOPIC 1 - STRUCTURE AND ORGANIZATION - STRATEGIES:

- 1) Recruit and support champions; people and organizations who are recognized by all partners as leaders.

- 2) Leverage resources and expertise through multiple partners (federal and state agencies, and other campuses) to strengthen research.
- 3) Use the food systems approach to establish the role of agriculture in societal issues.
- 4) Establish mechanisms to insure stakeholders' input is heard (advisory groups, focus groups).
- 5) Identify organizational structures that allow for and encourage collaboration, and create incentives to encourage collaboration (National Research Initiative Coordinated Agriculture Program, Multistate Research Funding process, integrated research, education and extension projects, National Research Initiative).
- 6) Create a system that better differentiates and identifies "niches" and builds on these so response time for addressing issues and problems can be quicker.

TOPIC 2 - PERSONNEL AND EXPERTISE - STRATEGIES:

- 1) Identify capacity and "gaps", including gaps in education among diverse groups.
- 2) Actively recruit persons from all segments of society to educate and train the next generation of researchers to meet the 7 challenges.
- 3) Utilize expertise without regard to location and discipline (across campus, among campuses, domestically as well as internationally).
- 4) Maximize the use of technology, where appropriate.
- 5) Provide incentives to encourage collaboration (release time, awards, salary stipend, hourly assistant, etc.).
- 6) Create joint programs to leverage resources (for example, World Food Distribution training programs offered through Texas universities; Great Plains IDEA).

TOPIC 3 - INFRASTRUCTURE/FACILITIES - STRATEGIES:

- 1) Establish a network of service centers (equipment used by many researchers; pay uses fee for service).
- 2) Share equipment and facilities to better utilize resources and minimize duplication.
- 3) Create matching sources of support for centralized service and/or shared equipment and facilities (as existing NIH or NSF programs).
- 4) Create Memo's of Agreement and/or Memo's of Understanding with Plans of Work to encourage sharing of new and existing equipment and facilities.

TOPIC 4 - FUNDING AND SUPPORT - STRATEGIES:

- 1) Create incentives to encourage pursuit of grants and contracts, for an example overload pay, grantsmanship training.
- 2) Create an incentive fund in competitive grants programs to provide matching funds for pooling resources (facilities, equipment and personnel).
- 3) Create a core-center approach to attract funds and promote multi-disciplinary participation in projects to which people can relate, for example obesity, renewable energy.

3. Committee members attending the Orlando meeting will meet to begin review of the most recent ESCOP report to BAA and integrate it into the ESS operational plan; to put

together a complete ESCOP operational plan; and to develop one-paragraph explanations for each strategy in the proposed Operational Plan for the Science Roadmap.

Actions Required: Approve proposed Operational Plan for the Science Roadmap for presentation to ESS at the September meeting in Oklahoma City.

Item 8.0: NRSP Review Committee

Presenter: Gary Lemme

- Lee Sommers will take over as NRSPRC Chair beginning after the Sept ESS meeting.
- An NRSP RC meeting was held in Minneapolis to discuss the NRSP projects (both proposals and budgets).
- Sent all preliminary NRSP RC recommendations to NRSP committees, who responded by June 25. These recommendations and responses were forwarded to the regional associations for their review.
- Sent preliminary budget recommendations to CSREES.
- Sent call to CSREES, WAAESD, and NERA regarding the need for new NRSP RC representatives.
- A follow-up teleconference will be held in August to discuss regional/committee responses and to prepare the NRSP RC responses for the ESS meeting.

Item 17.3: NCRA Report

Presenter: Wendy Wintersteen

- Appointed past MRC members to evaluate the usefulness of the NCRA project review forms. The appointees were Virginia Clark Johnson (chair of the committee), Gary Lemme, and Darrell Nelson. This group will provide their recommendations during the MRC Report.
- Corresponded with ESCOP regarding the following March 2004 NCRA requests. The results of this correspondence will be reported during the ESCOP Report:
 - ESCOP should undertake a review of the multistate project system to examine how increased efficiency and effectiveness can be achieved in the system. This concern was raised specifically by an ad hoc Committee led by Wendy Wintersteen on behalf of Dean Catherine Woteki. Although their report focuses on projects in the North Central Region, we believe that some of the comments are applicable to the entire multistate system.
 - As a follow on to the discussion on the multistate project system, it was the consensus of NCRA that a reporting system should be in place to ensure simplification of accountability, meet the needs of the agency (CSREES), and contribute to evaluation and planning for the experiment stations. It was moved, seconded and passed to take the concerns about the Federal Plan of Work and Annual Report to ESCOP and request that these concerns are forwarded to the BAA and the Farm Bill Task Force so that they may be addressed. This topic is timely for the BAA Farm Bill Committee because the reporting requirements that we now labor under had some of their roots in the 1998 Farm Bill and the

subsequent Agricultural, Research, Extension and Education Reform Act (AREERA) passed in 1998. Furthermore, CSREES has currently extended the Five-Year Plan of Work of 2000 another two years so the agency can critically evaluate the requirements and usefulness of the Plan of Work and the Annual Report. This presents an excellent opportunity for ESCOP to have input into this review.

- Investigated compensation for Executive Director.