

**ESCOP Budget and Legislative Affairs Committee**  
**Conference Call**  
**March 27, 2012**  
**NOTES**

**Participants:**

Bill Brown  
Bob Schultz  
Steve Slack  
H. M. Harrington  
Hunt Shipman  
Jeff Jacobson  
KarenPlaut

**1. Approval of February Call Minutes**

Karen motioned. Jeff seconded. Approved.

**2. Any budget updates from Cornerstone**

House budget committee released its budget resolutions for FY13 that sets out the amount of discretionary spending for the 11 appropriations committees. Noteworthy: It is 15 Billion less than what the Super-Committee included for discretionary spending, and what is expected from the Senate budget committee. So, already the House and Senate have different numbers. The House numbers have significant cuts to Hatch, Smith Lever, McIntyre-Stennis. This will likely slow any conference processes because the top line allocation numbers will have to be resolved before the subcommittees will know what they are working from. Finally, the House freshman may not be satisfied by this 15 Billion reduction and they may try to cut it even more. It is not clear how the 15 billion in cuts would be translated down to the subcommittees and how the Ag Subcommittee would then allocate their portion.

Reminder: Senate deadline is this week (March 30). Remind people to contact their senate office and submit their request about the programs that are important to them, especially the 7 priorities of the BAC.

Cathy Woteki testified before the House Ag Committee. Cornerstone sent a report out to the BAC (*see attached*). The Crop Protection Program issue was one of the things that was top on Sam Farr's mind, especially the IR4 and its future identity. There were also questions from other members of the subcommittee asking about allocation of AFRI funds to different issues, including animal health.

**3. Final Draft Crop Protection White Paper**

Mike sent out the White Paper to everyone earlier this week. The White Paper was discussed in the policy board last week and they have endorsed. Also, Meryl Broussard called in with his support of NIFA participation on the working group proposed in the White Paper (*see Core Group list below*). Extension insisted that “Integrated” be part of the title, reflecting the importance of IPM. The IR4 folks, however, do not see themselves as part of IPM.

The Steering Committee or Core Group will develop drafts and a broader group will review, much like the 321 process worked.

Robin Shepard, Jane Shuhardt, and Mike Harrington developed a list of people who could potentially work on this issue. The first step will be to create an executive steering committee who will work to produce a first draft. Representatives from IR4, Research, Extension, Regional IPM, Extension IPM, and stakeholders are all included. A final list of participants will be developed by March 29<sup>th</sup>. Mike has spoken to several people on the list to gauge their interest in participating.

The charge to the group is still being finalized but would basically involve identifying:

- what the program would look like
- linkages between each of the program parts
- how to make an effective system

Mike is going to the International IPM Centers meeting in Memphis tomorrow. There is an IPM listening session on Thursday at noon. Mike is not aware of anyone from Research providing input. He will provide input on behalf of this committee and the BAA, and Budget and Advocacy Committee. He is likely to submit this White Paper as a form of input.

Did the 406 White Paper last year and included a lot of the IPM groups, in terms of defining function, but didn't include IR4. The point made was that NIFA was directed by Congress to roll that in; this should be recognized as people move forward.

Will the committee work after implementation or is this still in the working phase as to what will go into the FY13 budget. The FY2013 program could be implemented in the same manner as it was in FY2012, keeping everything whole. This would give the working group a chance to develop their recommendations. Would have to come up with the 1.3 million that was taken from the program and some advocacy might be needed to help recover those dollars. The IR4 folks remain unhappy (see [www.saveir-4.org](http://www.saveir-4.org)), but they may be willing to participate in planning. The White Paper talks about preserving functional integrity of important, core programs that should be maintained and/or enhanced.

Appropriators will have to make decisions before the committee gives full input. Can the IR-4 community be satisfied to the point of supporting the budget proposal and allowing the committee to go forward and allow their recommendations to be developed after the fact? Dan Rossi reported

today that IR-4 seems to have dialed back a bit and may be willing to participate in planning efforts for the Crop Protection Program.

All Regions have the White Paper. EDs have been asked to provide names for the working group. EDs have been sharing with their Directors. It got wide distribution in Extension as well.

**Next Steps:**

Mike and Robin Shepard will write a cover letter for the white paper for Frank Galey to review that outlines what was discussed in this meeting.

**4. Possible work group members**

Larger than anticipated, but program-area and geographic representation was important. The representatives listed below would be charged to reach out beyond those names to their respective groups that they represent.

**CORE Group**

**EIPM:**

Paul Jepson	western	Oregon
Charles Allen	southern	Texas
Ed Rajotte	northeast	Penn
Chris Boerboom	north central	North Dakota

**Regional IPM Centers:**

Susan Ratcliffe	north central
-----------------	---------------

**IR-4:**

Jerry Barons	national	
Rich Bonnano	northeast	Massachusetts

**1890s:**

Moses Kairo	1890s	Florida (FAMU)
-------------	-------	----------------

**Research:**

Frank Zalom	western	California
Jonathan Edelson	southern	Oklahoma
TBD	northeast	
Doug Buhler	north central	Michigan

**Stakeholders:**

Harold Cable	ARS
Steve Balling	Delmonte

Tom Green                      IPM Institute/IPM Voice  
Don Parker                     National Cotton Council

**NIFA:**

Meryl Broussard  
Mike Fitzner  
Deborah Sheely

**CO Chair:**

Mike Hoffman                Research  
Daryl Buchholz              Extension

**Exo Officio:**

ESCOP BLC, Chair          Steve Slack  
ECOP BLC, Chair          Rick Klemme  
CLP, Chair                    Wendy Winterstein

**5. Survey Results on Roadmap Priorities**

Mike reported on this at the ESCOP meeting. Each of the 7 priority areas has 2 top issues. Water and sustainability were cross-cutting issues. These priorities will be forwarded to USDA as AFRI priorities.

## Memorandum

TO: Budget and Advocacy Committee

FROM: The Cornerstone Team

SUBJ: House REE Hearing

DATE: March 22, 2012

Yesterday, the House Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee held its annual hearing on the President's Budget Request for the Research, Education, and Economics (REE) mission area of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. REE Under Secretary Catherine Woteki and her agency heads (including NIFA Acting Director Chavonda Jacobs-Young) were witnesses. Subcommittee members present for the hearing were Jack Kingston (R-GA), Jo Ann Emerson (R-MO), Cynthia Lummis (R-WY), Alan Nunnelee (R-MS), Sam Farr (D-CA), and Sanford Bishop (D-GA).

Generally, we prepare a hearing report which is distributed to BAA members and other interested parties. However, there was little "news" in yesterday's hearing and a full-blown report is not merited. Instead, we would call your attention to a few matters that came up during the question and answer period.

Ranking Democrat Farr was particularly concerned about the proposal to consolidate several existing crop pest management programs into a single "Crop Protection" program. Noting that he had already heard from several interested parties expressing concern that the IR-4 (Interregional Research Project #4 Minor Crop Pest Management Program) mission "would be lost." Woteki replied that they had also met with a representative group recently and that "we clearly understand the importance of IR-4 for specialty crops."

Woteki also said that the proposal was put forward in response to congressional directives and a desire to provide "more efficient management" of NIFA's crop protection efforts. Jacobs-Young noted that the agency was embarking upon a "a consultative process beginning next week in Memphis." Both committed to work with stakeholders and members of Congress "to make sure that everyone's concerns are addressed."

Other members, including Reps. Lummis, Nunnelee, Bishop, and Emerson asked questions about various NIFA programs and activities. Lummis wanted to know why only 30 percent of funds appropriated for the Agriculture and Food Research Initiative (AFRI) go to "foundational programs like animal health." Woteki said that "balance of the AFRI portfolio is something we discussed with the agency and broader community and because of complaints we made the decision to increase it to the current 30 percent."

Nunnelee asked that if the REE agencies were going to have to “make do with less,” shouldn’t any budget reductions come first from USDA overhead?” Woteki responded that they were in fact focusing first on administrative savings noting that the travel budget had been cut by 20 percent and that 500 REE mission area employees had taken advantage of early retirement opportunities. Nunnelee asked in follow-up: “Even after those administrative cuts, you may have to cut research. How do you decide what else to cut?” Woteki replied that they’d consult closely with various REE stakeholders and try to use the REE Action Plan for guidance.

Farr asked: “If the Specialty Crop Research Initiative (SCRI) is going away, why aren’t you making specialty crops a greater part of AFRI?” Woteki stated that “SCRI has been funded out of mandatory funds” and the program “has been very productive... Perhaps the Farm Bill reauthorization may provide an extension of mandatory funding. If not, we’ll consider it within AFRI.”

Bishop asked questions about AFRI and the NIFA programs that benefit the 1890 land-grant institutions. He specifically wanted to know what steps NIFA was taking to improve the “success rate” of grant applications from 1890 institutions. Jacobs-Young noted that the agency “has strong 1890s relationships, and we’re in constant discussion about how to improve 1890s competitiveness.”