

**Item 5.0:**

**Budget and Legislative Committee Report  
ESS Priorities for FY 2010 and 2011 Budgets  
Presenters: David Boethel/Mike Harrington**

**Committee Membership:** The EDs have worked with their respective regions to identify a full complement of members and terms. In addition, efforts are underway to identify new liaison members from The Board on Human Science and the National Association of University Forestry Research Programs. Current AES members: Orlando McMeans (ARD), Carolyn Brooks (ED-ARD), CY Hu (WAAESD), Michael Vayda (NERA), Tom Klindt (SAAESD), Bruce McPheron (NERA), Steve Slack (NCRA), Jeff Jacobsen (WAAESD), John Kirby (NCRA)

**SECTION PRIORITIES FY 2010**

The Budget and Legislative Committee completed the priority setting process for the 2010 budget cycle. Using the FY 2009 priorities, as a starting point break out discussions were held at the 2007 ESS Annual Meeting in Philadelphia to identify new/emerging issues. This was followed by an on-line survey to which there were 50 responses.

**Overarching Priorities:**

- The Directors continue to indicate that maintaining capacity for research through base funds (Hatch, Evans-Allen, McIntire-Stennis, and Animal Health) is the top priority by a 3:1 margin over moving funds into competitive programs.
- Increasing funding for the NRI with emphasis on integrated activities is also an important priority
- The Directors did not favor focusing formula funds on specific topics in order to gain increases in these funds but did favor matching new formula funds for specific initiatives.

**Ranked Research Priorities:**

1. Biobased Economy; Food, Nutrition, Health and Well-Being (Tie)
2. Environment
3. Food Agrosecurity

**NEW ISSUES FOR 2010**

Several new items of concern had arisen since the original 2010 priorities were set. Thus, questions pertaining to these were included in the FY 2011 survey which has just concluded.

**Specialty Crop Research Initiative**

Did your institution have difficulty meeting the matching requirements for the Specialty Crop Research Initiative?

<b>Response</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>%</b>
Great difficulty or unable to submit	20	42
Some difficulty	24	50
No difficulty	4	8

### **CSREES Priorities for 2010**

CSREES has advanced several issues as priorities for the 2010 Budget to focus attention on specific issues. It suggested that there be future efforts to harmonize both issues advanced by the agency with those of “the family” to afford a unified message.

#### **Priorities for 2010:**

<b>Issue</b>	<b>% Supporting (H+MH)</b>
1. Sustaining production of agricultural bio-feed stocks for biofuels and other bioproducts, including the impact of expanded production on water use, soil fertility, and related environmental conditions. Analysis of expanded use of biofuels and other products is also needed in regard to food and feed prices and availability, domestically and worldwide.	<b>85</b>
2. Managing the consequences and contributions of agriculture practices in global climate change, particularly through educating students to assure they have agricultural and land management skills necessary to effect change.	<b>59</b>
3. Enhancing understanding of community and behavioral attributes of human nutrition to inform nutrition education and guidance programs.	<b>47</b>
4. Assuring the availability, quality, and diversity of a well-educated agricultural workforce throughout the 21st Century through strategic investments in minority serving institutions including establishing an endowment to fund Hispanic serving institutions with agricultural programs.	<b>27</b>

### **SECTION PRIORITIES FOR FY 2011**

The Budget and Legislative Committee conducted a preliminary survey as a prelude to the ESS Annual Meeting. There were 57 responses with the following results are as follows:

#### **Overarching Priorities:**

- The Directors indicate that maintaining capacity for research through base funds (Hatch, Evans-Allen, McIntire-Stennis, and Animal Health) is the top priority by 70%:30% margin over moving funds into competitive programs.
- Increasing funding for the NRI with emphasis on integrated activities continues to be an important priority
- The Directors favor the concept of “continuing services” increases for the formula programs but suggest that the increase should be 5% to 10% rather than the rate of inflation.
- Directors strongly favored seeking increases for new research programs in the 2008 Farm Bill:
  - Biomass Research and Development – 83%
  - Specialty Crops Research Initiative – 83%
  - Organic Agriculture- 52%

### **Changing the BAA-Budget and Advocacy Committee Process**

Heretofore each section submitted several (or more) priorities into the BAC process, which, unfortunately, resulted in a rather long list making it difficult to communicate priorities to decision makers. In light of this, the BAC has been working to develop a much shorter list of priorities as well as approaches to future budgets. To this end the ESCOP Budget and Legislative Committee has obtained input on the “next \$100 million program”.

#### **Approaches for Future Budgets**

<b>Approach</b>	<b>% Supporting (H+MH)</b>
Focus on major increases for the Agriculture and Food Research Initiative (AFRI).	<b>84</b>
Use themes to allocate AFRI funds; Beyond AFRI use themes to justify increases in	<b>61</b>

other lines.	
Use a variation of the CREATE-21 philosophy (i.e. 70:30 split, small 1862s, 1890s, 1994s etc.) to allocate increases among the BAC's priority programs (lines).	59
Align lines under themes and apply increases.	33
Abandon the use of themes and set program priorities as in recent past.	27

### What is the next \$100 Million Program?

Issue	% Supporting (H+MH)
1. A broad water initiative including supply, quality, use, conservation, etc.	84
2. Focus on the Environment including long term sustainability	83
3. A large scale initiative to provide solutions for bio and renewable energy and the food crisis	83
4. Food, health, obesity and food safety	74
5. Long term sustainable agriculture sites	64
6. Human capacity development including IGERT and young scholars programs	53
7. An integrated National Plant Germplasm System	43

### Additional Suggestions:

1. Build human capacity development into the large programs/themes.
2. Mitigating the impacts of climate change in agriculture
3. Control of Invasive Species
4. Food & Biosecurity
5. The cost of transportation and environmental impact with mitigation by appropriate more regional/local supplies
6. Shifting from high impact to lower impact production systems
7. Basic and applied plant science, particularly for those fruits, vegetables, and cereals of agricultural importance within various regions of the US
8. Expand the germplasm item into a broader 'technology innovations in agriculture.' that's more inclusive and keeps a broader presence of the elements of innovation, discovery and new technologies
9. Water is the next generation's oil

### CREATE-21 Philosophy

The philosophy developed during the formation of CREATE-21 for requesting increased funding supported proposals advocating a 70:30 split of new funds between competitive and capacity programs respectively.

Do you continue to support this proposed split?

**Yes – 77%**

**No – 23%**

### Additional Comments:

1. I don't think we will ever sell a significant increase until it is primarily for competitive programs.
2. As long as all groups can compete on a relatively level field. I certainly do not support this if competitive grants are going to require matching funds. Our institution has trouble meeting the formula funds match and has no additional funds for matching.
3. Generally, but prefer service line adjustments for capacity programs rather than unilateral policy of 30%. The formulas are not based upon current conditions in that they are 65 years old.
4. 20:80
5. Capacity or formula funds are extremely important to give capacity to support ongoing needs supportive of agriculture production, food systems and related environmental areas

6. Capacity programs have been level-funded for decades, while competitive programs have at least received some increases. New monies should be allocated preferentially to capacity programs, as these are woefully underfunded and will address different but critically important priorities that will not be addressed through competitive approaches.
7. From the perspective of a small state, and the northeast, it is critically important to increase formula funds as fast (50:50) as competitive funds to adequately meet emerging regional and state needs that are not addressed by "national priority" funding. This is especially apparent with the results of the 1st round specialty crops program: the projects were distributed to consortia \$985K to \$6.6 million.
8. So long as the 70% are in addition to the base support, not in place of it.
9. Clearly an ongoing need to maintain capacity, but we are well aware that the "easiest" (obviously a very relative term) sell is competitive programs.
10. Would prefer a 60:40 or 65:35 split.
11. OMB and OSTP have a mindset about competitive funding, and I believe that this is the best way to accommodate that concern while increasing the base programs.