

Meeting Minutes
NCR-197, Agricultural Safety and Health Research and Extension

January 23-24, 2002
Holiday Inn St. Louis Airport North
St. Louis, MO

Members Present: Dale Vanderholm, John Myers, Howard Doss, Willard Downs, William Field, Brad Rein, Charles Schwab, Robert Aherin, Thomas Bean, Dennis Murphy

Wednesday, January 23

The meeting began at 1:15 PM by Chair C. Schwab. Self-introductions were made. The agenda was reviewed and comments by NCR Administrator D. Vanderholm were moved from Wednesday to Thursday. There were no additions to the agenda and the committee approved it.

A copy of the Proposal for Innovation Funds was handed out (Handout A). USDA awarded the committee this grant in the amount of \$20,000. The grant was awarded to Iowa State University for a one-year period to support NCR-197 committee activity, and parallels committee objectives 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.6, and 2.4.

NCR-197 committee objective 1 was then reviewed. This objective is to “Establish a National Land Grant Research and Extension Agenda for Agricultural Safety and Health. Schwab passed out a communication from Mark Purschwitz dealing with gathering stakeholder input (Handout B). Aherin reviewed the stakeholder input process associated with the March 2-3, 2001 conference in Baltimore organized by Chip Petrea. This stakeholder input process has not yet run its course and may not in time for it to be useful to this committee. It was noted that the end product of the Baltimore conference, a follow-up document to the Agriculture At Risk document, would be very broad. After further discussion, it was clear that there was no clear understanding of what the final product would look like, and that it may not accomplish the goal of 1.1 (Create and Implement a Mechanism for Stakeholders’ Input to the National Agenda) for this committee.

D. Murphy mentioned feedback that he had received through department heads (NCA-16) regarding the direction of the NCR-197 committee. Some concern was expressed that the committee was looking and acting too much like a traditional cooperative extension committee, and was not focused adequately on engineering research. D. Vanderholm clarified that the concern was that our committee may not have sufficient biological health research expertise, and that it may be appropriate to have those issues addressed by another committee. C. Schwab pointed out that our committee would ultimately be evaluated as a committee on our progress at completing planned objectives. It was also noted that at the previous meeting of the NCR-197 committee, the committee agreed that focusing on objective 1.1 was the highest priority.

After considerable discussion on gathering stakeholder input for research agenda setting in a timely manner, a consensus was reached that we needed to use existing reports and evaluate those priorities, with active members of the NCR-197 committee serving as an expert panel to determine the final priorities and agenda. J. Myers advised that we should identify stakeholders who have an expressed interest, from a national perspective, in agricultural safety and health research, and consider their needs and interest as we articulate our priorities and agenda. Examples of these stakeholders included EPA, NIOSH, OSHA, USDA, and engineering departments, colleges and universities.

A draft report by J. Meyers of reported agricultural safety and health priorities 1990-2000 was then passed out (Handout C). J. Myers had assembled this report at the request of the committee at the last meeting. D. Murphy then summarized what he thought was developing as a committee consensus approach to completing overall objective 1. This was: a) synthesize several existing reports; b) a small (3-5 people) expert panel prepares a draft report; c) the draft is sent to the entire committee for input and reactions; d) revised draft distributed to a wider constituency group; and e) a final draft is prepared and distributed. The committee then agreed to spend time defining specific tasks, plans of action and a timetable to accomplish objective 1.1.

Identified task included (in no particular order):

identify external reports; collect external reports; synthesize/summarize reports; identify criteria for selecting priorities; develop committee priorities; identify expert panel members; draft document; send whole NCR-197 committee draft report; comments come back to expert panel; complete second draft; send out for final review by NCR-197; identify external stakeholders; send out for external stakeholder review; expert panel reviews external stakeholder comments; develop and distribute final report.

The committee then spent time identifying possible agency and organization reports and documents that might contain stakeholder input into priorities for agricultural safety and health research, and who would be charged with reviewing those reports and documents to see if they did indeed contain research priorities (person's name in parenthesis). B. Field volunteered to assemble the data. The results of these deliberations were as follows:

The National Action Plan for Childhood Agricultural Safety and Health (B. Field)
Draft comments from second National Action Plan (J. Myers)
A Report to the Nation: Agriculture At Risk (B. Field)
Tractor Risk Abatement Conference (J. Myers)
ASE (formerly EMI) Safety Committee Long Range Plan (B. Field)
Farm Foundation: Ad Hoc Working Group Report on Agricultural Safety and Health (B. Field)
EPA document (J. Myers)
5 NORA documents (J. Myers)
Youth Migrant & Seasonal Farmworkers Report from Marshfield (J. Myers)
OSHA documents (J. Myers)
NIOSH research priorities for Agriculture (J. Myers)
SAFE USA (J. Myers)

NIOSH Agriculture Centers priority lists (J. Myers)
NIFS research priorities (B. Field)
Agromedicine reports (B. Field)
American Farm Bureau—Jim Porterfield (B. Field)

Next the committee developed criteria for identifying how the expert panel should consider or rate specific topics and issues identified as stakeholder priorities. The following criteria were agreed upon:

- Identified by multiple stakeholders
- Capability of land grant universities to address (engineering oriented, attracts partners, involves interdisciplinary teams)
- Funding potential
- Potential for significant impact (short term results, high incident rate)
- Recently developed priorities
- Has significant future relevance
- Addresses underserved populations
- Research is not being duplicated elsewhere
- Transferability/broad application of research results
- Research is economically viable

C. Schwab will inquire of other NCR-197 committee members to see if they are aware of any other reports or documents that might contain agricultural safety and health research priorities, and to collect them as appropriate. B. Field noted he would identify the source of the priorities he assembled. C. Schwab volunteered to develop a matrix that included the criteria listed above with a grading scale of 1-7. This matrix will be used to rate each of the priorities assembled by B. Field. C. Schwab will distribute the matrix and research priorities to the entire NCR-197 committee for ranking.

A timeline for various activities was developed next:

- Reports to B. field by Feb. 8th
- Matrix developed by C. Schwab by Feb. 8th
- B. Field will assemble priorities by Feb. 18th
- C. Schwab will distribute to NCR-197 committee by Feb. 25th
- Committee responds to C. Schwab by March 18th
- C. Schwab compiles and forwards responses to expert panel by March 29th

B. Field, D. Murphy, B. Aherin and T. Bean volunteered to serve as the expert panel. T. Bean volunteered to host the expert panel at Ohio State May 13-15 to complete this work. The committee agreed that the goal for having a final national agenda report to distribute was the end of 2002. The expert panel will set intermediate deadlines for accomplishing this.

Thursday, January 24

The Thursday morning session began with several reports.

D. Vanderholm provided an Administrator Advisor report. His comments covered: the USDA budget; Dr. Daryl Lund being hired as the new Executive Director of the North Central Region Association (NCRA) of State Agricultural Experiment Station Director; the web site for NCRA (www.wisc.edu/ncra); the annual meeting of the Agricultural Experiment Station Directors; a National Information Management and Support system (NIMSS); and the NCA-16 annual review of NCR-197. Regarding the NCA-16 evaluation, a primary issue is that a strong health research component, particularly from a biological health perspective seems to be missing. Copies of two evaluation reports were distributed. An additional handout (www.escop.msstate.edu/2000prio.htm) identified experiment Station National Research Priorities for 2005-2009.

B. Rein gave the USDA report (Handout D). His comments covered: the USDA budget; the AgrAbility program; the Youth Farm Safety Education and Certification grant; and the Farm Safety Extension Reporting System. B. Rein discussion included the results of a CRIS search for agricultural safety and health projects and Impact Statements. The CRIS handout prompted a discussion on the limitations of the CRIS system for identifying agricultural safety and health research projects at land grant universities. The committee agreed that a good start at improving the identification of agricultural safety and health research projects was for everyone to describe their existing projects using a consistent format. The format that was agreed upon was:

Institution
Category (Research, Extension, or Research & Extension)
Principal Investigator/Project Director
Program/Project Title
Funding Source
Annual Funding Level (<\$5K; \$5K-\$25K; \$25K-\$100K; >\$100K)

The reports should cover active research projects in the fiscal year (October-September).

M. Purschwitz will be asked to send out a survey for this information to all NCR committee members, USDA farm safety contacts, and Agromedicine contacts at land grant universities. The reports will be forwarded to C. Schwab who will put the information on the NCR-197 web site. M. Purschwitz will be asked to send out survey by April 1. B. Aherin and C. Baggett will provide assistance as needed to complete this activity.

J. Myers gave a NIOSH report. His comments covered: the NIOSH budget, the search for a new director for NIOSH, and future directions; extramural programs and intramural projects that are agriculturally-related; NIOSH injury surveillance in agriculture; and the NIH research model being adopted by NIOSH. The NIH research model implies a move away from applied research to more basic research. It is difficult to know how engineering oriented research will fare under this model.

C. Schwab passed out a flyer on describing the North American Agromedicine Consortium (NAAC) (www.agromedicine.org/NAAC%20Brochure.htm). Discussion was held on how we might better establish good ties with Agromedicine programs. Past efforts at this were reviewed and we agreed to continue these efforts.

Discussion then moved to the additional activities listed in the Innovation Funds proposal. It was noted that if we are successful in completing the activities outlined early, then we would also be addressing most of the points identified in the innovation Grants proposal. Regarding the development and distribution of study papers on selected needs and opportunities, it was agreed that this activity needed to wait until the final draft of the research priorities report is completed, and that there may need to be an additional paper developed around the priorities. Regarding organizing national topical seminars or conferences, it was recognized that this shouldn't happen until the priorities document was finalized. One suggested venue for rolling out our priorities report would be the Agricultural Equipment & Technology Conference, which is usually held in Kansas City, MO or Louisville, KY each year. The 2004 conference was suggested as a target date.

Objective 2 from the NCR-197 plan was discussed. D. Vanderholm pointed out that at the 2000 committee meeting, there was committee agreement that the overall plan was very ambitious, and that the committee should concentrate on achieving Objective 1 (represented by the activities listed in the Innovation Funds grant). It was agreed that this was still an appropriate strategy.

The next meeting of the NCR-197 committee was suggested for November 6-7, 2002 at the Holiday Inn St. Louis Airport North. C. Schwab will confirm this date and location. It was also decided to have a conference call in May to facilitate better communications and actions. A date and time of May 29, 1:00 PM EST was set. B. Aherin agreed to facilitate the conference call through U. of Ill. telephone conferencing system.

Respectfully submitted,
Dennis J. Murphy for M. Purschwitz, Secretary, NCR-197.

Charles Schwab, NCR-197 Chair

Date

Dale Vanderholm, NCR-197 Administrative Advisor

Date