



# UNIVERSITY of NEW HAMPSHIRE

**USDA Listening Session on the 2007 Farm Bill  
Manchester, New Hampshire  
October 25, 2005**

**Comments by William Trumble  
Dean, College of Life Sciences and Agriculture  
Director, NH Agricultural Experiment Station**

Secretary Dorr, good morning and welcome to New Hampshire. Thank you for your interest in stakeholder views and input for the 2007 Farm Bill. I am Bill Trumble, Dean of the College of Life Sciences and Agriculture at the University of New Hampshire and Director of the NH Agricultural Experiment Station. I would like to address the question "How should agricultural product development, marketing and research-related issues be addressed in the next farm bill?", and I will restrict my comments to "research-related issues".

Agriculture, even in its broadest sense, is different in New England and particularly in New Hampshire than in the South, West or North Central regions of the country. Our agricultural efforts are, for the most part, smaller scale, focused on value-added products and niche markets, and changing at a greater rate than other areas. The number of farms in New Hampshire is once again growing larger each year, but the new farms are not the same as those of 50 years ago. Agriculture that is new, or changing, or innovative, or responding to crisis in New Hampshire has long looked to the Land Grant university system to help provide new research, information, and solutions for problems faced in our area. It is critical that new technologies, information, and education continue to be provided to assist and support our agricultural community.

The authority for the research and education partnership between the federal government (USDA) and the land grant universities is through the Farm Bill. Foundation funding (often called *Formula Funds*) including Hatch, McIntire-Stennis, Animal Health, Smith-Lever, and Evans-Allen support, has contributed in a massive way to creating safe and reliable food and fiber, allowing this country to be second in this area to no one.

This year, as you know, the federal budget proposed by President Bush recommended the elimination of Hatch and McIntire-Stennis funding over a two-year period. While universities often ask farmers and the industry to speak for us, with their considerable influence, today I have come before you to explain directly what would be saved and what would be lost by changing this base funding. Should Hatch and McIntire-Stennis funds be eliminated, and the state remove its matching funds, the College of Life Sciences and Agriculture would 1) lose one quarter of its current faculty, 2) lose complete support for 35 graduate students in the college, 3) close all its farm properties (dairy program, equine program, etc.) and eliminate all undergraduate "hands on" agricultural classes, 4) no longer be able to fund over 85 research projects supported through

**COLLEGE OF LIFE SCIENCES AND AGRICULTURE**

Office of the Dean

Taylor Hall 59 College Road Durham, New Hampshire 03824-3587 603-862-1450 603-862-4486 fax

the NH Agricultural Experiment Station, and 5) no longer be able to rapidly respond to new agricultural threats to the region. What the government would save would not equal the cost of one waterfront home at Squam Lake, NH or Rye, NH. This example is to show the magnitude of value that is generated through base funding to the University of New Hampshire as a land grant university. Federal dollars are leveraged at the University of New Hampshire to bring in over seven dollars for every dollar provided by the government. I suggest that what would be lost on the elimination of these funds would be great (you would multiply the loss for larger land grant universities), while what would be saved would be small.

Please let me note that base funding to support infrastructure, such as farms, cannot be replaced by competitive funding or even regional funding. Should just one funding cycle result in a non-funded grant application, people and farms would be lost, facilities closed, and the probability of reopening them would indeed be very low.

The United States has benefited greatly from the Land Grant partnership. A successful formula does not seem to be one that needs to be modified. Thank you.