

# Advisory Committee on Agriculture Statistics

**SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS**  
**February 25-27, 2008**



**U.S. Department of Agriculture**  
**NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS SERVICE**

**SUMMARY**  
**Meeting of the Advisory Committee on Agriculture Statistics (ACAS)**  
**February 25-27, 2008**  
**Hyatt Regency Crystal City at Reagan National Airport**  
2799 Jefferson Davis Hwy  
Arlington, VA 22202  
**Attendees at Meeting**

**Members Present**

|                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|
| Mr. James M. Baise       | Mrs. Lucy C. Meyring                             |
| Mr. John G. Baugh        | Mrs. Doris E. Mold                               |
| Dr. Patricia T. Berglund | Dr. A. Gene Nelson                               |
| Mr. Terry L. Francl      | Mr. Charles E. O'Brien                           |
| Ms. Janice I. Gengenbach | Dr. Ronald L. Plain                              |
| Mr. R. Edmund Gomez      | Mr. James G. Robb                                |
| Dr. Barry K. Goodwin     | Mr. Kent G. Schescke                             |
| Mr. John J. Hays         | Dr. Mary Bohman (Attended for Kitty Smith)       |
| Mr. Elvin L. Hollon      | Mr. Harvey Monk (Attended for Thomas Mesenbourg) |

**Members Absent**

|                        |                      |
|------------------------|----------------------|
| Dr. Gary M. Adams      | Dr. Karen M. Klonsky |
| Mr. Brent W. Blauch    | Mr. William G. Lapp  |
| Mr. Carl W. Brothers   | Mr. Ira Silvergleit  |
| Mr. Peter T. Daniel    |                      |
| Mr. Douglas A. Huebsch |                      |

**NASS Personnel Participating:**

Dr. Gale Buchanan, Under Secretary of Research, Education, and Economics  
Joe Reilly, Committee Executive Director and Acting Administrator  
Carol House, Deputy Administrator for Programs and Products  
Bob Bass, Director of Census and Survey Division  
Chris Messer, Branch Chief of Census Planning Branch  
Marshall Dantzler, Deputy Administrator for Field Operations  
Hubert Hamer, Associate Deputy Administrator, Eastern Field Operations  
Mark Harris, Director of Research and Development Division  
Jack Nealon, Director of Information Technology Division  
Greg Preston, State Director of Indiana Field Office  
Jay Johnson, Assistant to the Administrator  
Marlo D. Johnson, Committee Secretary

**Special Guest:**

Jim Johnson, Chief of the Farm & Rural Business Branch, Economic Research Service (ERS)  
Linda Atkinson, Statistician, Economic Research Service (ERS)  
Noel Gollehon, Agricultural Economist, Economic Research Service (ERS)  
Julia Lane, National Science Foundation (NSF)  
Chet Bowie, Senior Vice President & Director, National Opinion Research Center (NORC)

**Public:**

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Jennifer H. Dennis, Assistant Professor,<br>Purdue University                          | Rebeckah Freeman Adcock, Director,<br>American Farm Bureau Federation |
| Dr. Marco A. Palma, Assistant Professor &<br>Extension Economist, Texas A&M University | Leonard Gianessi, Director Crop Protection,<br>Croplife Foundation    |
|  |   |
|  |   |

# Table Of Contents

| <b>Subject</b>   | <b>Page</b> |
|--|-------------|
| I. Introduction.....   | 5           |
| II. Welcome .....  | 5           |
| III. 2007 Recommendations and Overview .....                                 | 6           |
| IV. Supervisory Enumerators Advisory Council (SEAC) .....                    | 9           |
| V. Census Update .....   | 9           |
| VI. State of NASS .....  | 10          |
| VII. Update on Data Enclave.....   | 12          |
| VIII. USDA Data Center Consolidation .....                                   | 14          |
| IX. Status of Programs .....   | 16          |
| X. Farm and Ranch Irrigation Survey/Energy Survey.....                       | 19          |
| XI. Agricultural Resource Management Survey Subcommittee Working Group ..... | 20          |
| XII. County Estimates and Crop Insurance.....                                | 21          |
| XIII. New Chairperson .....  | 22          |
| XIV. Closing Remarks for the Advisory Committee.....                         | 22          |
| XV. Committee Recommendations.....   | 23          |
| Appendix I - Agenda.....   | 26          |

## Day One Summary-May 2, 2007

### I. Introduction

The meeting was called to order by Committee Chair, Lucy Meyring, on Monday, February 25, 2008, at 8:00 a.m. Committee Members and NASS staff were asked to introduce themselves. Lucy Meyring welcomed everyone to the meeting and then asked Under Secretary of Research, Education, and Economics (REE), Dr. Gale Buchanan, to provide an update on REE.

### II. Welcome

Dr. Buchanan started by welcoming the members to Louisville, KY. He recognized the newest members: Mr. James Baise, Mr. Elvin Hollon, Charles O'Brien, and Mr. Douglas Huebsch in his absence. Buchanan expressed to the committee how important their input is to guiding our statistical program and priorities. He gave a brief explanation of his background. Dr. Buchanan also discussed how NASS data have been used in developing the Administration's Farm Bill proposals. The Administration's proposal relies heavily on statistical data and has several implications for NASS. These include revenue-based counter-cyclical payments, bio-energy/bio-based products, specialty crop research, crop insurance supplemental coverage, and organic data needs.

The Farm Bill also has a Specialty Crop Initiative. In light of the growing importance of specialty crops, I have established an REE specialty crop working group among the four REE agencies. NASS is included at the table and will help to determine how the money under the Bill's Specialty Crop Initiative will be used, if funds become available. NASS data will also play an important role in determining revenue-based counter-cyclical payments proposed in the new Farm Bill.

Dr. Buchanan also mentioned NASS' Annual Statistical Programs:

- First, the Environmental and Chemical Use Surveys. NASS greatly scaled back these programs in 2007 due to funding. I have received many inquiries about having these programs re-instated. Unfortunately, the funding situation isn't likely to improve. The FY 2008 Omnibus Appropriations Bill mandated an across-the-board reduction of 0.7 percent impacting all USDA programs and activities. REE is committed to maintaining the quality of our statistics program within the means of our budget.
- Secondly, he discussed the potential changes to the Census follow-on surveys. The Farm and Ranch Irrigation Survey (FRIS) is being updated to evaluate current access to water, methods to reuse water, quantities of water used, and costs associated with various water delivery systems for all agriculture, not just for crop irrigation. As many of you are aware, today, water usage is a major challenge, not only for agriculture but for society in general and having this

type of data is critical to ensuring we can continue to meet the needs of people, agriculture, and the environment.

Another big challenge our Nation is confronting is meeting our growing energy needs in the face of rising oil prices and diminishing supplies of petroleum. Biofuels and other forms of renewable energy are one way we are working towards meeting that challenge. Two initiatives within NASS will provide the necessary data to determine key impacts on agriculture from the increased production of bio-energy in the U.S. The first is an annual survey of ethanol plants, while the second initiative will focus on collecting data on farm-generated energy.

Dr. Buchanan stated that there would not be a shortage of work for NASS as we struggle to meet the challenges our food and agricultural system faces in the years to come.

During the next day and a half, the members were asked to consider a wide range of topics including:

- status of programs;
- county estimates and crop insurance; and
- information technology consolidation and implications to data privacy.

We would also very much appreciate hearing your feedback on the NASS/ERS initiative to give researchers, outside of USDA, access to the Agricultural Resource Management Survey (ARMS). This data is a highly valued and unique resource which is vital to USDA's mission. Much of the information in ARMS is also useful to other researchers. NASS and ERS are working to make the information more accessible while maintaining a balance between data access and confidentiality.

Dr. Buchanan stated to the members, "You have your work cut out for you!" The members' input are crucial to ensure timely, accurate, and useful data remain a cornerstone of our mission area and the Department of Agriculture. We count on this Board to ensure that we are doing all we can to provide our stakeholders and customers timely, accurate, and useful data.

### **III. 2007 Recommendations and Overview**

Joe Reilly, Acting Administrator of NASS, reviewed the Advisory Committee's recommendations from 2006. He also discussed the purpose and responsibilities of the Advisory Committee. The purpose of the Committee is to advise the Secretary on the conduct of the periodic census and surveys of agriculture, other related surveys, and the types of agricultural information to obtain from respondents. The committee also prepares recommendations regarding the content of Agricultural reports. It also presents the views and needs for the data of major suppliers and users of Agriculture statistics. The duties of the Committee are solely advisory. Joe also discussed the mission of NASS, which is to provide timely, accurate, and useful statistics in service to U.S. agriculture.

NASS is responsible for administering the USDA's statistical estimating program and the 5-year Census of Agriculture; coordinating Federal/State agricultural statistics needs; conducting statistical research for other Federal/State or private organizations and other countries, and statistical research.

NASS also supplies statistics, such as:

- the statistics necessary to manage USDA programs;
- NASS statistics help to improve efficiency of these programs; and
- facilitate in the development of new programs.

NASS Does Not:

- set policy;
- regulate activities;
- permit influence;
- disclose individual reports; and
- favor any group above others.

2007 Recommendations and Responses:

- The Advisory Committee recommends release of records to the National Archive and Record Administration (NARA) with the 2012 Census, after the change to Title 7 is made. In 2006, the NASS Administrator was contacted by NARA with a proposal to work cooperatively in order to permanently preserve the contents of the Census of Agriculture questionnaires containing farm-level data on such information as expenses and income from all sources, labor expended, agricultural practices, size, and every item produced. Following the 75 year restriction, the contents of the questionnaires will be available for public access and use in preserving the story of American agriculture. Working in cooperation with NARA will require changes to Section 2276 of Title 7, the legal basis for the NASS Confidentiality Pledge. These changes will require thoughtful consideration to avoid any negative perception by Census of Agriculture respondents and NASS stakeholders.
  - *NASS has contacted NARA to discuss this issue. It will be determined if Title 7 does need to be changed to accomplish the recommendation. The signing of the new NASS Schedule of Records by the Archivist of the U.S. raises the urgency of this issue. The new NASS Schedule has a permanent disposition attached to the edited census records, which presents a legal conflict between Title 7 and the Archivist's authority. Therefore, NASS will bring this to the attention of the USDA lawyers, after the data collection period for the 2007 Census.*

- The Advisory Committee recommends conducting a pilot study of making the Agricultural Resource Management Survey (ARMS) micro data available through the National Institute of Standards and Technology and National Opinion Research Center (NIST-NORC) data enclave to a limited number of researchers (no more than 20) for a limited time period (no more than 2 years). Following the pilot study, NASS will report back to the Advisory Committee with an assessment of risks compared to the current system of making ARMS data available and an evaluation of benefits derived from the research conducted and what was learned in the process.
  - *The group met briefly at the Advisory Committee meeting in February and they also had a teleconference meeting. A follow-up Data User's meeting is planned for February 2009.*
  
- The Advisory Committee recommends having a formal “to do” list of new content requests of some sort that we can approve action on the 2012 Census. It was determined that the only farmer demographic that NASS can not identify is for beginning farmers. It is suggested the census question asking “years on present farm” be replaced with a question asking “year began farming.” The final state of the Census form at this time precludes that this issue being resolved for the 2007 Census. Therefore, it is recommended that a formal list for the 2012 Census of Agriculture be created. The first item placed on it should be replacing the census question on beginning of new farmers.
  - *This question will be reviewed by the Content Team. A question on “year began farming” was tested several censuses ago with poor results. Many operators recorded a childhood age in response to this question.*
  
- The Advisory Committee recommends supporting the Census Follow-on Survey Project Schedule. The time line recommends conducting the Farm and Ranch Irrigation Survey (FRIS); Energy and Organics survey in 2009; the Horticulture Census; and Fruits, Nuts, and Vineyard Survey will be conducted in 2010. Land and Economic Stability Survey (LESS) and Aquaculture Census will be conducted in 2011.
  - *Plans for the FRIS and organic follow-on surveys are underway. Questionnaire content for the FRIS has been finalized and final versions are being prepared at NPC. The anticipated sample size is 35, 000—25,000 for the general FRIS and 10,000 for the Horticulture component. NASS did not receive funding for the Energy survey. The Fruits, Nuts, and Vineyard Survey and the Horticulture Census is still on schedule for 2010.*



#### **IV. Supervisory Enumerators Advisory Council (SEAC)**

Marshall Dantzer, Deputy Administrator for Field Operations, discussed NASDA and how it relates to NASS. Good sound basic data is really the cornerstone of all NASS' work because without that we could not do our work nor produce the statistics we have. The mission of the Department is to provide leadership on food, agriculture, natural resources, rural development, and related issues, based on sound public policy, the best available science and efficient management.

NASS was dealing with the States' Departments of Agriculture and became involved in their national organization because of who the members are. NASS decided to develop a partnership with the National Association of States' Departments of Agriculture (NASDA). It's a cooperative venture. It began in the early '70s with some of the Midwestern states, and then it gradually grew. About 30 years ago, in the late '70s, the agreement included all states, of agriculture. It is one of the largest cooperative agreements in USDA. It's a cooperative agreement with NASDA to provide field and office enumerators to collect data for NASS. The division and responsibility is that they collect data and NASS provides the technical expertise, the training, and the materials for them to do the work. NASDA provides the people and human resources to get the job done and manage those people. Currently, NASDA has about 3,400 field and office enumerators and officers onboard.

What is NASDA? It is a nonprofit organization. NASDA was founded in 1915 and the Washington, DC, office was actually opened in 1968, and they have a small staff there. They also have a small group that actually works with Congress in developing policy on the farm bill and a lot of the other things which is separate from the part that administers our cooperative agreement. Rick Kirchhoff is the Chief Operating Officer.

The mission of NASDA is to represent the State Departments of Agriculture in development implementation and the communication of sound public policy programs which support and promote the American agriculture industry while protecting the consumers and the environment. NASS partnership with NASDA over the years is consistent and well documented. Even though NASDA are in place, we don't lose sight of why we collected the data and the importance of our role and service to American Agriculture because we feel that it's very important, and we continue to work to stress that.

#### **V. Census Update**

Bob Bass, Director of Census and Survey Division, discussed how NASS arrived at their mailing list for the 2007 Census. NASS mailed out approximately 3.19 million questionnaires to farms and ranches on December 28, 2007. He stated that the post office had the questionnaires out in 2-3 days because the tax booklets were not mailed the end of December as they were in the past. As of

February 25, 2008, NASS had checked in 1.59 million questionnaires. NASS was 21 days past the due date, which was February 4, 2008.

Bob discussed Electronic Data Reporting (EDR). This was the first time that we have allowed producers to report over the Web. We've done it in a lot of other surveys and we've gotten low response rates, but this is the first time that we've made the Census available over the Web. NASS had 74,000 questionnaires on February 25, 2008. NASS was hoping to get 2 percent which would be 63,000 or 64,000, so we're above our 2 percent. On February 4, NASS had 4,199 records completed, and that's the highest 1 day results that we've had.

NASS does capture the comments that are left in EDR by respondents. NASS was mailing out about 1.3 million follow-up postcard reminders. As of February 25, 2008, NASS had run about 500,000 records through the data capture process. The second follow-up mailing was due to go out the end of March. NASS is already thinking about the 2012 Census and learning from mistakes, as well as incorporating new ideas. NASS will publish the Census of Agriculture on February 4, 2009.

David Hackbarth, Director of the National Processing Center (NPC), gave a briefing on what to expect on our tour of NPC. Rita Schuler, Census Coordinator at NPC, swore us in before we were allowed to take our tour.

## **Day Two Summary-February 26, 2008**

### **VI. State of NASS**

Joseph Reilly, NASS Acting Administrator, began by welcoming the Advisory Committee members to Louisville, KY. He then proceeded by reviewing events for the end of FY 2007 and current events for 2008. NASS has had a lot of changes over the last year, probably most importantly is that our Administrator, Ron Bosecker, retired at the beginning of the year, surprised us all at one of our National meetings last year, so that's a big shock. I'm keeping the wheels going for a while. The job was posted. It closed in mid-February, and under Secretary Buchanan will be making a selection. NASS also had another Senior Leader retire. Steve Wyatt, who was the Director of Statistics Division and Executive Director of the Ag Statistics Board retired. Other key losses, Mr. Kent Hoover, Head of our Census Planning Branch. A lot of experience walked out the door in October; along with him, another person who worked with the census for a long time, Joe Miller, also retired. NASS lost a lot of census experience that came over with the Bureau of the Census when NASS was getting ready to mail out.

Al Drain who worked as NASS Small Farms Coordinator for the last several years has retired. He is currently serving as a temporary reemployed annuitant who's helping with minority farm work that NASS is trying to do in order to get minority farm operators counted on the Census. Joseph Prusacki is moving from Iowa into the Statistics Division. NASS also lost some senior

statisticians that worked in our Research Division over the last year. NASS had a lot of years of experience that left us and walked out the door to retirement, well earned retirement. Dr. Charles Perry and Mike Craig both retired at the end of the year. NASS has lost a lot of senior leadership, and years of experience over the last couple of months.

Chris Messer is coming in to replace Kent Hoover. NASS started out on a continuing resolution, which means that you can only basically spend at the same rate of expenditures for the previous year. Well, in 2007, we weren't doing the census. We were getting ready for it. NASS was waiting in October, November, and December to see if the continuing resolution was going to pass. Finally, it did pass so we did get our appropriations for this year, but it's not nearly enough to run a railroad when you're not sure if you have enough. We were sweating it out, right at the end, until the mail out.

Joe gave an update on the Census. He highlighted what NASS was doing with the 2002 Census of Agriculture. When NASS reviewed their under coverage or our under counting of the minority or disadvantaged farms that were out there, we missed and did not have on our list about 40 percent of the Black farm operators and about 40 percent of the Spanish operators. NASS was also missing many of the American Indian reservations across the country. NASS didn't go out and do an individual enumeration on the reservation; we counted the reservation as one farm operator.

NASS has worked for the last 5 years with all kinds of organizations across the country to try to get them on our mail list. NASS has added over 300,000 new potential farm operators on the mail list. NASS partnered with community-based organizations to set up what we called "Census Days". NASS picked counties across the country; set up a day and advertised as much as possible; "If you could come in to this location, we will have staff there to help you fill out your census forms." Basically, these locations are setup with staff to help farmers complete their Census forms.

The President has released the fiscal year 2009 budget. NASS had several new initiatives in there that we were excited about. NASS is looking at doing an energy survey of energy production and use on the farm, as a follow-up census study. NASS has also looked at doing an annual energy survey, of looking at the production and the type of commodities going into energy production. Both initiatives were included in the President's budget. The production of bio-energy in the country is getting a lot of attention. However, the bad news is they told us to find tradeoffs in our other areas to pay for these new programs.

NASS had an issue last year working with the Agricultural Marketing Service (AMS) on covering the nonfat dry milk price. NASS had the Office of Inspector General (OIG) review the nonfat dry milk and NASS visited the plants across the country that produced the dry, nonfat dry milk, and examined the previous year to certify that the data was correct for the previous 11-12 months. The OIG has requested that NASS go back for 5 years to see if there were any other reporting errors earlier.

Last year, NASS suspended their chemical use programs. Again, that was based on findings from the Advisory Committee several meetings ago. This was used as the basis to look at which programs NASS could go back and curtail if there were any budget problems. As of right now, unless NASS finds more money, we're still looking at having that program suspended. NASS is working very closely with the Risk Management Agency (RMA) on our county estimates program. The growth of the crop insurance program, especially the group risk policy segment of it where payments will be based on the yield that NASS puts out at the county level, has called a lot of attention to those numbers. We're working as much as possible to make sure we have good quality numbers at the county level. However, the payment is going to be based on an exact average yield that NASS puts out.

Dr. Buchanan mentioned the farm bill. There are several sections in the Farm Bill that have a major impact for NASS. NASS data is used to determine whether those counter-cyclical payments will be paid out. One of the programs they're looking at is coming up with a revenue-based payment per acre. NASS is looking at getting back to a very small county-level program. If that program gets passed for the Farm Bill, where they're looking at revenue per acre down to the county-level, they'll be looking for us to produce some numbers to support that program. Another item that was placed in the Farm Bill is for NASS to be able to collect and produce annual county cash rental rates.

There is some mention in the Farm Bill about the specialty of the block grant program, and again, NASS numbers on specialty crop productions are used as the basis to determine what those block grants will be. The Farm Bill included a program for organic data collection. There is \$5 million mentioned in the Farm Bill, but again, that's \$5 million coming to USDA to do that program. NASS is not sure how much of that \$5 million will come to them to be able to do their part of it. The Department is looking at reorganizing our mission area. Most of the reorganization is dealing with CSREES and series as far as a hierarchy that would be set up for reporting to the Under Secretary. Where they would have a national program leader over a particular research area that would both be in charge of the internal USDA research effort and the external land grant research efforts. They are looking at some changes primarily to ARS and CSREES agencies; not a lot is mentioned about NASS, in particular, as far as being affected, but we are in that mission area. It will change some of the hierarchy a little bit, but it will not change us or our role that much.

NASS has an international program where we go out and help countries across the world trying to develop their statistical program. We are more and more in a world market, and when we come out with the national number, we also have Jerry Bange, who comes out with the world outlook as well. A lot more countries are coming in as players into the world market. NASS has three new areas that they have agreements with this year: Argentina, Madagascar, and Vietnam.

## **VII. Update on Data Enclave**

Julia Lane and Chet Bowie are representatives from the National Opinion Research Center (NORC). During last year's meeting, Julia presented a proposal which would expand access to

ARMS data to other offices and other universities. Based on that proposal and recommendations by the Advisory Committee members, NASS set up a security system and protocol. NASS selected a pilot that would accommodate about six individuals working with different universities across the country.

NASS had three basic goals, in terms of setting up the enclave. One was to increase the value added of the data collection. In other words, information that is being collected and there's massive amounts of federal money that are put into this and trying to get some more value added with really limited increase in costs, and to get deeper into key issues, rather than just collecting the tables, to try to look at the marginal impact of different changes, the marginal relationships between variables; and then of course, to look at topics that might be of deeper interest to the broader community. Therefore, NASS and ERS have done a terrific job of providing information that the broader communities ask for very much in response to what the advisory committee puts together, but there are other topics that individual researchers or the broader community might want to take a look at, and many of those are going to get pushed down to the State and Local level. What is generally available is at the national level; and by providing access to micro data, you could get down to issues of more than just your State and Local. Of course, the over arching thing, otherwise they go to jail, is to protect the confidentiality of the respondents.

Essentially, the enclave is set up at NORC at the University of Chicago. We already collect a lot of micro data from federal agencies, and that is one of the reasons why USDA felt very comfortable with our security procedures. We collect data, for example micro data, from the Survey of Consumer Finances. The data is based on an IRS frame of some of the wealthiest people in the country. Therefore, NORC goes through an IRS audit. Actually, NORC goes through audits with a lot of federal agencies.

The enclave is set up by the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), which is kind of the gold standard for IT security within the Federal Government. NORC always goes through an IT inspection. The data are under NASS supervision and control. NORC does not just rely on the physical security. The data does have the names and addresses of the owners of the farms taken off, so no one can see what the farms. Also there is some statistical blurring of the data, so that it makes it even harder to see inside the enclave. It is very difficult to re-identify individual farmers.

NORC also trains the researchers. Most researchers are presumably high quality individuals, at academic institutions, but not always fully up to speed on the confidentiality requirements and legal restrictions associated with accessing confidential micro data. Time is spent on educating the researchers on confidentiality rules before they are actually on-line working on the enclave.

NASS is very clear about what the researchers work on; the only researchers who are allowed to access the data are those who were authorized and identified as being trusted. Once NORC received the go ahead to do a pilot basis; NASS and ERS together identified eight high quality researchers. Both Agencies wanted to find people with wide ranging interests and geographically diverse. Training was in Washington, DC, in September 2007. The group discussed

confidentiality and data management. The researchers were trained and then the research process began.

How does the data lab compare to the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA)? With a FOIA request, people can request access to information, but that information is protected by law from Freedom of Information Requests. When someone submits a FOIA request to see ARMS data or any micro level data, NASS says no, across the board. However, under our confidentiality and the laws that protect this data from confidentiality, it says we cannot release it in any form to the public that's identifiable. Furthermore, it also talks about in the E-Government Act of 2002, I believe, CIPSEA, which is one of the laws that we work under, it does talk about the ability to share micro level data for research purposes, approved research purposes, and that which is appropriate under the confidentiality law. In other words, NASS has to have, and we do have a set of criteria in order to release data somebody has to be an academic. Other organizations cannot get access to micro data. They must have an approved project, which is read by Joe. NASS reads the actual project itself and makes sure that it is appropriate and good for agriculture as a whole. NASS is not taking a stance on a critical issue. However, it does mean that it is an issue that needs to be addressed for agriculture. NASS has denied access to researchers who haven't followed the rules.

## **VIII. USDA Data Center Consolidation**

Jack Nealon, Director of the Information Technology Division (ITD) at NASS, discussed a new USDA directive or mandate and how it can impact NASS in the future. He wanted to get the thoughts and advice from the Advisory Committee on the mandate.

The Department of Agriculture's Chief Information Officer, who was appointed in July 2007, sent a memorandum to all agencies in January 2008 directing them to migrate their applications and hardware out of their agencies to one of the USDA data centers or facilities.

The first reason given in the memorandum is that the EBoard in USDA approved the migration initiative. The EBoard consists of the following senior-level policy executives: the Deputy Secretary, the seven Under Secretaries, the two Assistant Secretaries, the Chief Information Officer, the Chief Financial Officer, the General Counsel, and the Director of the Office of Budget and Program Analysis. The EBoard agreed that critical information technology needed to be moved into the data centers.

The second reason given in the memorandum is that OMB had a directive from 1995 (OMB Bulletin No. 96-02) about consolidating data centers, but this directive was dealing with big data centers and not concerned with file and print servers and local area networks as used at ERS or NASS. This OMB directive actually expired about 10 years ago.

NASS wanted the Advisory Committee to keep in mind that if the USDA data center directive is approved for NASS, our applications and hardware that contain market-sensitive information would be housed outside of NASS, possibly in a private-sector facility, and that NASS would no

longer administer or control the market sensitive servers. This would really affect the way NASS has operated historically and this change in operation could result in some serious unintended consequences.

For example, if farmers, ranchers, and other data users believe or perceive that this market-sensitive information can now potentially be accessed by someone outside of NASS, then this would have consequences for NASS' survey program. If the farm operators who NASS has worked so hard to build trust with for over a century start saying: "So my data is combined with other agencies and you don't control the equipment it's on," then this could potentially have an impact on our survey response rates, which then has an impact on the quality of our data, which then can impact the stability of the markets. Therefore, NASS is really worried about the possible consequences of not being able to say to farmers and ranchers any more that we control the survey process from beginning to end.

Jack Nealon shared with the Advisory Committee five external documents or external reasons that support NASS not migrating to a shared Data Center. The first centers around the idea of being an independent and separate federal statistical agency. He shared a book with the committee that was published in 2005 called the Principles and Practices for a Federal Statistical Agency. The book, prepared by the Committee on National Statistics, states that independence of a Federal Statistical Agency is necessary for agencies to have credibility as being unbiased in being able to carry out their mission. The book also mentions how an agency without independence would not have the trust from the data users or the credibility of data providers.

The next two references that Jack shared were from OMB (OMB Statistical Policy Directives No. 3 and 4). One of the OMB directives emphasizes the importance of Federal statistical agencies and the need for statistical agencies to be free of any perceived or actual intervention by other organizations. OMB stated that any loss of trust could lessen the respondent cooperation, decrease the quality of the products, and foster uncertainty about the validity of the measures produced by surveys. The directive also mentions that the statistical agency is solely responsible for deciding on the collection, quality, and how things are disseminated. The other OMB directive deals with the compilation and release of principal economic indicators. It clearly empowers statistical agency heads; and not only empowers them, but it is their responsibility to decide what the security arrangements are and impose whatever conditions are necessary on who gets access or not.

The fourth external reference referred to the E-Government Act of 2002, which includes some discussion about IT consolidation. When the E-Government Act was published, the Committee on National Statistics wrote to the Director of OMB and threw up a flag right away saying, "Let's be careful here; there's some possible serious consequences." Furthermore, they discussed their concern about consolidating IT resources from a federal statistical agency with other agencies in the Department, and that an agency's effectiveness requires credibility among data users and trust among data provider, which requires a strong position of independence for the statistical agency.

Finally, Jack shared with the committee information demonstrating that other major federal statistical agencies, such as Census Bureau, Bureau of Labor Statistics, and Energy Information

Agency, have separate IT operations from the rest of the Department to maintain their statistical independence.

Jack discussed what NASS has on their servers to support our survey and census programs. NASS maintains complete control at NASS of any server that contains market-sensitive information. Even though NASS stores some farmer-level data electronically at a USDA Data Center now, NASS controls the servers and protects them with additional security measures, such as a firewall. NASS is the only one who can administer these servers and monitors the servers to ensure no one is inappropriately accessing them. NASS also has a 24 by 7 intrusion detection system to make sure no one is entering their network.

Another unique characteristic about NASS that is very impressive is NASS publishes over 500 statistical reports annually, on time. For example, NASS has not had a single delay in publishing a report the past two years. If the servers containing market-sensitive information are located off-site at a USDA Data Center, as proposed, this could jeopardize NASS' ability to publish over 500 reports each year on time.

In closing, NASS has a great culture for protecting the confidentiality and security of the survey and census data collected. NASS has not had any disclosures of individual data for over a century. NASS hasn't leaked any agricultural statistics since the 1905 cotton incident, and NASS has an organizational culture and climate that stresses security every day and everyone's job. One reason NASS brought this issue to the Advisory Committee members is because NASS thinks it is something that is worth fighting against from a business perspective. The way NASS has done business as an independent statistical organization has built the trust and credibility with the agricultural community. This could be harmed if NASS no longer can state that we solely protect the confidentiality and security of data from farmers and ranchers.

The Advisory Committee voted to support the Enterprise Data Center exemption request submitted to the Department, exempting USDA statistical agencies from the Department's Data Center Consolidation initiative. NASS should continue to maintain control of the applications and hardware containing "market-sensitive information" and; therefore, be exempt from the Department's Data Center Consolidation initiative.

## **IX. Status of Programs**

Carol House, Deputy Administrator Programs and Products, discussed adjustments NASS has made for budget shortfalls. One of the problems that NASS has experience for the last 2 years is that they do not hear from Congress, in terms of a budget, until after the first of the year, and the fiscal year begins October 1. NASS is not anticipating having very much additional monies coming for Agricultural Statistics.

NASS has a partial hiring freeze on. NASS has identified a lot of positions that they are not going to fill. At first, it was planned that the Field Offices would bring on new people to assist the



Census of Agriculture, but there will not be as much with that. NASS has cut back on travel and equipment. NASS looked at efficiencies first to try to cut and balance this budget. Now, NASS is making some program cuts. When NASS has to make a program cut, they are trying to actually cut a program out, either the scope of it, or the entire program, or something like that, and not hide the cuts as quality cuts inside of programming. NASS takes priorities into consideration when cutting programs. For instance, anything that is a principle economic indicator of the U.S., they try not to cut because it's that important, in terms of programs. Keep in mind that eliminating the principle economic indicator would take something more than just an act of NASS. NASS is also looking to see if any of their statistics are required by law in terms of any other program delivery at USDA.

The Chemical Use program endured reductions in FY 07. NASS had hopes of being able to reinstate the program at a fuller level in FY 08 and/or FY 09, but they clearly do not have the funding to do it. Furthermore, they don't have the funding to do it in 2009. The Chemical Use program involves collecting chemical usage data with fertilizer and pesticides on various crops. At its height, we were collecting this information on major crops every year: on livestock at some repeated time; on fruits and vegetables, alternating years with fruits, often alternating years with vegetables; and we also have done post-harvest applications, not just during growing season. However; at this time, there will be some chemical usage information collected on a very periodic basis. It will be part of and always will be part of the ARMS survey. It will be conducted every 4 or 5 years when the cost of production comes around. This is a very serious hit to NASS and the chemical usage industry. At this time, NASS is looking at collecting data on wheat in FY 09, corn in FY 2010, soybeans in FY 2011, and cotton in FY 2013. This type of a rotation is in our plans at this point, unless we figure out how to fund this differently, either by more money or by a different prioritization of the programs that we have going on.

NASS has a quarterly labor survey January, April, July, and October. In 2007, we hit this continuing resolution problem and we cut out the January labor survey. NASS was able to reinstate the last three quarters of that survey. The most important things Nationally for principle economic indicators of the use of this data is the annual wage rate that's conducted at the end of the year; and last year; our research people modeled the January numbers. The Research Division had many years of January labor data and they knew the relation. They had data of how January relates to the other four quarters, and they actually did a tremendous job of modeling that. However, NASS did not release the January numbers, but used those model numbers to incorporate with the other four quarters, so that we ended up with an annual wage rate. NASS is very content with the data.

NASS has been getting some money from Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC) in order to improve their price estimates, pulse crop production, yield, acres, and production. There is a variety of things that we have been doing with this CCC money. NASS recently found out that the Department will need to use the Section 11 CCC money on other projects. Therefore, NASS had to take a cut in terms of how much money they will receive from the Section 11 CCC money. NASS hasn't made a final decision about which program cuts they're going to make due to the cut. It is very likely in the post crop area that we're going to have to take some cuts in terms of the

statistics that we put out, either the frequency, or the crops that are involved. NASS is still finalizing that, but just wanted to give a heads up.

The annual horticulture survey is extremely important. Horticulture nurseries all of that area is one of the biggest growing areas of agriculture and obviously in some States that is extremely important, like in California and Florida. NASS had cut back the annual horticulture program to 15 States, maintaining again the sample sizes in the States that we were publishing, but cut back the scope of the program. This year, we have continued with that same horticulture level, and NASS does not see being able to reinstate more States at this time.

NASS does a dairy product price survey and that data is turned over to Agricultural Marketing Service (AMS). They use the estimates in terms of administering the milk program. The price for dairy products helps to set the floor for the market of what fluid milk will actually be sold for.

There was one firm that was identified to be misreporting, because they did not understand the criteria. There are very specific criteria on each of the products, because when you're trying to get a price for cheese, you want it to be a specific type of cheese, with certain; otherwise, the price doesn't make sense. NASS was able to work with the plant and get them to revise the numbers. This was a major problem, and it only goes to show that a few cents can make millions of dollars in terms of actually what's going on in the marketplace. NASS asked all of the reporters, the firms reporting nonfat dry milk, to go back over a year to review what they had sent to us and to make any changes. This turned out to be an isolated event. The end result was estimated that it could have been as much as \$50 million, in terms of price and the changing price of what fluid milk would have sold for to milk producers over that year, and that is a lot of money.

Carol worked with the Inspector General (IG), and she informed the Inspector General's Office that this was a confidential survey, and she would not release the name of the firm that had misreported. The misreported firm did identify themselves to IG. The IG Office mentions the name of the firm in their report. The IG Office did determine that they felt that the firm had made a mistake in their reporting, that it wasn't deliberate, and that it was a misreporting error on a form. IG had five recommendations for NASS to improve this situation in the future.

Last year, NASS did an external review of two of their major programs. One was the Census of Agriculture, and this was reviewed by a committee under the umbrella of CFARE and the other was a review of the ARMS program. This was done in conjunction with, or in partnership with ERS, and we also asked the National Science Foundation to do a review. The results from both reviews are on the NASS Web site. They are full of recommendations for both of these programs. They consider both of the programs very important and the recommendations suggest how NASS can do a better job.

Carol shared the single biggest recommendation on both sides, which is that NASS needs to develop a larger research program that will look at issues, programs, and how they can collect data effectively, so that it will answer a lot of the methodological changes. NASS is suggesting doubling the size of our current research program.

Carol also touched on county estimates and the relationship with crop insurance. NASS county estimates program was developed with state funding and for purposes of really dividing the county, the State, and where the yields are higher. Carol stated that our county estimates system is something that was fit for use or high quality in the past, but now that crop insurance is based off of that, Carol thinks that the quality needs to go up, in order for it to be fit for use.

## **X. Farm and Ranch Irrigation Survey/Energy Survey**

Bob Bass, Director of the Census and Survey Division, discussed collecting the data for the 2012 Census. NASS is committed to the Census and keeping the regular schedule. NASS will have all the proper tools; there will be a regular survey. The Farm and Ranch Irrigation Survey (FRIS) is a survey that NASS has done on a regular basis and for a number of years. The FRIS will be conducted in 2009. It's always done in the year following the data collection of the Census. The FRIS is the population of ranchers and all of those that indicated they irrigated any acreage. This becomes our population of interest, and we select a sample of those farms and conduct a FRIS. Due to inquiries from industries, the FRIS is going to be all irrigating operations, as defined by the census. Also, NASS includes the horticultural operations as a Version II questionnaire for the project. NASS will take a sample of both. The FRIS will include these sections.

- normal methods of water distribution
- water use from the survey
- wells and pumping capacity
- mechanics of actually finding water
- practices that are used
- water reuse and water security

The FRIS will be mailed in late January 12, 2009. The due date will be February 17, 2009. The second mailing will be March 2, 2009 and phone follow-up is April 6, 2009. This survey is a Census follow-up and is required by law.

NASS wanted to go forward with a data series on energy production on farms in the ethanol arena. Because there is a lot of data available, NASS moved forward to request funds for the energy program. However, NASS was given a line-item in two different areas: one in the Census and one in the agricultural estimates.

The energy program has three parts. The first part is on-farm energy production in the agricultural practices section of the Census of Agriculture questionnaire, and it contains a question—"Do you produce energy on the farm?," (whether it be methane digested, thermal, solar, geothermal, whatever the case may be.)

Part two includes the biomass crop such as corn, soybeans, or any kind of other biomass type product that can be produced. NASS will get production of that and also storage before it goes into the pipeline as an energy producing commodity.

Part three includes all farm storage. This section will ask basic questions about storage, energy production input, and the final disposition of storage. Once again, the FRIS data collection will start in January 2009 and released in the spring of 2010. The aquaculture survey data collection will take place in 2011. It is conducted every 5 years. The last one was done in 2006 for 2005.

## **XI. Agricultural Resource Management Survey Subcommittee Working Group**

Bob Bass, Director of Census Survey Division, discussed the review that the National Academies of Science made about our ARMS project. Bob highlighted one of the recommendations from the publication. It reads as follows: “The NASS Advisory Committee on Agricultural Statistics should expand its scope to include an annual review of ARMS—recommendation number 3.2,” and NASS is certainly in favor of that.”

Bob and Mary Bohman inquired to see if there was interest on the committee in order to form a subgroup or subcommittee. They would begin by having teleconference meetings and using email so they could start to work through some of the ARMS issues. Then at the next annual Advisory Committee meeting, they could have a full-scale report ready and involve the entire committee. Another possibility would be a 1 day data user meeting that would include outsiders to come and interact with the committee members and bring up a whole lot of issues associated with the ARMS program.

Mary Bowman, Director of Resource and Rural Economics Division (ERS), reiterated how thorough the review of the whole ARMS program was and that it was supported jointly by NASS and ERS. The review covered everything from the value of the data, who are the users, and what are they looking for. Mary highly supported the report and its findings. For instance, the report found tremendous value in the data and that it is a unique source of information that is out there on American farms and American agriculture. They raised issues about continuing that relevance, and it is believed that is where the recommendation to possibly involve the NASS Advisory Board came from. They also mentioned a lot of areas to shore up the statistical foundations, and it was mentioned that research is a big part of the recommendations of both this review and the Census review. Therefore, there are a lot of recommendations in the report about strengthening research.

Bob and Mary met with a group of Advisory Committee members later in the day to discuss how we might move forward, in what ways could the committee provide advice, and where does this fit in? The interested committee members did meet and had a successful first meeting.

## **XII. County Estimates and Crop Insurance**

Joe Prusacki, Director of Statistic Division, gave a little bit of history on the county estimates program, the uses of county estimates, our collaboration with Risk Management Agency (RMA), and changes in our county estimates. Joe cited the NASS mission: “To provide timely, accurate, and useful statistics and the keyword is service to U.S. Agriculture.”

The County Estimates Development Team was established in 2004, with the task of gaining efficiencies and reduce respondent burden. Also to ensure county estimates are consistent, defensible, and fit for use. Joe explained how the process works in the Iowa Field Office. For instance: The questionnaires are mailed out in the fall when 90 percent of the fall harvested crops are harvested. This is determined by NASS weekly crop progress reports. Between county estimates and crop progress, those are two very highly requested items, but from that NASS knows roughly 90 percent of the crops are harvested. The goal is to get 30-plus responses per county, which is the minimum.

NASS does not always use just the county estimate survey. They also use the December Agriculture Survey. NASS is able to obtain the end of the year production from the December Agricultural Survey. NASS is also able to utilize FSA’s certified planted area to help with the county estimates. The States in the upper Midwest have the cropland data layer, which uses satellite imagery to obtain information about planted areas. These different options help to strengthen NASS county estimates. During estimates review, Iowa will start with the U.S. level first, and then State-level acreage yield and production, then district-level acreage yield and production, and finally county acreage yield and production.

Minimum county coverage means NASS is going to establish a standard way of doing county estimates. If NASS does not get a certain amount of reports or a certain percentage of the acreage reported, NASS will not publish an estimate. If NASS is unable to publish a county estimate, RMA cannot issue a Group Risk Plan (GRP) or Group Risk Income Protection Plan (GRIPP) policy in that county.

NASS will have a new analysis and summary system for county estimates, and we are going to have a uniform and consistent release date across all States. All plans have to be in place by March 15. Then producers will be able to sit down with their crop insurance agent to discuss the best policy for their level of coverage.

NASS and RMA are continuing to work together to strengthen our county estimates systems. RMA has stated that if NASS consistently see that they cannot support a county estimate in a particular State for hay, corn, or whatever crop it happens to be because of not getting the accuracy that NASS need in that area, then RMA will quit writing policies for that area.

### **XIII. New Chairperson**

The nomination committee nominated Doris Mold to serve as Chairperson for the Advisory Committee on Agriculture Statistics, beginning with preparation for the 2008 meeting. Doris Mold accepted the nomination and was approved by attending members.

### **XIV. Closing Remarks for the Advisory Committee**

Joe Reilly announced that the next meeting is tentatively scheduled for February 2009, and it will be held in Washington, D.C. The meeting was adjourned.

## **XV. Committee Recommendations**

1. The Advisory Committee supports the Enterprise Data Center waiver request, exempting USDA statistical agencies from the Department's Data Center Consolidation initiative. NASS should continue to maintain control of the applications and hardware containing "market-sensitive information;" and therefore, be exempt from the Department's Data Center Consolidation initiative. According to the document, Principles and Practices for a Federal Statistical Agency (2005), a widely acknowledged position of independence is necessary for a statistical agency, like NASS, to have credibility and to carry out its function to provide an unbiased flow of useful, high quality information. Without the credibility that comes from a strong degree of independence, data users may lose trust in the accuracy and objectivity of the Agency's data, and data providers may become less willing to cooperate with Agency requests.
2. The Advisory Committee recommends that NASS create a user forum Web site, as soon as it is feasible, that centers on its major products. This would provide customers and producers a way of creating dialogue on NASS programs and products.
3. The Advisory Committee recommends that USDA determine a way to find funds to reinstate the Chemical Use Program by no later than 2009.
4. The Advisory Committee would like for NASS to continue providing access to ARMS data through National Opinion Research Center (NORC) data enclave. New participants will be accepted under the existing security, training, and project approval procedures with the addition of meeting with NASS State Directors to initiate project planning. Progress will be reported at the 2009 Advisory Board meeting.
5. The Advisory Committee recommends supporting the 2007 Census follow-on programs as presented.
6. The Advisory Committee would like to reverse their recommendation concerning releasing records to the National Archive and Record Administration (NARA) beginning with the 2012 Census, after the change to Title 7 is made. The Advisory Committee would like to recommend that NASS not release Census of Agriculture data to NARA. NASS promotes confidentiality, and the Advisory Committee feels that NASS should stand behind their word. The Committee also feels that response rates will be affected if the producers find out that their data will be released in 75 years starting with the 2012 Census.

## **Public Comments from the Advisory Committee on Agricultural Statistics Meeting**

### **Dr. Marco A. Palma–Texas Cooperative Extension**

USDA-NASS survey programs on nursery and greenhouse crops are critically important for industry managers, allied professionals and university-based researchers.

More frequent reporting is needed for specific horticultural crops, now provided only every 10 years in the Census of Horticultural Specialties.

Some important ornamental plant commodities, such as turfgrass sod, are not covered by annual surveys and are only minimally covered in the Census of Agriculture with information on production area.

### **Dr. Jennifer H. Dennis–Purdue University**

The nursery and floricultural industries are not fairly represented on the NASS Advisory Council. The current Council membership is heavily weighed and biased toward traditional commodity and program crops and livestock producers. Only 1 representative out of the 25 members–The Society of American Florists (SAF) represents the floriculture sector. We do not feel that this representation necessarily provides a comprehensive view of all nursery and greenhouse crops. We encourage the addition of representatives from the nursery crop producer community to provide broader representation and input from these agricultural crop producers.

### **Rebeckah F. Adcock–American Farm Bureau Federation Leonard Gianessi–Crop Life Foundation**

We did mention in our report that support for the current program was “soft.” USDA has misinterpreted what we meant by that statement. We meant that the current surveys are taken for granted. Users are not demanding more and have been quietly going about their business of using the NASS surveys for the past 17 years. No one is jumping up and down calling attention to the program.

Let me remind USDA that the NASS Agchem Survey Program is the only source of publicly available pesticide use survey for the Nation. Only one State, California, has a set of full use reports. The NASS program provides some usage data for 25-30 States; but more importantly, the NASS surveys cover 80-90 percent of the acreage in the U.S. for the crops in the survey. The NASS data are authoritative for all of the major crops grown in the U.S.



In my letter to the Undersecretary, I pointed out the real danger in eliminating the NASS AgChem Survey Program by reminding him of the reason it was started in the first place. In the late 1980's, there were a series of public scares regarding the safety of pesticides which were fueled by the lack of pesticide use data. The National Academy of Sciences released a report on pesticides in the diet. In their calculations, they assumed that all pesticides are used on 100 percent of the acres of crops with registered uses. This assumption grossly overestimated risks; however, the NASS stated that there were no actual usage data to refine these assumptions.

Without the NASS data, there are only proprietary sources of data of uncertain accuracy and completeness which cannot be released publicly. Thus, there would be no more transparency for regulation and no chance for the agricultural community to review the assessments for accuracy. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) may have to resort to simply assuming that 100 percent of the crops are treated with all registered pesticides which would greatly overestimate risks and jeopardize the continued registration of pesticides important to U.S. growers.

## Appendix I - Agenda

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE STATISTICS  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS SERVICE

Marriott–Louisville Downtown  
280 W. Jefferson Street  
Louisville, Kentucky 40202  
February 24–27, 2008

### Monday, February 25

| <b><u>Time</u></b> | <b><u>Topic/Activity</u></b>            | <b><u>Discussion Leader</u></b>   |
|--------------------|---|---|
| 8:00 a.m.          | Call to Order                           | Lucy Meyring,<br>Committee Chair  |
| 8:05 a.m.          | Welcome                                 | Dr. Gale Buchanan,<br>Under Secretary, Research,<br>Education, and Economics  |
| 8:15 a.m.          | Introductions and Overview              | Lucy Meyring  |
| 8:30 a.m.          | 2007 Recommendations and Overview       | Joe Reilly, Acting Administrator<br>and Committee Executive Director  |
| 9:00 a.m.          | Discussion                              | Lucy Meyring  |
| 9:15 a.m.          | Break                                   |   |
| 9:30 a.m.          | Supervisory Enumerator Advisory Council | Marshall Dantzler and Hubert<br>Hamer, Field Operations (DAFO)  |
| 10:15 a.m.         | Discussion                              | Lucy Meyring  |
| 10:30 a.m.         | Census Update                           | Bob Bass, Director of Census<br>Survey Division   |
| 10:45 a.m.         | National Processing Center              | David Hackbarth, Director<br>National Processing Center (NPC)<br>and Bob Bass and Chris Messer of<br>the Census and Survey Division |

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE STATISTICS  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS SERVICE

Marriott–Louisville Downtown  
280 W. Jefferson Street  
Louisville, Kentucky 40202  
February 24–27, 2008

**Monday, February 25**  
(Continued)

|            |  |  |
|------------|--|--|
| 11:00 a.m. | National Processing Center–Swearing In | Rita Schuler, Census<br>Coordinator at NPC |
| 11:45 a.m. | Lunch                                  | Hotel                                      |
| 1:00 p.m.  | Tour of National Processing Center     | Jeffersonville, IN                         |

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE STATISTICS  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS SERVICE

Marriott–Louisville Downtown  
280 W. Jefferson Street  
Louisville, Kentucky 40202  
February 24–27, 2008

**Tuesday, February 26**

|            |  |   |
|------------|--|---|
| 8:00 a.m.  | Call to Order and Overview of Day 1            | Lucy Meyring  |
| 8:10 a.m.  | <i>'State of NASS'</i>                         | Joe Reilly,<br>Acting Administrator                                   |
| 8:40 a.m.  | Update on Data Enclave                         | Julia Lane, National Science<br>Foundation (NSF)                      |
| 9:10 a.m.  | Discussion                                     | Lucy Meyring  |
| 9:30 a.m.  | Break  |   |
| 9:45 a.m.  | USDA Data Center Consolidation                 | Jack Nealon, Director of<br>Information Technology<br>Division (ITD)  |
| 10:15 a.m. | Status of Programs                             | Carol House, Chairperson of<br>Agricultural Statistics Board<br>(ASB) |
| 11:00 a.m. | Discussion                                     | Lucy Meyring  |
| 11:15 a.m. | Farm and Ranch Irrigation Survey/Energy Survey | Bob Bass, Director of<br>Census and Survey Division<br>(CSD)          |
| 11:45 a.m. | Lunch  |   |

ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE STATISTICS  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE  
NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS SERVICE

Marriott – Louisville Downtown  
280 W. Jefferson Street  
Louisville, Kentucky 40202  
February 24–27, 2008

**Tuesday, February 26**  
(Continued)

|           |   |  |
|-----------|---|--|
| 1:00 p.m. | Discussion  | Lucy Meyring                                     |
| 1:15 p.m. | Agricultural Resource Management Survey<br>Subcommittee Working Group | Bob Bass   |
| 1:30 p.m. | County Estimates and Crop Insurance                                   | Joe Prusacki, Director of<br>Statistics Division |
| 2:15 p.m. | Break   |  |
| 2:30 p.m. | Public Comments   |  |
| 3:30 p.m. | Committee Requested Topics and Recommendations                        | Lucy Meyring                                     |
| 4:00 p.m. | Discussion and Recommendations  | Lucy Meyring                                     |
| 4:30 p.m. | Present Recommendations   | Lucy Meyring                                     |
| 5:00 p.m. | Wrap Up   |  |