

Table of Contents

Transmittal Letter (Milan Rewerts).....	2
Plan of Work.:	
Realities of Colorado Programming for the 21 st Century.....	3
Integration Across County and State Lines.....	8
Stakeholder Input.....	9
Diversity Infusion & Equal Employment Opportunity Reporting.....	10
Planned Programs:	
Goal I.....	11
Goal II.....	14
Goal III.....	18
Goal IV.....	21
Goal V.....	27
Merit Review Process.....	33
Documentation of Impacts and Reporting Plans.....	34
Summary Data on Multi-State and Integrated Research and Extension Activities.....	35

Appendices:

- A. State/Regional POW Titles
- B. Multi-State Activities
- C. Advisory Committee Members and POW Interest
- D. Commitment to Diversity: A Strategic Plan and Diversity Action Plan
- E. Questionnaire - Accountability and Impact System
- F. Multi-State Programming Efforts

July 26, 1999

Bart Hewitt
Partnerships/POW
Cooperative State Research, Education
and Extension Service
U.S. Department of Agriculture
Stop 2214
1400 Independence Avenue, S.W
Washington, D.C. 20250-2214

Dear Bart:

Enclosed are two final copies of the Colorado Plan of Work for October 1, 1999 thru September 30, 2004. This plan has been the result of collaboration with a number of partners and with extensive discussion collaboratively with the Agricultural Experiment Station.

We have obviously not limited our discussion of this Plan of Work only to Federal dollars due to the integration of our programs in total. We look forward to your comments and suggestions as we continue to work in Colorado on our programming priorities in support of Colorado citizens and those established by CSREES.

Sincerely,

Milan A. Rewerts
Director

MAR/clp

REALITIES OF COLORADO PROGRAMMING FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

July 15, 1999

Historical Context

From its early history, Colorado has initiated independent programs within its counties, has served a multi-cultural clientele, provided both family and agriculture oriented programs and has developed a presence in both rural and urban areas. As Colorado moves into the 21st century, like most states of the new west, its challenges rest on the unique combination of its history of development, its remarkable natural resource base, the steady diversification of its economy, and a new fiscal conservatism.

When Colorado Agricultural College President Charles Lory and U.S. Secretary of Agriculture David Houston signed a Memorandum of Understanding on July 30, 1914, establishing Cooperative Extension in this Centennial State, the action was built on a history already rich with independent innovative outreach from the State Agricultural College.

Officially established by the legislature in 1870, the State Agricultural College accepted its first students in September of 1879. Three months later, the first off-campus Farmers Institute was conducted at Del Norte, Colorado, and two weeks later a second one was presented in Greeley, Colorado. The first institute carried the entire college faculty and a number of board members and producers over an arduous train journey through the mountains where they presented a well-received discussion of modern agriculture to a multi-cultural audience. The experience in Greeley, only 30 miles from campus, included spirited challenges and criticisms from local producers whose on-farm experiences with irrigation were presented as practical truths in contrast to academic theory. The contrasts of the geographical location, the eastern plains versus the high Rocky Mountains, cultural diversity, and spirited independent challenges to the College's knowledge base have been typical of Colorado State University's entire experience with outreach.

On October 1, 1912, Logan County employed the first Extension Agent through a formal agreement with county commissioners, the high school committee, the State Agricultural College, and the Bureau of Plant Industry. Soon after, county agents were employed in El Paso, Pueblo, Mesa, Boulder, Morgan and Prowers counties, and the San Luis Valley. All of these outreach efforts in agriculture were in place prior to the formal signing of the Smith-Lever Act. Between 1916 and 1918, home demonstration agents began to be employed in the counties. From the beginning they offered urban home demonstration activity, as well as rural activities and with the coming of World War I, urban youth activities were begun in Denver.

The history of Colorado has always been one of extractive industries - from mining to tourism - which have tended to drive 'boom and bust' economic cycles reinforcing entrepreneurial independence and creating

difficulty in establishing strong bonds within communities. In 1998, for the first time in 16 years, a Republican administration was elected in Colorado. Therefore, as the new century dawns, many state bureaucracies have new personnel with limited experience in long -range planning. The population of Colorado has exploded since 1990. It is the fifth fastest growing state in the union and the year 2000 census is expected to show a 20% increase since 1990. Two of the top-ten fastest growing counties in the nation are in Colorado. The state has made a limited investment in infrastructure over the last 20 years. Highways, elementary and secondary schools, prisons, higher education, and hospitals are all in need of major reinvestment. These infrastructure needs conflict with the Tabor Amendment that puts strict limitations on spending and funding in the state and compete with ongoing program funding needs.

Cooperative Extension took a serious budget cut in the late 1980s and has yet to recover any of that loss. With a 20% increase in state population and an Extension budget increase that has not kept pace with inflation, Cooperative Extension has had to down -size and focus its programs to the point where effectiveness and viability are sometimes threatened.

The front range and southwestern mountain counties in Colorado are all experiencing dramatic increases in population which have strained the counties' ability to provide appropriate services. The pattern of employment in Colorado is changing by relative weighting in the different sectors. There are only two counties in the state where more than 35% of all employment is still in the traditional areas of mining, logging, ranching or farming.

Thirty-six percent of Colorado's land is in public ownership - a resource that attracts much of its tourism industry. Fifteen of Colorado's 63 counties show 25-76 percent of the homes owned by persons from out-of-the-county. This second-home absentee owner trend has deep implications for the decision making process at all levels of the community.

The funding of higher education in Colorado has been conservative, in spite of the fact that Colorado's population is extremely well educated. In 1995, the U.S. Census Bureau estimated that Colorado ranked first in the nation in the percent of population with a college degree and third in the nation in percent of population with a high school diploma. Most program enhancements of the past decade have been achieved through grant and contract development and the Smith -Lever 3(b) and 3(c) funds have increasingly contributed a smaller portion of the Extension budget in the state. Strong county budget support of 38% brings active stakeholder oversight from county commissioners. A state Extension Advisory Committee which is geographically representative and includes a variety of stakeholder perspectives, has worked closely with Cooperative Extension administration to realign and focus the state's Extension program.

In the new century, it is clear that the fundamental Extension programming challenges are in the areas of natural resource conservation and protection, facilitation and negotiation of conflicting stakeholder interests, and the enhancing of community.

Issues and Opportunities for Extension in the Future

Agriculture Trends:

Production agriculture Extension program challenges are increasingly impacted by the competition of global markets, low commodity prices, intensifying pressures from development, environmental protectionism, public concerns about biotechnology and food safety, and the promise of sophisticated management technologies. Maintaining a faculty with currency in the appropriate areas and operating support to maximize their effectiveness to focus on the most important aspects of agriculture and the economy in Colorado, is a difficult challenge.

In 1986, Colorado agriculture ranked among the top five producers in the nation in the following commodities: summer potatoes, winter wheat, onions, cattle on feed, market fed cattle, sheep and lambs, sheep and lambs on feed, and wool production. Eleven years later, in 1997, Colorado was still in the top five ranking for all of the above commodities and in addition for spinach, lettuce, carrots, and all potatoes.

The Colorado beef industry generates over \$2,000,000,000 annually ranking 10th nationwide in total numbers of cattle. Colorado is becoming a major pork production state, as well. In 1996, Colorado was producing over 1,700,000 hogs and pigs annually, generating about \$87,000,000 in gross income. Colorado ranks first nationwide in total numbers of lambs slaughtered, generating about 34% of the nation's domestic lamb meat supply.

Another measure of change in agriculture in Colorado is that in 1975, 37,500,000 acres were classified as farm land. In 1997, farmland had been reduced to 32,500,000 acres. The average acreage per farm had changed only minimally from 1359 in 1975 to 1327 in 1997. However, in 1997 there were only 24,500 farms compared to 27,600 in 1975.

Social/Community Trends:

In general, socio-economic vital statistics show that Coloradans are at the mid-level or among the top 25 percentile of states in indicators of well being. In 1997, Colorado had the 25th largest population with 80% of its population White non-Hispanic, 13% Hispanic, 4.2% Black, 2% Asian, and 1% American Indian. Two Colorado counties are among the 12 counties in the western states with a Hispanic majority. In comparison to the nation, Colorado has a lower rate of teenage births, infant mortality, homicide, and a higher life expectancy. In comparison to the nation, it has a higher percentage of low-weight births, a higher death rate from suicide, a higher rate of unintentional injury and motor vehicular deaths, and a higher rate of drug and alcohol induced deaths.

In 1997, a hunger study by the Food Bank of the Rockies profiled their emergency food aid recipients as follows: 81% have non-food resources other than agency or government food programs; 24% reported adults in the households missed meals in the previous month because they lacked food or

money to buy food; 80% had no private health insurance; 51% of these households had a working adult; 46% of the recipients were children under 17 years of age. In 1996, the Food Bank of the Rockies distributed 11,000,000 pounds of food representing 8,000,000 meals for needy individuals in Colorado.

Heart disease is the #1 cause of death in Colorado requiring expenditures that are nearly \$800 per year for every Coloradan. Diabetes Mellitus directly accounts for 2.1% of all deaths and shows a higher prevalence among Hispanics with 50 per 1,000 compared to 24 per 1,000 among non-Hispanic whites. A 1996 behavioral risk factor surveillance system indicated that 21.8% of all Coloradans were classified as overweight with 27% of children age 6 to 11 considered obese.

Overall Economy:

Since 1990, individual income tax receipts have grown an average of 9.9% per year. Corporate income taxes are growing at double-digit rates. This has increased the general fund revenue and forced the legislature, due to the Tabor Amendment, to return funds to Colorado citizens or pass a special bill to allocate funds for special state priorities. It is expected that the Colorado economy will remain strong into the next century. Its robust growth has created low unemployment and increasing labor costs. Economic activity will continue to be led by construction, advanced technologies, communications, financial services, and the service sectors. The state is expecting a steady growth in tourism related industries. A comparison of non-agricultural employment percentages between 1960 and 1997 shows that the most dramatic changes for the state are in the area of mining, which decreased from 3% in 1960 to 0.7% in 1997; manufacturing, which fell from 17% in 1960 to 10% in 1997; and services, which rose from 15% in 1960 to 30% in 1997.

Since 1990, with a robust economy, the total numbers of Coloradans in poverty has decreased from 13.7% to 8.5% in 1997. Anecdotal information from Extension faculty indicate the differentiations between well-off Coloradans and those in poverty have become more extreme, regardless of the strong economy. As noted in Table 1, from 1990 to 1997, the percentage of households in Colorado with incomes over \$1,000,000 has increased from 5 to 16.5%.

The profile of low-income families in 1997 shows 93,914 households receiving food stamps in Colorado. The households are described as follows: 73.9% were headed by females; 54.3% were white; 31.2% were Hispanic; 11.6% were African American, 1.7% were Asian, and 1.2% were American Indian. A comparison with the Colorado racial and ethnic breakdown shows that a much higher percentage of non-white households are in the poverty ranks.

Water Issues:

Like the rest of the "New West" inhabitants, Coloradans use 120 gallons of water per day per citizen versus 30 gallons per person in the rest of the country. In a state where most regions receive only 10-20 inches of rainfall per year, increasing competition for water resources is evident. While 90% of the state's water is used in production agriculture, the Denver metropolitan area uses 50% of its water for home landscaping.

At present, the cost of municipal treated water remains fairly low in most areas, though shortages and costs are increasing. Agricultural water supplies are generally adequate in most years. There is little evidence of a commitment to reduce domestic water use in line with rainfall realities and increasing demands.

Challenges to Extension

Against this robust economy and political/economic conservatism, there are key challenges that Cooperative Extension must meet at the turn of the century:

1. Information technology access is challenging/changing the specialist role.
2. Budget realignment is needed for more technology investment and information management functions.
3. Urban/rural conflicts over land use and open space are increasing.
4. Economic growth compatible with environmental protectionism is important as well as overall profitability.
5. Rapid changes are occurring in business marketing and finance.
6. Biotechnology is playing an increasingly important role in agriculture and food production/distribution.
7. Customer demands for personal service, distributed learning, and assistance in complex decision models.

In a state with an increasing technology employment sector and demands for open space preservation and recreational resources, new programming challenges are evident. Education regarding public policy issues, particularly concerning public/private property rights and natural resource conservation and protection is a key need.

Dramatic Challenges:

In 1999, two public events which illustrate the challenging realities in Colorado were a protracted and bitter fight to regulate confined hog feeding operations and the shooting tragedy at Columbine High School. Both events revealed the absence of appropriate consensus building decision processes in our communities. There were complex and passionate arguments over causes and the appropriate role of public and private resources in the future. The media was instrumental in “creating truth” around both of these events.

As a system with technology expertise in subject matter, we find ourselves needing to assist in the difficult process of public policy education, facilitation of discourse around issues creating conflict, and engaging in a vigorous discussion of how we can best serve the common good in Colorado in the 21st century. This work demands creativity, focus and new partnerships.

Integration Across County and State Lines

In the Fall of 1997, broad programing priority areas were identified for Colorado State University Cooperative Extension through a process of total staff involvement. These areas and the relevant Federal Goals are as follows:

<u>Colorado Program Areas</u>	<u>Federal Goals</u>
1. Engaging Communities in Transition	Goal V
2. Enhancing Families and Communities	Goal V
3. Improving Nutrition, Food Safety, and Health	Goals II and III
4. Managing Small Acreages	Goals II and IV
5. Partnering for Green Colorado	Goals I and IV
6. Strengthening Youth Development	Goal V
7. Sustaining Agriculture and the Environment	Goals I and IV

Each program area is managed by a core team, which includes campus specialists and county faculty. The core team is often co-chaired by campus and field personnel. These teams have established situation statements for Colorado and broad program goals. In addition, the teams have been actively working on evaluation processes and instruments that can be used throughout the state. In the Spring of 1999, regional meetings clarified specific program issues under these 7 broad state plans for each region. In the attached (Appendix A), the specific plans important to each region of the state are linked to these program areas. Plans of work were written for each regional plan and the state plan of work core team has established communication, planning, and training relationships with the regional teams. These regional plans have enabled county faculty to expand their resources by teamwork with colleagues in the region across county lines.

State specialists were asked to outline support statements for their program areas and provide county faculty with statements of the situation, educational goals, educational products or processes, and evaluation models they are providing to the appropriate program area/s. These support statements form the basis of county faculty planning for regional educational program support from state faculty. The

seven broad areas form the basis of all Extension pro-active programming, marketing, and reporting for Colorado.

Multi-state Efforts:

In (Appendix B), a chart summarizes the Extension activities occurring across state lines with a variety of partners. The total resource allocation to these efforts was \$917,144 which represents 38% of our 1997 formula funding. Many of these programs have a long history of collaboration. Most are ongoing.

Stakeholder Input

Research Survey - For all of our planned programs we have responded to stakeholder input in a variety of ways. Over the past two years, CSU Cooperative Extension completed a participant CE2000 survey to help us identify priorities for ongoing programs. We identified seven counties which represent each of our five regions and both rural and urban constituencies. This sampling technique of two metro counties and five non-metro counties, included variation by county location, population, immigration, ethnicity, agriculture and natural resource characteristics, and adult participation in a range of Extension programs. Using names of all current Extension newsletter lists within those counties, names of attendees at Extension educational sessions, and names of individuals who had initiated personal contact with the office, a random sample was determined. Questionnaires were mailed to the lists selected in the Fall of 1997 and in the Summer of 1998. Initial results from these respondents were summarized and used for a comparison with current Plan of Work priorities. On Tables 2 through 5 the importance of future challenges to Extension programs are summarized by broad content areas. This Plan of Work includes priorities reflecting this input.

Advisory Committee Involvement - In addition to the research survey outlined above, we involved our State Extension Advisory Committee in a stakeholder review of this plan. Since the Spring of 1998, our State Advisory Committee members have each built a relationship with one of our major plans of work. They have been receiving regular correspondence, progress reports, impact summaries, and have been invited to participate in a variety of activities by the state Plan of Work teams. The Advisory Committee members self selected the program areas in which they had most interest or expertise and have been active in discussions of the progress of these teams. Note (Appendix C), for a list of these individuals and the programs they have been monitoring.

Appropriate portions of this plan were then mailed to each of the Advisory Committee members for their comments. They were free to solicit input from their own colleagues and constituencies to strengthen their evaluation/feedback.

Vice Provost Advisory Committee - CE and the CAES actively participate in biannual meetings of an Advisory Committee convened by the Vice Provost for Agriculture and University Outreach. CE and CAES programs are discussed and input is solicited on future priorities for research activities. In addition, the CAES regularly participates in meetings held by CSU Cooperative Extension where current and future program needs are discussed.

Listening Sessions -Beginning in 2000, CAES and CSU Cooperative Extension will hold joint regional listening sessions to solicit further input on research priorities and program needs. Each year. A listening session will be held in two of state's six regions (Southeast, Northeast, Front Range, San Luis Valley, Southwest, and Northwest). Both CAES and CSU Cooperative Extension programs will be modified to reflect the input received where appropriate and feasible. All sessions will be open to the public and advertised in each region of the state.

Diversity Infusion

Colorado State University created a strategic action plan for diversity in 1997. Extension then initiated a strategic plan development process with an advisory committee of Extension faculty, non -Extension Colorado State University faculty, and community members. This planning built on the accomplishments Colorado State University Extension had made with the allocation of resources to a half - time state diversity coordinator for the past 4 years.

The Colorado State University Cooperative Extension Diversity Action Plan contains specific steps to honor diversity and infuse skills and a commitment to diversity throughout our system. Included in the plan (See Appendix D), are clear strategies with the responsible persons indicated for each action. In keeping with the racial, cultural, and class diversity of Colorado, this plan provides a blueprint for Extension faculty's commitment to understanding the diversity in their service area and creating new models to reach audiences not currently served by Extension education.

Equal Employment Opportunity Reporting

We adopt by reference the Colorado State University's procedures for reporting civil rights compliance with Equal Employment Opportunity requirements. A biennial report is filed by Dana Hiatt, Director of Equal Opportunity at Colorado State University to the Colorado Commission on Higher education, who forward the report to the U.S. Equal Opportunity Commission. The CAES is committed to enhancing the diversity of the faculty, staff, and students at Colorado State University.

Colorado Plans for CSREES Goals

GOAL I:

An agricultural system that is highly competitive in the global economy.

Issue: As indicated in the introductory situation statement, Colorado still has a strong agriculture base but has an increasingly differentiated economy with strength in the tourism and technology related industries. Unemployment is very low, resulting in labor shortages and problems with finding and maintaining qualified workers in agriculture. The depressed commodity prices and the international markets create new challenges for traditional producers. Current research shows only 10% of livestock producers and 40% of grain producers implement some risk management tools. These factors contribute to an increased need to emphasize management skills, in addition to production expertise in all Extension agricultural programs.

Objective I:

- A. Enhance the profitability of Colorado agriculture producers with an emphasis on increased business management skills through the development and adoption of:
1) risk management tools; and, 2) comprehensive business plans including integrated resource management.

Output: 1) A series of fact sheets outlining risk management tools available to producers; 2) Workshops conducted with Cooperative Extension in Wyoming, Montana, and Colorado based on a research study of producer risk management practices in those three states; 3) Database of enterprise budgets for a representative sample of Colorado producers developed over the five-year period, initially utilizing records integrated from the two existing farm and ranch management associations. Appropriate additional producers will be acquired from individual subscriptions or collaborations with other organizations to complete a representative sample for Colorado.

Outcomes: 1) The increased adoption of risk management strategies by producers; 2)

An increase in agriculture producers who implement an integrated resource management business plan for their entire business;

3) Integrated summaries of costs of production and analyses of Colorado Agri-Businesses to assist with education on management for producers, lenders, and policy makers in Colorado.

Linkages (Internal): Department of Agricultural and Resource Economics, Soil and Crop Sciences, and with county agents especially in the northeast and southeast regions of Colorado.

Linkages (External): Animal Sciences, Montana and Wyoming Extension systems.

Target Audiences: Mid-size agriculture producers.

Duration: Short-term intensive work will be done in 1999 -2000. Intermediate and long-term work will continue through 2004.

Resources Allocated:

	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	\$Equivalent
State FTE	2	2.5	2.5	3	3.5	1,303,439
County FTE	2	2	3	4	5	1,224,816
Total FTE	4	4.5	5.5	7	8.5	2,528,255
Budget	346,204	394,480	471,031	595,857	720,684	

Education and outreach: These programs will be implemented in the regional plans of work and the state plan of work. The state plan of work on agriculture and business management is incorporated into our state programming area in Sustaining Agriculture and the Environment, as well as our state plan in Communities in Transition.

Integrated CE/AES work: In support of this goal the Integrated Resource Management (IRM) Project (#614) team is engaged in research to evaluate the most profitable, ecologically sound and socially accepted animal production systems. The results of this research are translated directly into the risk management and production consultation output through Extension state and county faculty. Resource from CE: .3 FTEs.

Objective I:

A. Enhance the diversification of income for Colorado agriculture producers by increasing the production of alternative and niche market crops: 1) crops not currently grown or in low production in Colorado; 2) increase production and value-added facilities in Colorado.

Output: Development and introduction to production of successful new Colorado Crops.

Outcome: Increasing acreages of the following: quinoa (from 800 acres to 1200 acres); blue corn, canola, edamame soybean, chick peas, mung beans, and azuki beans. The above are all now in demonstration and limited production in Colorado as an outgrowth of the Soil and Crop Sciences value-added research and development program. It is expected that by the year 2002 the edamame industry and canola industry will be in place yielding a total of \$33,000,000 per year. By the year 2004, chick pea and bean pasta industry yielding \$8,000,000 per year will be in place.

Linkages (Internal): Soil and Crop Sciences, Agriculture and Resource Economics and with the Agricultural Experiment Stations.

Linkages (External): The Colorado Department of Local Affairs, and State Department of Agriculture Marketing Division.

Target Audiences: Canola for producers in the intermountain areas, San Luis Valley and southeastern Colorado; blue corn for high plains (from Adams county east to the Kansas line); edamame soybeans, chick peas and mung beans and azuki beans for small acreage owners within Colorado.

Duration: Development is ongoing and long-term with research.

Resources Allocated:

	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	\$Equivalent
State FTE	2	3	4	4	5	1,737,918
County FTE	2	2.5	3	3.5	4	1,148,265
Total FTE	4	5.5	7	7.5	9	2,886,183
Budget	346,206	481,031	615,858	654,133	788,959	

Integrated CE/AES work: An ongoing AES research project in support of new crop development (#729) provides information directly supportive of this Extension outreach

effort. Resources from CE: .3 FTEs.

Objective I:

- C. Enhanced Colorado producers’ competitiveness through the use of appropriate new GPS/GIS and precision agriculture technologies.

Output: Demonstration sites, industry/education conferences, and field tours showing the appropriate use of new technologies.

Outcomes: Increased profit through the adoption of appropriate GIS and GPS technologies in production areas of the state where economies of scale make this technology feasible.

Linkages (Internal): Chemical and Bioresource Engineering, Agriculture and Resource Economics, Soil and Crop Sciences, Bioagricultural Sciences and Pest Management, state, regional, and county faculty, and Agricultural Experiment Station (AES) faculty.

Linkages (External): Private seed companies, equipment companies and other agri business interests, Agricultural Research Station (ARS), and local producers.

Target Audiences: Mid- to high-end producers with capital resources to invest in appropriate equipment.

Duration: Long-term in collaboration with research and development.

Resources Allocated:

	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	\$Equivalent
State FTE	3	3.5	4	4.5	5	1,931,020
County FTE	2	5	3	3.5	4	1,148,265
Total FTE	5	6	7	8	9	3,079,285
Budget	442,755	529,306	615,858	702,409	788,959	

Education and Outreach: This plan supports the Sustaining Agriculture and the Environment state plan of work, as well as the Communities in Transition plan of work. Multi-county efforts will be in place in all regions with particular emphasis on the production areas in the northeast and southeast.

GOAL II:

A Safe and Secure Food and Fiber System

Issue: Coloradans are particularly concerned about the safety and purity of their food supply. This is especially true of those persons who have immigrated to Colorado for the healthy natural environment and active lifestyle.

An increasing number of Coloradans live in an urban environment and their views dominate the state legislature and many state policies. Coloradans are critical of the agriculture community whenever food safety alarms or food borne illnesses become a matter of public attention. Specific concerns surround pesticide residues, microbial safety, and natural toxins. A strong environmental group in Colorado is critical of new biotechnology methods and preservation/packaging methods.

While a number of specific food safety initiatives are funded by 3(d) funding, food safety is an important component of our ongoing base programs. In 1996, 608 cases of food borne illnesses were reported to the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (approximately 20 cases per 100,000 people). It is estimated that the cost in health care and loss of work productivity represents 75-330 million dollars annually in Colorado.

Colorado participated in the 1995 and 1996 regional Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System on food handling behaviors and consumption of foods. Half of the survey respondents (50.2%) reported eating undercooked eggs; by comparison 62% of Coloradans reported eating undercooked eggs. Coloradans also report consuming more pink hamburger meat (28.8%) than the other states surveyed (19.7%). Approximately, 23% of the Colorado respondents reported not washing their hands after handling raw meat or chicken, and 28% of Coloradans responded that they did not wash cutting surfaces with soap after using it with raw meat or chicken. Both of these percentages were higher than the averages in other states.

Objective II:

- A.** Promote food safety across the food chain from production through consumption.

Outputs: 1) A rapid response and information service including the safe food web site; 2) a food safety list serve; and 3) a quarterly food safety newsletter.

Outcomes: 80% of Extension program participants will show increased knowledge of recommended food handling practices through pre/post survey.

Linkages (Internal): Departments of Animal Science, Epidemiology and Environmental Health, and Food Science and Human Nutrition state specialists and county faculty.

Target Audiences: Informed public and educators who are active web site and electronic mail users.

Resources Allocated:

	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	\$Equivalent
State FTE	1	1	1.5	2	2	724,133
County FTE	1	1	2	2	2	612,408
Total FTE	2	2	3.5	4	4	1,336,541
Budget	173,102	173,102	297,929	346,205	346,205	

Objective II:

B. Provide certification training for food handlers.

Output: Food safety certification and train the trainers project to deliver food safety education programs for dissemination to food handlers.

Outcomes: 70% of attendees at an Extension sponsored food certification program will report plans to adopt recommended food handling practices and increased knowledge of risks in food safety and health.

Linkages (Internal): Animal Science and Food Science and Human Nutrition, and between state specialists and county faculty.

Linkages (External): State Department of Health and Environment, local health departments, and congregate meal site managers.

Target Audiences: Health educators, public health inspectors and food service managers in school systems, 24 hour care facilities, schools and child care facilities.

Resources Allocated:

	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	\$Equivalent

State FTE	1	1	1.5	2	2	724,133
County FTE	1	2	2	3	3	842,061
Total FTE	2	3	3.5	5	5	1,566,194
Budget	173,102	249,653	297,929	422,755	422,755	

Objective II:

C. Enhance red meat safety.

Output: Training programs on verification criteria and consulting to implement mandatory HACCP systems in meat packing and processing plants.

Outcomes: Increase the number of Colorado red meat producers/packers and processors who implement preventive systems to improve meat safety and quality.

Linkages (Internal): Food Science & Human Nutrition and Animal Science.

Linkages (External): Colorado Livestock Association, Colorado Pork Producers Association, and Lamb Producers Association.

Target Audiences: Colorado small to mid-size meat producers, packers, processors.

Resources Allocated:

	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	\$Equivalent
State FTE	1	1	1.5	2	2	724,133
County FTE	2	2	3	3	4	1,071,714
Total FTE	3	3	4.5	5	6	1,796,147
Budget	249,653	249,653	374,480	427,755	499,306	

Integrated CS/AES work: Red meat quality and safety is enhanced through an ongoing AES funded project (#214) which provides research and technology transfer to producers and Extension educators. Resources from CE: .4 FTEs.

Objective II:

A. Enhance the health of Coloradans by increasing awareness and skills to manage animal diseases.

Output: 1) Consultation by Extension veterinarians and researchers; 2) education fact sheets; 3) electronic news alerts; and 4) training teleconferences and meetings to educate key citizens.

Outcomes: 1) Increased awareness and increased number of emergency preparedness plans for animal disease threats; 2) enhanced skill/consultation among Extension

personnel in handling individual consumer/producer questions on animal health.

Linkages (Internal): Department of Clinical Sciences, Epidemiology and Environmental Health, Pathology, Microbiology, and Diagnostic Laboratory in the College of Veterinary Medicine, Department of Animal Science in the College of Agriculture, the Department of Food Science and Human Nutrition in the College of Applied Human Sciences, Department of Fishery and Wildlife Biology in the College of Natural Resources, and county and regional faculty.

Linkages (External): Colorado Department of Agriculture, Colorado Division of Wildlife, and Colorado Department of Health and Environment.

Target Audiences: Extension clientele including ranchers, small acreage owners, health department officials, practicing veterinarians, and Division of Wildlife regulatory personnel.

Resources Allocated:

	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	\$Equivalent
State FTE	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	1,206,888
County FTE	2	2	3	3	4	1,071,714
Total FTE	3.5	4	5.5	6	7.5	2,278,602
Budget	297,929	346,204	471,031	519,306	644,133	

Education and Outreach: This program will be integrated into the state Plan of Work and regional Plans of Work in the broad programming area of Improving Nutrition, Food Safety, and Health, and in the area of Sustaining Agriculture and the Environment. In 1999-2000, the Colorado Department of Agriculture is funding .5 FTE of an Extension veterinarian to work in the programming area.

GOAL III:

Healthy Well-Nourished Population

Issue: As indicated in the introductory statement, many Coloradans are immigrating to take advantage of the healthy lifestyle in a state rich with natural resources and recreational opportunities. Coloradans therefore, are sensitive to health and wellness issues. However, there are specific health related issues in Colorado including obesity, diabetes mellitus, and increasing numbers of low birth weight babies.

The disparity between high and low incomes in Colorado, the frantic pace of dual career families, commuting schedules, and the fast -pace of new development and growth in the state, encourages stress related illnesses, poor dietary practices and inconsistent exercise habits.

Objective III:

- A. Coloradans will increase their knowledge and adoption of practices which promote healthy lifestyles.

Outputs: 1) Educational programs provided at school, work, community, and health care sites to small and medium size groups; and, 2) teleconferences, individualized consultation and distance learning programs to targeted groups.

Outcomes: Coloradans will increase their knowledge and adoption of practices which promote healthy lifestyles including; 1) balancing food intake with physical activity in order to maintain or improve weight; 2) eating less fat, less saturated fat, and less cholesterol; 3) eating more grain products, vegetables, and fruits and a variety of foods; 4) moderation in salt and sodium and sugars; and, 5) increase moderation among persons who drink alcohol beverages.

Linkages (Internal): Specialists in Departments of Food Science and Human Nutrition and Health and Exercise Science and county faculty.

Linkages (External): The Colorado Department of Agriculture, Colorado Department of Health and Environment, and Colorado Department of Human Services.

Target Audiences: Coloradans in vulnerable health categories such as diabetes or health disease patients, persons with weight management challenges, and Hispanics.

Objective III:

- B. Communities will improve their capacity to address health and nutrition related needs.

Output: Brochures, personal consultation, and letters describing available resources to promote health and nutrition in the community from Extension educators and state specialists to key community organizations, professionals in the health and education arenas and agency and governmental managers.

Outcomes: Increase in the 1) number of joint health and nutrition related educational sessions offered within the community; 2) number of organizations who request educational sessions from Extension educators; 3) number of communities who institute health needs assessments; 4) number of community groups who initiate health related activities, healthy food choices, or volunteerism in health and nutrition related activities; and, 5) number of community members who are trained as volunteers in La Cocina Saludable Specialists in master food preservers, or team nutrition members.

Linkages (Internal): Department of Food Science and Human Nutrition and Department of Health and Exercise Science and county faculty.

Linkages (External): Colorado Department of Health and Environment, Colorado Department of Local Affairs, Colorado Department of Agriculture, American Heart Association.

Target Audiences: City and county elected and appointed officials, organizational leaders in the community, and professionals in the medical and educational community.

Objective III:

C. Improve the nutritional status and health of school and community athletes.

Output: Two-day workshops for community coaches and athletic directors on topics related to exercise and fitness, food supplements, use of drugs, hormones and herb supplements, basic nutrition for performance, weight loss or gain and maintenance.

Outcomes: 1) Increase in nutrition and dietary knowledge among state high school and community coaches; 2) increase in requests for educational materials and presentations to coaches, athletes, and parents; and, 3) decrease in athletic injuries and health problems related to inappropriate use of exercise, supplements, stimulants, or unbalanced diets.

Linkages (Internal): Departments of Health and Exercise Science, Department of Food Science and Human Nutrition, 4-H Youth Development and School of Education.

Linkages (External): Colorado Department of Education, Colorado School Athletic Association, Colorado High School Activities Association, and Colorado Coaches Association.

Target Audiences: Athletic directors and coaches at junior and senior high and community athletic organizations, as well as health professionals.

Duration: Short-term development of educational presentations. Ongoing educational presentations over the long-term.

Resources Allocated:

	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	\$Equivalent
State FTE	2	3	3	4	4	1,544,816,
County FTE	3	3	3	3	3	1,148,265
Total FTE	5	6	6	7	7	2,693,081
Budget	422,755	519,306	519,306	615,858	615,858	

GOAL IV:

Greater harmony between agriculture and the environment.

Issue: Agriculture is still a strong contributor to the economy of Colorado and citizens of the state are increasingly concerned about protecting the rich natural resources. Much of the new growth in population is accounted for by persons retiring to Colorado for recreational environments to enjoy and persons who seek a high quality of life including the enjoyment of the resources of a beautiful and healthy environment. Rapid population growth has transformed many grasslands and irrigated crop lands into suburban housing developments. An increasing number of property owners with acreages from 1 to 50 are finding threats to their chosen life style. Waste management, water quality control, noxious weed management, animal health, pasture management and conflicts with wildlife are all challenges to unprepared small acreage owners.

With the increasing numbers of urban citizens wielding political power at the county commission and legislative levels, the sustainability of a healthy agricultural industry and reasonable environmental regulations is increasingly difficult. Among agriculture producers there is a need to increase the use of consistent records for decision making, particularly in those areas related to the application of chemicals and pesticides or specific water management techniques. There are approximately 3 million acres of irrigated crop land in Colorado. Salt affected soils and challenges to water rights are increasing problems for communities and land owners.

Prairie dogs have been viewed as a major agricultural pest by landowners in Colorado. According to the Colorado Agricultural Statistics Service, about 1.5 million acres were occupied by prairie dogs in Colorado, and prairie dogs were estimated to cause about \$10 million of damage to agriculture. Over half the acreage and damage was attributed to black-tailed prairie dogs. Although black-tailed prairie dogs appear fairly abundant in Colorado, their populations have been significantly reduced across their

historic range. Thus, environmental groups have petitioned the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to list the black-tailed prairie dog as a threatened species. With these conflicting values and needs, it is apparent that some prairie dog populations will need to be protected/preserved whereas others may need to be controlled to minimize conflicts.

Objective IV:

- A.** Increase the adoption of research based best management practices to control weeds, insects, disease and nematodes for wise use of agriculture chemicals and for ground water protection.

Outputs: 1) Resource manuals and research summaries on pesticides, fertilizers, and nutrient management; 2) best management practices demonstrations; 3) field schools to education crop advisors and producers; 4) development of best management practice manuals for irrigated corn production, alfalfa, and legume production.

Outcomes: 1) Increased producer adoption of best management practices such as integrated management and biological controls developed with research in Colorado; 2) decrease in ground water nitrite levels; and 3) reduced crop loss and lower production costs due to weeds and pests.

Linkages (Internal): Departments of Soil and Crop Sciences, Department of Chemical and Bioresource Engineering, and state, regional, and county faculty.

Linkages (External): Colorado Department of Agriculture, Colorado Department Health and Environment, Colorado State Legislature, and specific commodity groups.

Target Audiences: Producers and crop advisors.

Duration: On-going and long term.

Resources Allocated:

	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	\$Equivalent
State FTE	2.5	3	4	4	4	1,689,643
County FTE	1	2	2	3	4	918,612
Total FTE	3.5	5	6	7	8	2,608,255
Budget	317,929	442,756	539,307	615,858	692,409	

Integrated CE/AEA work: Ongoing research on projects on biological and ecological weed management and pest management practices (#221, 618 and 646) provides information to assist Extension educators and producers. Resources from CE: 1.3 FTEs.

Objective IV:

B. Increase the effective management of pests in agriculture systems and landscapes.

Outputs: 1) Electronic newsletter (pest alert); 2) web site; 3) fact sheets on pest management; 4) database of transportable digitized images for pest management education; 5) crop clinics; and 6) field schools.

Outcomes: 1) Enhanced grower/crop consultant/master gardener understanding of the ecological and economic impact of pests on crop production; 2) increased use of non-chemical pest management alternatives; and 3) reduction in crop losses due to pests.

Linkages (Internal): Departments of Bioagriculture Sciences and Pest Management, including Entomology, Plant Pathology and Weed Science, and the Department of Soil and Crop Sciences.

Linkages (External): Department of Agriculture, crop consultants, and Agriculture Experiment Stations.

Target Audiences: Home gardeners and landscape managers and agriculture producers.

Duration: On-going and long term.

Resources Allocated:

	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	\$Equivalent
State FTE	6	8	8	8	9	3,765,489
County FTE	2	3	3	4	4	1,224,816
Total FTE	8	11	11	12	13	4,990,305
Budget	732,408	1,002,061	1,002,061	1,078,612	1,175,163	

Objective IV:

B. Enhance wise soil management decision making.

Outputs: 1) Manure management plan workshops; 2) on-farm best management practice demonstrations; 3) field days; and 4) manure management publications.

Outcomes: 1) Increase in number of land managers who base manure and fertilizer decision on soil testing; and 2) reduction of nitrate contamination.

Linkages (Internal): Departments of Soil and Crop Sciences, Department of Bioagriculture Science and Pest Management, Master Gardener Program, and Department of Food Science and Human Nutrition.

Linkages (External): Colorado Department of Agriculture, Colorado Department of Health and Environment, crop consultant groups, and green industry leaders and producers.

Target Audiences: Crop consultants, producers and master gardeners.

Duration: Intensive, long term.

Resources Allocated:

	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	\$Equivalent
State FTE	1.5	2	2	3	3	1,110,337
County FTE	2.5	3	3	4	5	1,339,643
Total FTE	4.0	5	5	7	8	2,449,980
Budget	336,205	422,755	422,755	595,857	672,408	

Integrated CE/AES work: Ongoing research project (#685) to determine manured crop land evidence of salinity levels, nitrate leaching, and pest populations provides information for Extension educators on helping producers manage nutrient applications. Resources from CE: .3 FTEs.

Objective IV:

B. Enhance adoption of research based management practices in the green industry of Colorado.

Outputs: Educational materials, including, 1) computer graphic slides; 2) Green Scene Newsletter; 3) PlantTalk Colorado message scripts; and 4) introductory level school at the Annual Pro Green Conference.

Outcomes: 1) Increased utilization by green industry members of CSU Extension research based best management practice recommendations; 2) increase utilization of PlantTalk Colorado by members of the industry and their customers.

Linkages (Internal): Departments of Horticulture and Landscape Architecture, and Bioagriculture Science and Pest Management.

Linkages (External): Department of Agriculture, Denver Botanical Gardens, Denver Water District, Green Industry Executive Committee, Board, and members.

Target Audiences: Master Gardeners, and employees of Green Industry in Colorado.

Resources Allocated:

	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	\$Equivalent
State FTE	3	3.5	4	4.5	4.5	1,882,445
County FTE	10	11	12	12	13	4,439,958
Total FTE	13	14.5	16	16.5	17.5	6,322,403
Budget	765,799	890,626	1,304,816	1,353,092	1,429,643	

Integrated CE/AES work: Ongoing research project (#713) on the selection, introduction and evaluation of landscape materials for the high plains enables horticulture specialists and agents to make appropriate recommendations to producers. Resources from CE: .2 FTEs.

Ongoing research project (#642) technologies impacting waste water and fertilization needs in greenhouses provides technical recommendations for specialists and agents to share with members of the green industry in Colorado. Resources from CE: .5 FTEs.

Objective IV:

- E.** Improve the rangeland management skills of Coloradans who manage public and private land.

Outputs: 1) Grazing management class for producers, agency personnel and environmentalists;
2) field days; and 3) educational seminars.

Outcomes: 1) Colorado producers will implement grazing management plans appropriate for their operations; 2) environmental groups, government wildlife agencies, private land owners, and resource management owners will collaborate to improve grazing management to enhance resource conservation and protection, and wildlife and fishery management; 3) enhanced watershed hydrological functioning and improved quality of water resulting from better vegetation management practices; 4) Colorado producer adoption of integrated sustainable livestock, rangeland, crop land production systems.

Linkages (Internal): Departments of Rangeland Ecosystems Science, Integrated Resource Management Team Cooperative Extension Southeast Region; Fishery and Wildlife Biology and Animal Science.

Linkages (External): Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Land Management, Natural Resource Conservation Service, and National Park Service.

Target Audiences: Private and public land managers of grazing lands.

Resources Allocated:

	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	\$Equivalent
State FTE	1.5	1.5	2	2	3	965,510
County FTE	2	2.5	3	3.5	3.5	1,109,990
Total FTE	3.5	4.0	5	3.5	6.5	2,075,500
Budget	297,929	336,205	422,755	461,031	557,582	

Integrated CE/AES work: An ongoing research project on management of weeds on range and pastureland (#759) provides technology transfer to Extension educators and land managers. Resources from CE: .20 FTEs.

Objective IV:

- F. Creation of Prairie Dog Management Work Group to develop and implement a program that achieves conservation of the black-tailed prairie dog in Colorado while recognizing that control is necessary and appropriate in areas where prairie dogs conflict with agriculture and other human activities.

Outputs: Comprehensive work plan with specific tasks to accomplish: inventory and monitoring of existing black-tailed prairie dog populations in Colorado, criteria and procedures for identifying potentially unique or high-quality prairie dog colonies for protection, identification of unique prairie dog colonies, identification of incentives for landowners to protect important prairie dog colonies, establishment of a target acreage of occupied prairie dog habitat, and criteria for and identifying unoccupied potential prairie dog habitat in Colorado.

Outcomes: Conservation of adequate populations of black-tailed prairie dogs in Colorado to negate their listing by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service as a threatened species. Agricultural producers will have greater flexibility in managing prairie dogs where they cause conflicts if they are not listed as a threatened species.

Linkages (Internal): Department of Fishery and Wildlife Biology, Department of Biology.

Linkages (External): Colorado Division of Wildlife, Colorado Department of Agriculture, Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment, Colorado State Soil Conservation Board, Colorado State Board of Land Commissioners, USDA/APHIS Wildlife Services, U.S. Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Department of Defense, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, USDA Farm Services Administration, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and U.S. Forest Service.

Target Audiences: Agricultural producers, land managers, and agency personnel in Colorado.

Duration: The project will be conducted for at least the next 3 years.

Resources Allocated:

	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	\$ Equivalent
State FTE	.2	.2	.3	67,585
County FTE	.3	.8	1.2	176,066
Total FTE	.5	1.0	1.5	243,651

Budget	42,275	80,551	120,826	
--------	--------	--------	---------	--

GOAL V:

Enhanced economic opportunity and quality of life for Americans.

Issue: For many Coloradans improved quality of life is their most important goal and that potential has attracted many people into the state. Economic opportunities in the tourism industry and the technology related industries also have attracted people. The Extension program challenges, resulting from this rapid and targeted growth, include building community connections and decision-making processes so that change can be planned for. In addition, families need to keep a work and relationship balance which nurtures all members of the family in a rapidly changing environment. Young people have many opportunities for recreation and participation in the fast-paced media related world. Yet, the high employment and rapid change creates real deficits in maintaining community social capital, family cohesion, and effective decision-making structures for controversial challenges. Building the capacity of our Extension system to engage in public policy education, focus leadership in key environmental conflicts, and support investments in youth and families will take a deliberate and comprehensive strategic plan.

Objective V:

- A. To integrate the Youth as Assets framework into all youth development programs with an emphasis on developing life long skills.

Outputs: 1) Newsletter articles clarifying the assets model for 4-H leaders and other youth professionals; 2) development of materials and in-service experiential learning opportunities for 4-H youth faculty, other youth volunteers, and professionals

Outcomes: 1) 4-H youth leaders and other youth professionals will begin to integrate youth as asset language into their planning and programming activities; 2) youth can name positive assets which create resiliency and encourage positive contributing behaviors; 3) youth take more responsible leadership positions within their own organizations; 4) youth initiate plans for community service and identify leadership opportunities for themselves and others in their community.

Linkages (Internal): 4-H Youth Development, Departments of Human Development and Family Studies, Fishery and Wildlife Biology, Social Work, and School of Education.

Linkages (External): Colorado Trust (funding for state coordinator), Colorado State

Department of Education, and Search Institute (Minnesota).

Resources Allocated:

	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	\$Equivalent
State FTE	.5*	.5*	1	2	2	482,755
County FTE	2	3	3	4	4	1,224,816
Total FTE	2.5	3.5	4	6	6	1,707,571
Budget	153,102	229,653	326,204	499,306	499,306	

*Extramural funding

Objective V:

- A. Enhance the ability of Colorado parents to control their own anger and react with appropriate guidance to their young persons.

Outputs: 1) Trainer of trainers program for RETHINK; 2) ongoing research updates and reviews for county faculty; 3) adaptation of RETHINK for specialized targeted audiences.

Outcomes: 1) Parents and youth will report reduction in anger levels and expression of physical or psychological violence; 2) increase in parent use of appropriate developmental guidance techniques; 3) pro-active community requests for anger management for adolescents and parents.

Linkages (Internal): Specialists in Department of Human Development and Family Studies and county faculty.

Linkages (External): Department of Social Services and State Department of Education.

Resources Allocated:

	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	\$Equivalent
State FTE	1	1.5	1.5	2	2	772,408
County FTE	3	4	4	5	5	1,607,571

Total FTE	4	5.5	5.5	7	7	2,379,979
Budget	326,204	451,031	451,031	575,858	575,858	

Objective V:

- A. Enhance the ability of Colorado communities and citizens to prevent youth violence.

Outputs: 1) Development of a resource database to provide youth and family professionals with materials for teaching specific violence prevention skills; 2) clearly communicated administrative support for the importance of the key strategies to prevent violence in young people and in communities; 3) skill development training for Extension professionals and youth and family professionals in other organizations on topics such as “Recognizing Vulnerable Youth,” “Defusing Anger,” “Responsive Communication Techniques,” and “Mentoring and Supporting Young People;” 4) training for communities in the “Community Problem Solving Model”.

Outcomes: 1) Increased active use of violence prevention curricula and experiential learning among 4-H volunteers and youth professionals in Colorado; 2) development of active problem-solving committees led by youth in selected Colorado schools; 3) enhanced adult/youth collaborative learning projects; 4) increased recognition of Cooperative Extension as a violence prevention/youth as assets resource for other organizations; and 5) increased number of active Extension Community Policing Projects.

Linkages (Internal): Department of Human Development and Family Studies, 4-H Youth Development, School of Education, Department of Social Work, and Department of Health and Exercise Science.

Linkages (External): Colorado Attorney General’s office, Colorado Governor’s office, Colorado State Department of Education, Colorado State Department of Social Services, and Colorado Community Policing Institute.

Resources Allocated:

	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	\$Equivalent
State FTE	1	2	2	3	3	1,062,061
County FTE	2	3	4	4	5	1,377,918

Total FTE	3	5	6	7	8	2,439,979
Budget	249,653	422,755	499,306	595,857	672,408	

Community Policing programming is funded through a grant from the U.S. Department of Justice.

Objective V:

- A. Enhance the quality of youth and family serving programs in Colorado and create more supportive policies in areas affecting youth and families.

Output: Continued development of the Family and Youth Institute to provide policy education, research collaboration, youth and family professional education, and social and economic analysis of trends affecting Colorado’s family and youth.

Outcomes: 1) New interdisciplinary collaborations on the Colorado State University campus in research and programming affecting families and youth; 2) increased understanding of socio-economic trends and cross-ethnic and assimilation challenges affecting youth and families and strategic planning initiated by communities and organizations which reflect these trends; 3) enhanced skills in developing, implementing, and evaluating appropriate programs for Colorado’s families and youth; 4) increase in external funding to increase institutional capacity for research, policy education and professional development.

Linkages (Internal): College of Applied Human Sciences, College of Agriculture, College of Liberal Arts, and Agricultural Experiment Station, and county faculty.

Linkages (External): Colorado State Department of Education, Colorado State Department of Social Services, Colorado Governor’s office, Colorado County Commissioners, and Colorado State Legislature, and multiple agency and organizational leaders.

Resources Allocated:

	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	\$Equivalent
State FTE	1	2	3	3	5	1,351,714
County FTE	1	2	2	3	3	852,061
Total FTE	2	5	6	8	9	2,193,775

Budget	249,653	346,204	442,755	519,306	615,857	
--------	---------	---------	---------	---------	---------	--

Objective V:

- A. Increase rural economic diversification with special emphasis on existing business retention/expansion, small and home-based business emphasizing value-added agriculture, eco-tourism, forestry, and appropriate technologies and business/community mutual support.

Outputs: 1) Training for community teams in economic diversification models, 2) electronic communication to share new opportunities for economic development and funding, 3) workshops and web sites providing guidelines for eco-tourism and fisheries and wildlife economic opportunities.

Outcomes: 1) Jobs created by enhanced business expansion or new businesses; 2) improved business planning for realistic business success; 3) improved business/community collaborative work for long-range economic development.

Linkages (Internal): Center for Rural Assistance, Department of Agriculture and Resource Economics, Department of Human Development and Family Studies, Fishery and Wildlife Biology, and Department of Design and Merchandising.

Linkages (External): Colorado Department of Local Affairs, Colorado Department of Agriculture, Colorado Division of Wildlife, and Colorado Rural Development Council.

Resources Allocated:

	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	\$Equivalent
State FTE	1	1.5	2	2.5	3	965,510
County FTE	2	2	3	4	5	1,224,912
Total FTE	3	3.5	5	6.5	8	2,190,422
Budget	249,653	297,929	422,755	547,582	672,408	

Education and Outreach: This federal goal is supported by work carried forward by the state and regional plan of work teams in Colorado emphasizing Engaging Communities in Transition and Enhancing Families and Communities.

Merit Review

In the Spring of 1999, we talked with the five Deans on the CSU campus who currently have Extension faculty in their departments. We obtained their support to engage faculty from their colleges in a review for quality and relevance of the plan.

Our major objective in requesting that this group provide the merit review was to enhance our working relationships between Extension faculty and the broader campus. Over the past two years, since the completion of the CE2000 document, CSU Cooperative Extension has been engaged in a number of strategies to strengthen the integration of Extension faculty across the colleges and departments. Strategies have included regular meetings with all Deans, communication on long range planning, the review and development of new performance criteria for Extension faculty, etc. We felt that one way to obtain support and important input from the campus was to ask them to name faculty members whom they believe could provide quality reviews. All Deans named faculty and relevant portions of the report were sent to them for their input. This process has made our plan of work development process more open and enhanced the quality of our plans.

Documentation of Impacts and Reporting Plans

Beginning in the Fall of 1997, a joint committee of Agricultural Experiment Station faculty and Cooperative Extension faculty have been meeting to develop a joint system for a PC-based electronic evaluation and reporting database. The database is being designed in the Summer of 1999 and will consist of two separate and integrated information bases. The Agricultural Experiment Station projects and the seven major program areas of Cooperative Extension will each have in-depth impact reports entered on approximately one-quarter of their projects every year. PI's for Experiment Station projects or Extension programs will respond to an in-depth questionnaire developed by the joint planning committee. This questionnaire will document the social, environmental, and economic impacts of these projects and programs (Appendix E).

In addition to this database, the required reporting databases for Cooperative Extension will be integrated into this system. Reporting will include impacts for all major programs, audience profiles, and other appropriate case studies and project summaries which can be used at the local, regional, state, and federal levels. The database will be word-searchable and both county and state faculty will have access to the data for developing summary reports for stakeholders or fulfilling reporting requirements. The database will be initiated October 1, 1999. By September 30, 2004, the data base will include all projects within the Agricultural Experiment Stations and all major Cooperative Extension plans of work. Updated reports will be provided annually for Cooperative Extension programming impacts on an ongoing basis.

This project has been integrated across CE and AES structures. Funds have been reallocated to support this project equivalent to 1.5 FTEs in planning over the past year. On-going development will require 1.75 FTEs.

Summary Data on Multi-State and Integrated Research and Extension Activities

Multi-State Activities:

In (Appendix F), a chart summarizes activities designed as multi - state efforts and indicates faculty responsible and other states involved. The total resource allocation of these efforts was \$384,250 for personnel and operating expenses. This represent 16% of our 1997 formula funds.

Integrated Research and Extension Activities

Within each goal summary above, the resources committed to integrated research/technology transfer activities are described. These resources total \$386,204 which represent 13% of our 1997 formula funds.