


900  
P&P  
ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCE

Same letter sent to John D. Rockefeller IV

Trustees

1974

October 1, 1976

Dear Maurice:

I am enclosing the minutes of the Trustee-Staff Program Committee. Please review and edit and return to me along with other thoughts on any aspect of the Quality of the Environment Program. Was the format satisfactory, and do you feel the meeting was worthwhile? (We valued it highly!)

I will report the results of all the Program Committees at the December meeting.

Very best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

John H. Knowles, M.D.

Mr. Maurice Strong  
Petro-Canada  
P. O. Box 2844  
Calgary, Alberta T2P 2M7  
CANADA

JHK:aym  
Enclosure

INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

FROM: RWR

DATE: September 28, 1976

TO:

JHK		

COMMENTS:

SUBJECT:

Minutes of Quality of the Environment Program Committee Meeting, September 9, 1976 Involving Trustee Participation

I am attaching the totally revised minutes of the September 9th Quality of the Environment Program Committee Meeting. As you know, various of us took scattered notes of that meeting. GHT brought them together in a preliminary document which I passed on to you last week. Since that time, however, we have been able to obtain individual comments and assistance in drafting the attached final document.

I hope you find these of interest and value. I feel they completely reflect the essence of the meeting, its accomplishments and now a formal part of our committee record.

I understand that you have mailed a copy of them with a covering letter to Jay Rockefeller. We have given them no independent circulation. Perhaps you would like to send them to Maurice Strong with your own covering letter.

*RWR*  
R.W. R.

/mcs  
Attachment

*and began feel the meeting was worthwhile. Was the format satisfactory? How much are attaching the minutes!*

MSK -

Dear Jay <sup>and</sup> Maurice:

I am enclosing the minutes of the Trustee - S.E.H. Program Committee. Please review and edit and return to me along with any other thoughts you may have about the Quality of Environment Program. I will report the results of all the Program Committee at the Dec. meeting. H.B.W. 9/11/76

Quality of the Environment Program Committee Meeting #29

(Special meeting with Trustee participation)

September 9, 1976

9:30 - 11:30

Minutes

Present were: Trustees - Jay Rockefeller and Maurice Strong  
Committee members - SW, RWR, JEB, MMK, PRJ, GSH, JJM and GHT  
Other Officers - JHK, ACB, LDS, JZM, MZW and JS

I. Introduction

RWR and JHK briefly reviewed the purpose of the interdisciplinary program committees. It was pointed out that the committees bring perspectives to the proposal review process which may not be represented by the division staff. Examples were given of how this interdisciplinary approach has strengthened proposals or led to declinations. The program committees are an important component of the Foundation's system of checks and balances.

SW provided a brief historical review of the QE program noting its establishment in 1969, its current budget guideline of about \$2.8 million and its interaction with other programs such as COH, CIR and P&H.

II. Committee Structure and Function

RWR introduced all participants and explained their involvement with the QE committee. Agenda and minutes of previous meetings were reviewed as examples of how the committee functions.

Mr. Rockefeller inquired concerning:

- the cost/benefit ratio of the interdisciplinary committee process,
- the mechanisms by which the committee assures that the proposals it recommends will have an impact on public policy,
- in light of this extensive review process, the proper division of Trustee time between review of specific docket items and consideration of broader program objectives and policies.

In response officers indicated that:

- the benefits of program committees far outweigh the costs in staff time (luncheon meetings about once a month),
- concern for the impact on public policy starts with each officer and continues throughout the review process with committee meetings and docket conferences often focusing on this issue,
- Trustee review and questioning of specific items is helpful and contributes to improved performance.



Mr. Strong inquired concerning the criteria used in determining what items are brought to the committee. First, Officers indicated that items which are officer initiated are naturally reviewed by the committee. Unsolicited proposals are initially screened by two or three officers to determine if they meet stated program objectives. If they do, appropriate officers undertake an intensive review usually involving site visits. If this review indicates that specific program objectives will be addressed and that other guidelines related to budget, staffing and administration are met, the item is presented to the committee.

Messrs. Rockefeller and Strong both felt that Trustee questioning of specific docket items often reflected a misunderstanding of the presentation rather than an inherent weakness in the proposed projects.

#### III&IV. Program Statement and Review of Program Objectives

The objectives of the QE program were briefly reviewed and a written summary of progress made in meeting these objectives was distributed.

#### V. Recommendations

The committee discussed the following recommendations for changes in QE program objectives:

- 1) that the "environmental perceptions" objective no longer be formally stated but addressed in conjunction with other objectives,
- 2) that a new stated objective be to assist in the development of environmentally sound and economically rational strategies for natural resources management,
- 3) that a new stated objective be to encourage the objective analysis and assessment of U.S. environmental policy including the development of recommendations for improvement of that policy.

There was general endorsement of recommendations 1 and 2 with the committee agreeing that research on environmental perceptions should be incorporated in projects also addressing other program objectives and that greater program emphasis should be placed on natural resources management. Recommendation 3 was not endorsed with some committee members suggesting that it was more important for the Foundation to be at the forefront in development of new environmental policies rather than evaluating existing policies.

At the invitation of the committee, Messrs. Strong and Rockefeller commented on important environmental issues and problems that they felt the RF might effectively address.

Mr. Strong first noted that it is important that environmental considerations be included in the decision making process of all RF programs not just QE. He also felt there was no need for any QE objective to have a strictly U.S. focus and hoped that the program could become more responsive to international requests. His two major points were:

- The environmental movement should have a greater influence on growth processes. New environmentally sound strategies for sustained growth need to be developed. Environmental advocates are needed to direct growth in these new directions. Research is needed on how and where growth policies can be influenced.
- Some mechanism needs to be developed that can transform continued public support for the environmental movement into financial support for key environmental organizations. Such groups are needed to keep the movement progressive, to create awareness of important issues and to assist in translating an improved understanding of environmental issues into new public policies. He suggested a "United Fund" type of umbrella organization that would receive public financial support as a means of funding a variety of environmental organizations which would be evaluated and selected on their merits.

Mr. Rockefeller noted the importance of continuing to support the generation of basic knowledge concerning specific environmental problems and he later noted waste reclamation and land use management as important problem areas. However, he also felt there was need to examine environmental issues from a larger more comprehensive perspective. In this regard he encouraged

- a follow up to the Hudson Basin Project,
- greater emphasis on development of a rational U.S. energy policy,
- continued concern for transferring information generated by RF supported research into public policy making processes.

Both Messrs. Rockefeller and Strong reiterated their feeling that the RF should "think big", again mentioning the energy problem and serious issues surrounding growth.