



NAICC Newsletter

Vol. 2 No. 2

December, 1987

PRESIDENT'S REPORT

The 1987 NAICC convention is behind us. I felt that it was a very good convention. I would have liked to have seen more people in attendance but the quality of the meeting was very good. The thing that impressed me the most was the interest level and the commitment to NAICC growth. Several people volunteered to serve on committees, as well as made suggestions. Those that I asked to serve accepted with what I sensed as a determination to contribute. This, I feel, is a good sign. With this attitude and commitment, the NAICC will grow and develop into a strong and viable organization. It then can contribute back to the members.

I see the consulting profession as a child that is just about to become an adult. It is a critical time and I hope that I can in some small way contribute to the NAICC, the profession, and to agriculture. The future of NAICC lies in its members. There is tremendous talent in the association — I hope we can use it to build with.

The following is a situational analysis of the NAICC. I would ask for input from all members. After you have read and studied it, you may wish to make comments. In our next issue, I hope to have a marketing plan (plan of action).

SITUATIONAL ANALYSIS

I. Purpose of NAICC

The National Alliance of Independent Crop Consultants was formed to serve as a professional organization for independent crop consultants to:

- Provide a national organization through which all members can unify their efforts to promote agriculture and crop consulting.
- Promote professionalism in the business of crop consulting.
- Assist in the development of broad based formal and intern training programs, for students interested in crop consulting as a profession.
- Distinguish for the public the difference between independent professional consultants and those consultants that may have a conflict of interest in advice on crop management.
- Assist in the formulation of State and National policies relating to agricultural production.
- Encourage and participate in research on crop management techniques.
- Support agricultural producers in the production of their crops by the most ecologically sound, environmentally safe and economical means.
- Support agricultural producers in the production of their crops by the most ecologically sound, environmentally safe and economical means.

- Encourage and assist crop consultants to expand their knowledge concerning crop management practices and techniques.
- Provide assistance in the formation of state and regional consultant organizations.

II Funds

- A. Association has very limited funds.
- B. By October of 1987 expect all bills to be paid but only limited operating capital.
- C. Expect income to increase but still be limited.

III. Membership

- A. Paid members (125)
- B. Members on roll (137)
- C. Sustaining members (14)
- D. Membership drive in progress
- E. Membership classes
 - 1. Member
 - 2. Provisional Member
 - 3. Affiliate Member
 - 4. Student Member
 - 5. Academic Member
 - 6. Sustaining Member
- F. Representation (by list 1986)
 - 1. By area
 - a. West 23
 - b. North 83
 - c. South 65
 - 2. By Type of Company
 - a. Sole Proprietorship 43%
 - b. Partnership 9%
 - c. Corporation 48%
 - 3. By Services Offered
 - a. Crop Scouting 41%
 - b. Contract Research & Product Demo 25%
 - c. Soil Testing/Fertility Rec. 21%
 - d. Other Services 12%
 - 4. By Size
 - a. Over 2/3 have 2 or less full time people
 - b. 10% have 100 or more full time people
 - 5. Crops Scouted Rank
 - a. Corn
 - b. Cotton
 - c. Sugar Cane
 - d. Soybeans
 - e. Milo
 - f. Vegetables
 - g. Sugar Beets
 - h. Wheat
 - i. Forages
 - j. Rice
 - k. Other Beans

IV. Product Offered by NAICC presently

- A. Information Exchange Network
 - 1. Education - Formal
 - a. At Annual Meeting
 - 2. Exchange of information
 - a. At Annual Meeting
 - b. Through Newsletter
- B. Political Influence
 - 1. Occasional Washington contact
 - 2. Interaction with other associations - not organized
- C. Reference source
 - 1. Membership listing
- D. Social
 - 1. Annual Meeting
- E. Accreditation
 - 1. Membership only

V. Membership Needs

- A. Education
 - 1. Formal
 - a. Pest Management
 - b. Business
 - c. Crop Production
 - d. Techniques
 - e. Marketing
 - f. Employee
 - g. New tools
 - 2. Informal
 - a. Business
 - b. Social
 - c. Sources of information
 - d. Resource Information
 - e. Successful programs
 - f. Idea exchange
- B. Reference Source
 - 1. Accurate reference of services performed
 - 2. Source of potential clients
 - 3. Clearing house of parties with a mutual interest
 - 4. Products/services offered to consultants
- C. Insurance
 - 1. Liability
 - 2. Health
 - 3. E & O
 - 4. Auto & etc.
- D. Promotion of Concept
 - 1. Local level - grower
 - 2. National level - influence people
 - 3. Legislative/regulatory
 - 4. Manufacturer
- E. Upgrade Profession
 - 1. Actual
 - 2. Perceived
- F. Provide Additional Tools to Profession
- G. Social

VI. Association Needs

- A. Increase membership
- B. Closer ties with State Organization
- C. Clear Rules and Regulations
- D. Open discussion and participation
- E. Educational Sources
- F. Membership Communication
- G. Communication between Related Associations
- H. Communication in Washington
- I. Communication at State Legislative level
- J. Communication with State Associations
- K. Two-way communication with Industry

VII. Market

- A. Crop Consultant
 - 1. Private unaffiliated - scouting
 - 2. Company affiliated
 - a. scouting
 - b. no product
 - 3. Research/Demonstration
 - 4. Related Service
 - a. Soil testing
 - b. Waste Management
 - c. Training
 - 5. Provisional members
- B. Sustaining Members
 - 1. Suppliers of products to growers
 - a. Chemical
 - b. Fertilizer
 - c. Equipment
 - d. Seed
 - e. Services
 - f. Other Suppliers
 - 2. Suppliers of Products to Consultants
 - a. Labs
 - b. Equipment
 - c. Microscopes
 - d. Other materials
 - e. Services
 - 3. Promotional companies/ad agencies
 - 4. Agencies
 - 5. Media
 - 6. Related fields
- C. Students
- D. Academics

VIII. Market Segments

- A. State
 - 1. Associations
- B. Professional Organizations
- C. Land Grant Colleges
- D. Industry
 - 1. Professional Organizations
 - 2. Companies
- E. Government

IX. Market Priority

- A. Private crop consultant - unaffiliated - member
- B. Company crop consultant - affiliated - no product - member
- C. Research/Demonstration - member
- D. Sustaining Member
- E. Related service member
- F. Provisional Member
- G. Academics

X. Goals

- A. Increase income
 - 1. Membership
 - 2. Sustaining membership
 - 3. Annual Meeting
- B. Increase membership
- C. Improve communication to member
- D. Offer more services
- E. Membership Directory
- F. Strong Annual Meeting
- G. Executive Secretary
- H. Improve education to members

David J. Harms
President

1987 - 1988 NAICC COMMITTEES

Membership	*Earl Raun (Neb.), Jim Ladlie (Minn.), Richard Wildman (N.Y.), Milton Ganyard (N.C.), Carl Richgels (N. J.), Curt Wilhelm (Tex.)
Steering	*Madeline Mellinger (Fla.), Lee West (Col.), Bruce Nowlin (Ok.), Danny Bradshaw (Tex.), Harold Lambert (La.), Richard Woldman (N.Y.), Ed Lloyd (N.D.), Grady Coburn (La.)
Constitution Review	
Public Relations	*Carl Richgels (N.J.), Louise Henry (Ga.), Robert Kennedy (Calif.), Clyde Sartor (Miss.), Mark Otto (Mich.), Ken Pohlman (Neb.), Charlie Mellinger (Fla.)
Needs Assessment	*Reed Green (Tex.), Bill Nissen (Ia.), Dewey Chandler (Wa.), Ray Pestle (Vt.), Kenneth Shouse (Calif.)
Demographic Survey	*Dick Jensen (La.), Richard Weston (Ka.), Doug Henry (Az.), Bill Gilbert (Col.), Harlan Smith (Va.), Jay Dee Johnson (Iowa).
Education Programs	*John Nordgaard (Minn.), Kim Polizotto (Ind.), Herb Henry (Ga.), John Kimbrough (Miss.), Stanley Nemec (Tex.), Emil Moherek (Fla.), Paul Min (Az.), David Watson (Ill.)
Convention Local Arrangements Program	Steve Barwick (Ill.), Ron Meyer (Ill.), James Roth (Mo.)
	*Charlie Mellinger (Fla.), Roberta Spitko (Mass.), Randy Van Haren (Wisc.), Robert Palmer (Ind.), James Coppedge (Tex.), Jay Dee Johnson (La.)
Exhibits	Steve West (Col.), Jim Ladlie (Minn.), Curt Wilhelm (Tex.), Daney Kepple (Tenn.)
Purchasing	Bill Dunavan (Neb.), Glenn Morin (Mass.), Roger Carter (La.), John Christian (Tex.), Jon Baldock (Wisc.), Ray Krause (Calif.), J. P. Goode (Tex.)
Certification	*Larry Emerson (Tex.), Mills Rogers (Miss.), Steve Acquafresca (Col.), Paul Groneberg (Minn.), Joe Traynor (Calif.)
Newsletter	1 person from each state - chosen by the state or appointed by NAICC membership designee
Research Coordinator	Executive Secretary
Legislative	*Earl Raun (Neb.), Louise Henry (Ga.), Madeline Mellinger (Fla.), Danny Bradshaw (Tex.), Dave Watson (Ill.)
Group Insurance	*Herb Henry (Ga.), John Christian (Tex.), Lafayette Thompson (N.C.), Dale Stukenholtz (Id.)
Promotion Items	*Bob Glodt (Tex.), Aubrey Harris (Miss.), Fred Hepler (Ia.)
Nominating	Past Presidents (By Constitution)
*Chairperson	

SURVEY ON EXTENSION - CONSULTANT RELATIONSHIPS

The results of the survey conducted by Agricultural Advisors, Inc., Yuba City, CA to which many of you responded are summarized below. (These results were presented at a symposium at the International Horticultural Congress at UC Davis.)

Of 117 extension respondents, 72% felt that consultants were beneficial in producing high quality crops with higher farming efficiency; only 10% considered consultants competitors (19% said consultants had no effect on them and 70% felt consultants were helpful).

Results were the same from consultants where 10% felt there was extreme competition between extension and the private sector. Of 83 consultants 59% felt that extension in their state welcome consultants.

By far the strongest response from consultants was that 87% of crop consultants felt that university personnel consulting privately for a fee was either unethical, degradive or competitive.

One of the comments from extension was, "Consultants appear to be increasing in numbers. Most are very competent but some appear to be exceeding their capabilities . . ."

From a consultant, "Extension and experiment station personnel should overcome their general feeling of infallibility and of being the final word. We should have annual statewide meetings where extension and especially experiment station personnel would welcome our input regarding unsolved problems."

NEWS NOTES

If the pony express broke down and you didn't get your 1987 Membership Directory (mailed in early September) please contact Louise Henry 404-769-7860.

New Product: CoHort Software, an affiliate member of NAICC, has **CoStat**, "an easy-to-use, menu-driven statistical program for PC compatibles that offers a wide variety of statistical procedures and high resolution graphs for only \$79. The program includes a spreadsheet-like editor and can import or export data to ASCII files. Data files can have up to 100 variables and up to 30,000 data points. CoStat performs simple tests and more advanced multiple regression and log linear analysis of 3 way tables. The ANOVA has 12 variations including analysis of unusual designs like split plots." For more information contact CoHort Software, PO Box 1149, Berkeley, CA 94701.

DUES CHANGE

No, there has not been an increase in dues, but there has been a change in dues deadlines and "arrears" status.

Beginning in 1988 there will be only **annual** dues - no one will be "in arrears" or billed for previous year's dues. The deadline for dues will be FEBRUARY 15. At that time the 1988 Membership Directories will be printed and mailing lists revised.

If you skip a year's membership, you can rejoin the NAICC by filling out an application form and sending a check for \$100. There will be no charges for any previous years' dues.

If you know of anyone who has dropped their membership but would like to rejoin the NAICC, have them call 404-769-7860 for an application form.

PESTICIDE USER ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Because I am representing Ag Consulting on the PUAC, this summary of its activities is prepared for the NAICC newsletter, following each of the twice-a-year meetings.

To re-cap the spring 1987 meeting, since that summary did not get published, the following are the main points of that meeting, held in Washington in early April.

1. Label Improvement Program: Pesticides to be used in chemigation must be labeled for that. Posting requirements are included.
2. EPA is considering a means of reducing the quantity of minute detail on container labels, by considering a GENERIC PESTICIDE USERS MANUAL.
3. There is increasing concern for the so-called "inert ingredients" in a formulation. Many of these "inerts" have hazard implications. EPA will be taking action to remove or reduce the use of those with toxicological or environmental hazards.
4. Seed treated with a pesticide has become a problem, with carryover stocks. PUAC suggested the possibility that such stocks might be used as carriers (made into granules or dusts) for other pesticides, or burned as a source of energy.
5. When EPA cancels a pesticide and FDA revokes tolerances for that pesticide, PUAC suggests that FDA consider a grace period for the time between revocation of a tolerance and the disappearance of the chemical from the environment.
6. Hazardous waste disposal continues to be a problem. EPA needs to consult with users, distributors and manufacturers on disposal options and indenification costs associated with such emergency suspensions as dinoseb. Sometimes there can be more of an environmental impact with an emergency suspension than there would be from the suspension of manufacture and the gradual utilization of the suspended pesticide.
7. PUAC reiterated its long-held position that a glossary of definitions involved in pesticide regulation should be produced by EPA. Terms used on one label may not mean the same on another label. Consistency and clarity in regulation are essential to users.

The fall meeting was hosted by the Ocean Spray Cranberry people, on October 5-7, 1987 at Plymouth, Massachusetts. The PUAC toured cranberry production, with pesticide problems being pointed out during the tour.

EPA/OPP personnel reported to PUAC on various projects, with PUAC offering comments, suggestions, and eventually recommendations on appropriate items.

1. "Oils and diluents" have been under discussion and consideration by EPA for several years. EPA is currently awaiting completion of some research data before taking further action. Currently it appears that re-entry intervals may be more affected than residues, when oil is used as a diluent.
2. Farm Worker Safety document is being re-drafted again. Such items as worker training, notification of product use, small farm exemption, posting of fields, and contamination of water are being considered.

3. Generic Labeling: A contractor study, and a draft policy statement by National Ag Chem Assoc. are being reviewed in this regard. Special consideration is being given to legality, training, and funding of a generic user's manual.
4. The pilot grant water survey has been completed and initial results provided to EPA's Scientific Advisory Panel. Further study will be carried out. EPA has issued 16 "HEALTH ADVISORIES," and is working with the drinking water office to establish levels on other products.
5. Endangered Species Act requirements are being implemented by EPA under the Label Improvement Program. Enforcements of label violations will be by EPA. Violation of the endangered species act will be prosecuted by the Dept. of the Interior.
6. The National Academy of Sciences Report on Regulation of Pesticides in Food is being studied carefully by EPA. It is the opinion of PUAC members that this report will not make much of an impact on the consumer, but may dramatically impact EPA. To understand this development you should read "THE DELANEY PARADOX" published by the National Academy Press, 2101 Constitution Ave. NW, Washington, DC 20418.
7. Storage and Disposal Guidelines are in the process of being rewritten at this time. (Any suggestions you care to send me will be included in the PUAC discussion on the topic at the spring meeting.)
8. IPM STIMULATION BY EPA, as a means of reducing pesticide problems is being considered. EPA, APHIS, CSRS and ARS are collaborating in developing research priorities which will move in that direction.

Particular items that you would like brought to the OPP-EPA, drop me a letter outlining that item. I'll be glad to bring it before the PUAC.

Earle Raun, Lincoln, NE

AG CONSULTANT VIEWPOINTS REPRESENTED

Many ag consultants want to know what NAICC does for them. That question usually means the individual asking it has a narrow, selfish viewpoint of the profession.

One value of NAICC has been to provide visibility for the profession to various agencies, organizations and committees. Without that visibility, the ag consultant profession would not have been considered for membership on committees or for viewpoints of special agricultural considerations.

Here are some of those groups, agencies and committees to which NAICC members have provided viewpoints, or served as ag consultants for the good of the profession. Office of Technology Assessment (Cotton Boll Weevil Eradication), Pesticide Use Advisory Committee (to EPA), Cotton Council, Chemigation Advisory Committee, IPM Advisory Committee, Corn Rootworm Research Planning, . . .

In addition, several NAICC members have been called in to consult with various universities about curriculum changes which should be made to better serve the ag consultant profession.

Members of NAICC serving in this fashion do so at personal expense, either of time or money, or both. The NAICC deserves the support of all those in the Ag Consulting profession!!

Earle Raun, Lincoln, NE

ENDANGERED SPECIES

You can order Endangered Species County-Specific Maps/Bulletins. These maps/bulletins will identify areas in counties listed on the label where certain pesticides may not be used. The bulletin will include a county map identifying the ranges of each endangered species using commonly recognized borderlines such as roads, powerlines and water bodies; pesticides, listed by active ingredient only, which jeopardize the species; and a list of the endangered species in that county protected under the Federal Endangered Species Act.

Mail your request for the map/bulletin to: ENDANGERED SPECIES TS-769C; U. S. Environmental Protection Agency; 401 M St., SW; Washington, D. C. 20460.

PESTICIDE UPDATE

The American Farm Bureau Federation (AFBF) has asked EPA Administrator Thomas to begin rulemaking for the endangered species pesticide labeling program. The AFBF and California Dept. of Food and Agriculture have provided objections to the labeling program and it is understood that USDA has provided EPA with negative comments also. John Datt, Executive Director for AFBF was quoted as saying, "the program may potentially have greater impact on pesticide use than FIFRA itself."

EPA has restricted for one year a Montana professor's research involving his unauthorized experiment with a genetically engineered bacteria. This was the strongest sanction the agency could impose. The researcher injected the bacteria, designed to combat Dutch elm fungus which has killed millions of trees over the past 50 years, into elm trees. The National Institute of Health may convene a panel to determine if the researcher violated NIH's recombinant DN research guidelines. (Chemical Regulation Reporter, Vol. II, No. 22).

In an August 11 press release, Velsicol said it sought an agreement with EPA "to voluntarily amend its product labels and restrict termite use of heptachlor and chlordane to exterior applications because of mounting cost of going through prolonged IPE proceedings and customer concerns about negative publicity. Under the agreement, indoor uses of heptachlor and chlordane have ended permanently, but, depending on study results, the products could be back on the market for use outside a house or structure. Some EPA officials doubt that the company will conduct the tests, described by EP as having to include "at least 100 homes for some applications and at least 50 homes for other uses. (Pesticide & Toxic Chemical News, Vol. 15, No. 40)

Mobay Chemical Corporation does not plan to continue to produce and market demeton (Systox) insecticide in the U.S.

EPA has proposed a \$1,200,000 flat registration fee for each pesticide active ingredient that has more than \$10,000,000 annual revenues according to a draft proposal that is part of the agency's response to FIFRA amendment questions from Senator Leahy (D-Vt.). The fee for pesticides with less than \$10,000,000 annual revenues would be 2.2% of the average annual revenue for three years. This scheme is designed to pay \$150,000,000 of a \$260,000,000 cost of a nine-year program to reregister 685-700 pesticides that were registered before November 1, 1984. According to the proposal, 85 pesticides have annual revenues greater than \$10,000,000 and 600 have revenues that are less. (Pesticides & Toxic Chemical News Vol. 15, No. 35).

The U.S. Fourth District Court of Appeals upheld a U. S. District Court of Maryland ruling that struck down two Maryland **county** ordinances that would have required commercial pesticide applicators to post signs on property where pesticides are applied. Meanwhile, there is discussion and testimony in the House Agriculture Department Operations, Research and Foreign Agriculture Subcommittee concerning what role, if any, political subdivisions below the state level should have in the regulations of pesticides. (Chemical Regulation Reporter Vol. 11, No. 12).

Dichlorvos, an insecticide and anthelmintic sold under nearly 30 tradenames, was found to be a carcinogen in a two-year animal bioassay peer reviewed by the National Toxicology Program's Board of Scientific Counselors in Research Triangle Park, N.C. (Pesticide & Toxic Chemical News, Vol. 15, No. 37).

The FIFRA Scientific Advisory Panel (SAP) has recommended that 2, 4-D should be a category "D" carcinogen (not classifiable as to carcinogenicity). EPA has proposed an interim category "C" classification (possible human carcinogen, limited evidence of carcinogenicity in the absence of human data) and the 2, 4-D industry task force recommended category "E" (inadequate evidence). (Pesticide & Toxic Chemical News Vol. 15, No. 35).

1988 NAICC OFFICERS (EXECUTIVE BOARD)

President: Dave Harms (IL); President-Elect: Dr. Jim Ladlie* (MI); Secretary/Treasurer: Bill Gilbert *(CO); Director ('88): Dan Bradshaw (TX); Director ('89): David Jameson* (WA); Director: (Past-President): Dr. Dick Kinzer (TX).

*Newly elected

**National Alliance of
Independent Crop Consultants**



2180 Elder Rd • Bishop, GA 30621

