PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

The NAICC represents "The Voice of the Professional Crop Consultant". What does that mean to you? What does this mean to someone you may be persuading to become a member?

The NAICC is having a membership drive which we all should be supporting as members. All of us know people who should and would benefit from membership in the NAICC. To recruit new members will require, on all our parts, some salesmanship and friendly persuasion. But, are you prepared when a new prospect asks - Why should I become a member?

We often do not have an immediate response. I feel the NAICC may offer different things to each of us, though there are some common interests served by being part of an organization such as the NAICC. The following are a few that come to mind:

* Have one voice for the profession - a focus. A mass of people with a common voice speaks louder and is heard further than a number of voices that speak as individuals.

* Offers professional ethical standards.

* Offers a base from which to qualify individuals as consultants to maintain a standard of professionalism. This is a major project that has been undertaken at this time on a national and state level.

* Allows individuals of common interest to meet and share experiences. This alone is worth your membership in the NAICC.

These are but a few of the values associated with being a part of the NAICC. I would like each of you to give some thought to the following questions:

- Why are you a member of the NAICC?
- What has the NAICC done for you since you have become a member?

We need your input. Fill out the enclosed questionnaire and return it to:

Garry W. Raymond
Executive Vice President
NAICC
401 Liberty Drive
Bolingbrook, IL 60439

Your comments will then be passed on to others through the newsletter. We should all be able to list numerous reasons when asked by a prospective member "What are the benefits of being a member of the NAICC?"

I look forward to your comments.

James S. Ladlie, Ph.D.
NAICC President
CASE STUDIES

Have you ever heard the question, how do your services pay for themselves? Many times it is simply in the matter of assurance on what is happening in the field. In other cases it is simply keeping tabs on some of the variables which influence crop quality. And we have all experienced those instances where it's a very clear cut savings on chemical use. In 1988, an asparagus grower subscribed to our aphid monitoring service for the first time. He was being cajoled to sign up at the beginning of the summer for a flat 3 spray program which a particular company would then apply at fixed intervals during the summer. The cost of this calendar program, and the consequential benefit of relying upon our scouting service is detailed in the next paragraph.

Case scenario: A new client which we worked with this year had 70 acres of asparagus. The spray program suggested by his chemical supplier was a 3 spray program. With this program, assuming $15.00 per acre cost/spray, his total costs in 1988 would have been $3150. With monitoring on this acreage 5 visits were necessary from early July through mid-September. Our recommendations were one full acreage spray in mid-July and a partial acreage spray in mid-September. The total cost of this program including insecticide application, application costs and monitoring was $2020. In this situation, we were able to save the grower $1130 for the season which is equal to $16.14 per acre savings. Considering his investment in our monitoring of $6.35 per acre, this represents a 154% return on his investment.

Second case scenario on nitrogen: A fertilizer nitrogen use study was done by Agrimanagement on 7 years of data in fertilizing hop yards of the Yakima Valley. From that study, the average annual application of nitrogen was determined to be 150 lbs. of N per acre. However, the mean rate used arbitrarily across the valley would have resulted in one out of three hop yards being under-fertilized and suffering an estimated yield reduction of 154 lbs/ac (approximately $175 value/ac) another one out of two yards would have been over- fertilized at an average cost of $19/ac of excess N. Following this line of analysis, the company's calculations showed that a soil testing program had an expected benefit to cost ratio of as much as 7 to 1 (in effect, the expected benefit of the soil and plant tissue monitoring program for nitrogen management was $77 per acre based on the statistical probability of either saving fertilizer or getting better yields).

Submitted by,
Don Jameson, Agronomist
Agrimanagement, Inc.

EFFECTIVE NEMATODE MANAGEMENT REQUIRES PROPER SAMPLING AND TESTING

The world of the plant parasitic nematode is a dark and mysterious domain. For the crop consultant, trying to manage these beasts can be an equally mysterious undertaking. Nematodes exist with a crop, many times without producing visible symptoms of stress until the harvest exposes a poor yield. At other times nematodes can predispose a crop to disease or yield loss due to marginal crop management. The result is the same. Poor yields
are blamed on other factors and the management changes made to correct the "problem" are ineffective.

Nematode assay is a valuable tool for anyone trying to identify those sources of stress that limit an economic return on the investment made in a crop. Testing procedures have been available for many years, but until recently a lack of thresholds for nematodes, as well as a poor understanding of how to manage them, has inhibited their use by growers and consultants.

Enough is known these days to make some management decisions for a crop based on nematode assays. Knowing what type of nematode is present, and in what numbers, can guide the decisions of which rotation to use, the variety to plant, planting date and density. Perhaps more importantly this information will allow adjustments to be made in the fertility and overall pest management programs. For example, on corn; at some level of nematode infestation, the use of a insecticide-nematicide is warranted to minimize their effect in association with a sub-economic level of corn rootworm. The decision to use a foliar feeding program might be made where nematodes are present in high numbers. The starting point for making these stress management decisions must be a reliable test for both fertility and nematodes.

I have found that it pays to test fields in anticipation of a problem rather than wait until stress symptoms or yield suppression occurs. This allows you to use the winter months to develop management strategies for each field. It may not be necessary to sample a field during each crop in the rotation; however, this could be helpful in establishing what nematode types are present and which crop in the rotation is at greatest risk. The time and depth of sampling for plant parasitic nematodes can vary greatly depending on the crop sampled and nematode present, but for the average situation the following guidelines can be used.

1. Sampling should coincide with the crop at its peak in vegetative growth. This is usually in August for full season crops such as corn or soybeans. Short season crops such as snapbeans and peas should be sampled just prior to harvest.

2. If possible, divide each field up into areas based on crop performance. Avoid sampling in areas of severely stressed plants. Nematode populations will be greatest on the fringes of stressed areas, so this is the best place to sample when trouble shooting a field for nematode damage. At least one additional sample should be taken from the remainder of the field for use as a comparison. Your more important management decisions will be based on the results of this second sample because it will usually represent the largest share of the field.

3. Each sample should be composed of a minimum of 25 soil plus roots subsamples. Expose the root zone using a shovel, to a depth of 4-10 inches and grab soil and roots together. Avoid sampling the top 1-3 inches of soil, particularly on dry soils. Thorough mixing is very important, as few testing labs will make much effort to do so. Once the sample is mixed, about
one pint of it can be submitted for testing. A good sample consists of about 70% soil and 30% roots. Ample root quantities are required for testing for the presence of root lesion nematodes, a type which feeds both inside of the roots and out. This is one of the most common nematode types in America.

4. Plastic sample bags must be used to avoid drying of the sample and the samples should be kept cool (38-45 degrees F) until submitted for processing. Label the bag as follows:

   Grower name
   Field and section ID
   Crop sampled
   Date sampled
   Crops in rotation

The above information is helpful for the diagnostician, in making an assessment of the types and population of nematodes present.

What is the cost for nematode testing?

A recent survey of private testing labs indicates that a soil assay or root assay will run around $16.00 per sample and $30.00 for a complete test. Costs for a soil assay range from $6.50 to $30.00 per sample.

What do you get for your money?

Results are generally reported as nematode numbers per 100cc of soil and per gram of dry root. Nematodes are identified to genus and a species diagnosis will usually cost more. Management recommendations are normally included with each report.

Private Nematode Testing Laboratories:

A & L Agricultural Labs
3505 Conestoga Dr.
Fort Wayne, IN 46808-4413
219-483-4759

Agri-Growth Research, Inc.
RR1, Box 33
Hollendale, MN 56045
507-889-4371

Brookside Farm Laboratory
308 S. Main St.
New Knoxville, OH 45871
419-753-2448

New England Fruit Consultants
4 Denton St, Box J
Lake Pleasant, MA 01347
413-429-4782

Peninsu-Lab
23976 NE Newellhurst Ct.
P.O. Box 3000
Kingston, WA 98346
206-297-3295

Pest Pros Inc.
P.O. Box 188
Plainfield, WI 54966
715-335-4046

Clyde Shields Entomological Services
420 West Main St.
Brawley, CA 92227
619-344-0706

Triple S Labs, Inc.
Box 678
Loveland, CO 80539-0678
303-667-5671

List continued on next page.
Waters Agricultural Lab
Newton Hwy.
P.O. Box 382
Camilla, GA 31730
912-336-7216

State Laboratories

Many states offer nematode testing on a commercial basis. See your local extension agent for details.

Submitted by,
Randy Van Haren, Entomologist
Pest Pros Inc.

This month we welcome 5 new members to the National Alliance of Independent Crop Consultants, they are:

Mr. Alfred J. Alicandro
AgrAssistance
5118 N. Huron St., P.O. Box 266
North Rose, NY 14516
Office Phone: 1-716-721-2533
Home Phone: 1-315-587-2789
Membership Type: Voting
Services Offered: Crop production consulting: pest management, fertility, cultural practices.
Crops: Orchard crops (apples, pears, stone fruits), potatoes, onions, cabbage.

Mr. Michael D. Hutter
Northern Agricultural Management
2208 23rd St. SW
Minot, ND 58701
Office Phone: 1-701-268-4216
Home Phone: 1-701-838-1930
Membership Type: Voting
Services Offered: Entomology, growth regulators (PGR), soil tests, herbicide recommendations.
Crops: Cotton, corn, grain sorghum, sunflowers, vegetables.

Dr. Marvin D. Kauffman
Soil Scientist
35178 Balboa Pl. S.E.
Albany, OR 97321
Office Phone: 1-503-926-8973
Home Phone: 1-503-926-8973
Membership Type: Voting
Services Offered: Soil fertility, plant nutrition, irrigation monitoring, soil compaction and soil tilth.
Crops: Row crops, hops, mint, seed crops, cereals and ornamentals.

Mr. Mark R. Spaur
High Plains Agronomics, Inc.
1011 16th Street
Gothenburg, NE 69138
Office Phone: 1-308-537-3887
Home Phone: 1-308-537-3887
Membership Type: Voting
Services Offered: Soil fertility and crop nutrition, insect pest management, irrigation scheduling, weed science, cultural practices and tillage, plant disease.
Crops: Corn, soybeans, popcorn, alfalfa, wheat.

Welcome
CROP CONSULTANT'S ALLIANCE BUILDING CAMPAIGN

Already 17 members have recommended 111 prospects from 26 different states, and 12 of these have now applied for membership. If this rate of progress continues, a new all-time membership record can be achieved for 1989.

Alliance Building Consultants participating to date include: Jeff Alicandro, NY; Steven Acquafresca, CO; Dan Bradshaw, TX; Bill Craig, IL; Bill Gilbert, CO; Don Jameson, WA; Harold Lambert, IA; James Ladlie, MN; Earl Miller, ND; Bill Nissen, IA; Mark Otto, MI; Earle Raun, NE; Carl Richgels, NJ; B. B. Singh, NE; Roberta Spitko, MA; Dan Thompson, WA; and Ivan Wikner, IA.

So far Dan Bradshaw has earned a free 1989 NAICC Convention registration. Several others are getting close. A free registration is awarded to any participant in the Alliance Builders Campaign who signs up at least three new members.

CERTIFICATION

As you are well aware the NAICC is actively researching the possibility of a national certification program for crop consultants. Following are some of the highlights from a speech given recently by President-Elect Dan Bradshaw on the subject. Part one will appear in this issue and part two will be printed in next month's issue.

PROFESSIONAL CERTIFICATION OF INDEPENDENT AGRICULTURAL CONSULTANTS

It is a distinct pleasure for me to have the chance to visit with you here today on a subject that has been getting a lot of interest across the nation recently. That is on the professional Certification of Independent Agricultural Consultants. Since I first became seriously interested in professional self-certification of agricultural consultants in early 1985, a lot of interest has been expressed to me, especially lately, from both individuals and organizations from states all across the nation.

Before we go any further we probably need to consider some definitions. Basically, there are two types of "professional" regulation, licensing and self-certification. First before we consider the two types of regulation, we must define professional. In the broadest sense a professional is one who undertakes an activity for financial gain. Under this definition anyone who has a job is a professional.

In a narrower sense a professional is a person who relies on higher education or special ability to earn a living. This definition might include many occupations; policemen, plumbers, football players, insurance salespersons, and schoolteachers to name a few. Many individuals in these occupations or under this definition of professional are regulated by licensing. Their duties are fairly easily defined and structured. Therefore, they can be regulated by licensing rules that might be promulgated by a state or state agency.

When used in the context of "professional self-regulation or self-certification," however, "professional" has traditionally referred to a more limited class of
CERTIFICATION (cont.)

individuals; physicians, lawyers, veterinarians, CPA's and others in the so-called learned professions. In this strict sense according to Bierig in the American Bar Association Journal, a professional is a person who applies advanced training in a complex, systematic discipline to meet the needs of individuals of the general public. This definition distinguishes the professional from the craftsman, the athlete, and the salesperson, none of whom are trained in a complex, systematic theory. At the same time, it differentiates the professional from the philosopher, the academician, and the scientist—none of whom apply their scholarship to the meeting of individual needs.

The fact that a professional serves people by bringing highly specialized training to bear on their problem lies at the heart of professional self-certification. Lay persons lack the specialized training of professionals. They cannot fully understand what professionals do and therefore cannot evaluate the judgements that professional must make. Lay persons must then trust professionals to make decisions in their best interest.

At an individual level, the necessity for this trust is the basis for the physician-patient and the lawyer-client relationships. At a group level, the necessity for trust is the foundation of professional self-certification. If lay persons cannot fully understand the practices of professionals, then the professions themselves must set standards that will serve the public interest. If lay persons cannot effectively evaluate the qualifications of professionals, then the professionals themselves should set standards of education, experience, and performance for those who choose to practice in their profession. The professionals themselves should determine by peer review questions of ethics and whether individual decisions were made in order to benefit the patient or client.

Whether we are talking about professional self-regulation for doctors, lawyers, veterinarians or whatever other group, these self-certification programs all have the same basic purposes: to establish a basic level of competence and to enhance the profession by enhancing the professional level of the members. I feel that we as agricultural consultants are where veterinarians were 50 or 75 years ago when they were still commonly called "Horse Doctors". Plants, especially agricultural plants are the Rodney Dangerfields of the biological world. There can be a lot of emotion generated over a dog or a horse, but only a few of us can get emotional over a cotton plant or a rice plant. But that does not lessen the importance of plants. Neither does it lessen the importance of those who deal with the health and well being of these plants or the method or system in which they are grown. As agricultural entomologists, your primary function really is to protect plants and help them produce. What good is it to kill boll weevils if there is no cotton? Plants are at the center of all agriculture!

I guess one thing that has come with this interest on certification is some confusion as to the difference between
certification and licensing. Simply stated, self-certification is a voluntary program designed and mainly administered by a group of professionals and their peers. Licensing is a mandatory program run by a governmental entity. Licensing carries the force of law. Certification has to rely on the character and dedication of the professionals themselves for its strength and credibility. The effect of licensing is immediate but not as forceful as certification. Certification takes longer to build than licensing, but when built is much more substantial as it is supported from within rather than being propped up with outside forces as with licensing. Doctors, for example, would not have gained the stature that they now experience if they did not have Board certification to take them beyond the basic level of competence necessary for issuance of a license.

Because of EPA's call for state regulation of those who recommend the use of pesticides and because of some rather weird and off the wall regulations drafted by some states, ARPE has drafted a PROPOSED MODEL LEGISLATION for PEST MANAGEMENT CONSULTING. The purpose of this proposal is: "To provide model legislation to the States that wish to regulate the activities of professional consultants involved in FIFRA related activities."

At the present time, about 10 states have licensing laws for those that recommend the use of pesticides.

One thing that all of the licensing programs that I have seen have in common is that they treat agricultural consultants as a trade to be regulated rather than a profession. They all consider the only function of agricultural consultants to be in the field of pest management and the use of agricultural chemicals. You know as well as I that the scope of activities of agricultural consultants extend far beyond pest management. In a fast survey of the NAICC directory that I did just before this meeting, I found that between 80% and 90% of NAICC members offer services other than pest management or agricultural chemical work.

I venture to say that most, if not all, of you here are really in the plant production and protection business rather than in the pest management business. There is a difference! Think about that! I have said it in Texas without being lynched so I will take my chances here. Fellows, despite what you might have been taught in college, agriculture does not revolve around insects!! Plants are really at the center of it all!

Things such as soil fertility, variety recommendations, soil conservation, moisture management, integrated crop management and many more are all very important parts of our profession. These and many more are the areas that have the most potential for growth. We should take the lead in this area not covered by pest management consulting by developing our own basic standards on education, experience, performance and ethics. The states and EPA are only concerned with regulating the use of pesticides and perhaps at sometime in the near future the use of fertilizers.
TELL YOUR SIDE OF THE STORY

NAICC INPUT OPPORTUNITY

Your Name__________________________

Responses will be placed in the NAICC newsletter and those that send in their comments will receive a NAICC decal. Respond to the questions below, fold, seal, stamp and mail.

Why are you a member of the NAICC?

What has the NAICC done for you since you have become a member?

NAICC CONVENTION ASSISTANCE

Please list your contacts for:
(Name, address, phone, etc...)

Potential meal/entertainment sponsors.

Potential exhibitors.
CERTIFICATION (cont.)

It is up to us to be concerned with and taking action on developing our profession. As I see it, this can best be accomplished by dedicated effort by consultants themselves and one of the steps is developing a program of self-certification.

With the increasing sophistication and complexity of agriculture along with the need for increased efficiency, agricultural consultants will have a greater role to play in the future. The scientist and other technical experts are becoming more and more specialized. This was really brought home with the talks on new developments in biotechnology that were discussed at the NAICC meeting last November. Someone is going to be needed to transfer all this explosion in information and technology into workable systems for each different farm and field situation. Who will perform this function? The University or company research scientist? No, they are specialists and as such, see and understand only a small part of the overall picture. As John Naisbitt said in Megatrends "We are moving from the specialist who is soon obsolete to the generalist who can adapt." Okay, then perhaps the company rep who is selling whatever product or service that might be concerned? Again, no. He is still a specialist and furthermore he is biased. His allegiance must be to his employer first rather than to the farmer. Then perhaps the county extension agent? No, or at least no more than at today's level, and probably less because of decreased funding and an increase in other duties in the extension service.

This leaves us or at least the future generations of Agricultural Consultants to perform these functions of information and technology transfer. We must start today to build our profession to a worthy one to leave to the young people yet to follow us.

(to be continued next month)

Presentation to the 15th annual meeting of the Mississippi Agricultural Consultants Association on February 10, 1988 at Jackson, Mississippi by Dan E. Bradshaw, CPAg/CS; Director - Texas Registry of Certified Professional Agricultural Consultants; CROP AID Agricultural Consultants, El Campo, Texas.

CLIENT TESTIMONIES

One of the steps of the membership approval process is to request the clients (listed on the membership application) to complete and return a reference form. The 1989 membership committee developed the form and so far it has been averaging a 80% return rate. In the next several issues of the newsletter we thought that it would be interesting to print some of the clients' comments.

10. Why did you choose to hire a crop consultant?

Primarily because he had a service to sell and not chemicals & fertilizer.

I feel that I do not have the time to spend myself monitoring crops. I also raise specialty crops and feel I do not know enough about disease and insects to do it myself.
He has a higher level of expertise in regard to insects & diseases. His recommendations allow us to obtain better control at lower cost.

I needed a professional that could interpret insect pressures on cotton & grain sorghum. [Name] is most competent in his consulting business. He is thorough and knowledgeable in his work, and his recommendations are sound and conservative.

For their expertise in a specialized field.

Take the guesswork out of my operation.

To better target herbicide and pesticide usage. Economize fertilizer usage.

I personally have a very high regard for his knowledge.

(The) Consultants personal experience in areas to make better use of dollars of investment in crops.

Best qualified.

To get best results from fertilizer.

More accurate information than people selling other things also.

Professional advice.

We feel that in order to stay competitive we can no longer be "Jacks of all Trades". We feel insect fertility management requires the services of professionals. Consultants offer the small & mid sized operation the results that large firms enjoy with "in house" specialists.

To improve yields and cut down on Chemicals, Pesticides, and Fertilizer costs.

We are always looking for ways to increase profitable productivity. My feeling has always been you better get that information from someone that's not selling a product.

Two heads are better than one. Also, in increasingly specialized times, I'm convinced that I need to rely on other people with greater expertise.

IN THE NEWS

Dr. H. Charles Mellinger from Glades Crop Care, Inc. had an article published in the February 1989 issue of Ag Consultant Magazine. The article was titled "Nemesis of South Florida vegetables: sweet potato whitefly". The article emphasized the major problems with the whitefly and highlighted a monitoring technique. Also, Dr. Mellinger was an invited speaker at the National Sweet Corn Breeders Association meeting on November 18, 1988. His talk was entitled "Pest Management of Sweet Corn", and was very well received by those in attendance.

Dr. James S. Ladlie from Agri-Growth Research, Inc. was featured in an article written by Gil Gullickson entitled "On the herbicide carryover watch". The article was printed in the March 14, 1989 issue of the Wallace Farmer Magazine. Dr. Ladlie explained the process of herbicide breakdown and the effect that the drought has on the process.
IN THE NEWS (cont.)

Mr. Harold C. Lambert from Lambert Agricultural Consulting, Inc. was featured in the "Ask The Consultant" column in the March/April 1989 issue of Dealer Progress Magazine. Mr. Lambert addressed the overall question "How can I help soils and profits with crop rotation?"

FREE SUBSCRIPTION

Enclosed in this newsletter is a card entitling you to a free subscription to Dealer Progress Magazine. If you wish to be placed on their mailing list just complete the card and drop it in the mail.

LOGO USAGE

Also enclosed in this newsletter is a page of NAICC Logo proofs. If you are a member you are authorized to use the NAICC Logo on your letterhead, business cards, etc... We would like to establish a file of sample logo usage. Please send Garry Raymond any examples of how you are (or will be) using the NAICC Logo.

1989 NAICC Convention

Plans are well underway for the 1989 NAICC Convention. Please mark the dates of Monday, November 6 through Wednesday, November 8, 1989 in your calendar. We will be meeting at the Tropicana Hotel in Las Vegas, Nevada. This year we are setting aside time on Monday afternoon for the committees to meet. We can all be proud of the progress that the committees are making this year.

We need your help. Last year the NAICC was very fortunate to have many corporate friends assist us in holding down the registration costs by sponsoring meal/entertainment functions and by participating as exhibitors. This year it is our goal to increase this type of involvement. Please take a few minutes to jot down your contacts on the enclosed return form and mail to Garry, he will be sure that the appropriate committee receives the information.

The theme of this year's convention is "Challenge to Grow".

The Convention Program and the Convention Exhibit Committees are hard at work putting the preliminary details together. The committee members would sincerely appreciate any suggestions that you have. Please feel free to get in touch with them.

The members of the committees are listed below.

PROGRAM

Steven Acquafresca (CO)
Brad Buchanan (IA) - Chairperson
Loarn Buc1 (KS)
James Coppedge (TX)
Gier Friisoe (NE)
Milton Ganyard (NC)
Charles Mellinger (FL)
Bruce Nowlin (OK)
Ivan Wikner (IA)

EXHIBITS

James Coppedge (TX)
John Gruber (OH) - Chairperson
Beck Johnson (OK)
Harold Lambert (LA)
Y. G. Reddy (NE)
1989 NAICC OFFICERS

Dr. James S. Ladlie  
President  
Agri-Growth Research  
RR 1, Box 33  
Hollandale, MN 56045  
507-889-4371

Mr. Dan E. Bradshaw  
President Elect  
Crop Aid  
2806 Western Acres  
El Campo, TX 77437  
409-543-3416

Ms. Madeline Mellinger  
Secretary  
Glades Crop Care  
949 Turner Quay  
Jupiter, FL 33458  
407-746-3740

Mr. Harold C. Lambert  
Treasurer  
Lambert Ag. Consulting  
P.O. Box 947, Hwy 418  
Innis, LA 70747  
504-492-2790

Mr. David J. Harms  
Past President  
Crop Pro-Tech  
33 W. Bailey Road  
Naperville, IL 60565  
312-420-2999

Mr. Donald L. Jameson  
Director  
Agrimagement  
P.O. Box 583  
Yakima, WA 98907  
509-453-4851

Mr. Bruce E. Nowlin  
Director  
Crop-Guard, Inc.  
P.O. Box 238  
Eakly, OK 73038  
405-797-3213

Mr. Garry W. Raymond  
Exec. Vice President  
NAICC  
401 Liberty Drive  
Bolingbrook, IL 60439  
312-739-0818

NEXT ISSUE TOPICS

More Grower Comments  
More Excerpts from Dan Bradshaw's Talk to the MS Association  
Alliance Builders Update  
More 1989 Convention Information  
Answers to the enclosed survey  
Preliminary results of the 1989 Demographic Survey

April Showers!