California is at it Again
More pesticide restrictions

Again, California pesticide regulations have been sprayed out over the political landscape as the "California Food Safety Act of 1990", (technically the Environmental Protection Act) is headed for the November ballot. Under this initiative apparently all pesticides will undergo updated tolerance requirements. Any pesticide shown to cause possible cancer or reproductive problems during early toxicity studies will automatically be banned. This factor completely dispenses with the well established and scientifically accepted risk assessment process currently used. Put another way, a pesticide can be banned if one test shows a cancer result at any dose without proceeding to the next step which would assess the potential risk on a practical basis.

Registrants of pesticides not able to meet the deadlines for mandated testing (whether it be due to monetary or EPA limitations) will be left with a product with zero tolerance. Additionally, no pesticide containing an inert ingredient considered known to the State to cause cancer or reproductive harm shall be registered for food after two years of the initiative's effective date. This aspect of the Act may affect as many as 75% of current pesticide products. Also, no shipments of commodities from other states or countries will be accepted if any banned substance is detected.

Other factors such as extending quarantine periods, drifting of enforcement responsibilities between the California Department of Food and Agriculture, Department of Health Services and Industrial Relations and Health, and a potential $2500.00 per day in fines provision are also included in the initiative.

A partial list of some commonly used pesticides thought to be in jeopardy under this initiative includes, Ailiet, Atrazine, Benomyli, Bromoxygen, Captan, Chlorothalonil, 1,3-D, Dicofol, Glyphosate, Mancozeb, Maneb, Parquat, Parathion and Trifluralin.

A list of inert ingredients likely to be affected includes benzene, ETU, formaldehyde, silica, heavy metals, methyl chloride, methyl oxide and ethylene oxide.

A study conducted by an independent consulting

President's Message

The deadline is here for another newsletter and once again we are faced with an over abundance of information. I find it extremely difficult to write and convey to the membership all the things that are happening that impact our profession.

SP 53, the ASCS cost-sharing Integrated Crop Management demonstration project, is still causing problems in a number of states. In others it is providing an opportunity to document the positive effects of what we have been doing all along.

This program provided impetus to the renewed push for government funding for the Extension service to implement IPM programs. Such programs could be desirable in research and education, but unless we exercise proper vigilance, the net result could be government subsidized competition to our members. The position adopted by your Board is that programs such as this should not be established as long-term government subsidies as has been the case all too often in the past. If you are not familiar with what's happening in your state, I urge you to find out. Feel free to contact me, another Board member or a person on the Governmental Affairs Committee if you need more information.

Jim Ladlie, Deanna Marquart and I attended the REAP organizational meeting, as did Dave Watson representing ASAC and Bob Palmer who attended on behalf of ARCPACS. Many other scientific societies and groups were represented also. The other groups were concerned, as we have been for some time, about the small amount of input that scientifically based agriculture has had in the areas of agricultural policy. Recognition of agricultural professionals by a certification program was a main topic of discussion. But it looks like there might be a number of other areas where cooperation between disciplines might also be possible.

Many of the professional societies and organizations representing general practitioners and professionals in agriculture are, for the first time, cooperating on issues that will affect agriculture and society, not just our own respective memberships.

A number of proposals are being prepared for the
President's Message (cont.)

Farm Bill that could have dramatic and long term implications for our profession and for our farmer clients. One such proposal that was mentioned at the REAP meeting was a new class of pesticide use for materials that might otherwise be cancelled altogether. This classification of materials would be for 'Prescription' use only, and would be in addition to the general and restricted use categories currently in existence.

Other NAICC members have been busy representing the Alliance recently. Earle Raun met with Nebraska Senators in Washington last month, and represented NAICC on the Pesticide Advisory Committee to EPA. Madeline and Charlie Mellinger represented us at the Institute of Food Technologists meeting on greater utilization of IPM in food safety. Michael Brubaker carried our banner to the National Coalition on Integrated Pest Management meeting in Washington.

NAICC is considering sending representatives to participate in the "Earth Day" activities in Washington next month. Many other agricultural representatives will also be in attendance that week. This would provide an excellent opportunity to meet, get acquainted with, and make our profession known to a number of policy makers. The Administration of ASCS, Keith Bjerke, has graciously offered to help set up meetings for us with a number of key people in government. The Board on Agriculture will be meeting at that time, and we hope to have a chance to participate in this vital activity.

Deanna Marquart and I are down to (I hope) the final draft of a paper that outlines the educational needs of agriculture and our profession. The paper lists a number of specific recommendations that will be proposed for the Farm Bill. Our position recommends the multidisciplinary and integrated approaches that are needed to answer many of the challenges that face production agriculture.

As you can see from these brief notes, many events that we have worked for and dreamed about for years are coming to fruition. Our professions gaining a new recognition and respect that has been a long time coming. Along with that recognition, we are gaining a voice in national policy decisions that affect agriculture. It will be a real challenge to keep up with all these developments, but with the help of all our members, I am confident that we can continue to steer a positive course.

More details to follow next month!

Dan E. Bradshaw, CPag/CS
NAICC President

California (cont.)

firm showed the following possible economic results if the Act passes,

1. Significant reduction in many agricultural products produced in California, estimated to be as high as 40% to certain commodities,
2. Inability to sell foods with traces of targeted pesticides will force prices upwards by 50% or more as California producers will need to export their products and subsequently retailers will need to import more products,
3. California would end up losing a large segment of its agricultural sector to other producing states,
4. If most of the pesticides on the suspect list are banned it was estimated that California's gross product will be reduced by about $10 billion, lose 70,000 farm jobs and up to 225,000 agribusiness related jobs.

A "Farmer Friendly" initiative is in the works to assure adequate coverage is given to a more sound and scientifically based program that voters can contrast with the above described initiative. More on this will be reported later.

California State Informant
Mark Steinberg
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New Members

Voting

Paul T. Dorman, B.S. (Agricultural Education)
Top-Soil Testing Service
P.O. Box 340
Frankfort, IL 60423
Office 815-469-2530 Home 708-534-6618
Began business 1987

Kenneth W. Fobes, (Agronomy)
Pro. Ag. Inc.
824 W. 3rd.
Pratt, KS 67124
Office 316-826-3607 Home 316-672-3781
Began business 1988
Crops: Corn, soybeans, sorghum, alfalfa, wheat

Kevin R. Hagen, B.S. (Ag Industries & Service Agronomy)
ARCPACS
CENTROL, Inc.
P.O. Box 412
Buffalo Center, IA 50424
Office 515-562-2269 Home 515-562-2683
Began business 1984
Services: IPM, fertility, crop plans, record keeping
Crops: Corn, soybeans

Rodney Sams, MS (Entomology)
P.O. Box 30024
San Angelo, TX 76903
Office 915-653-5469 Home 915-653-5469
Began business 1980
Services: Entomological
Crops: Cotton, Corn, Alfalfa, Onions, Potatoes, Grain, Sorghum, Wheat

Affiliate

Jeff O. King, B.S. (Agronomy)
J.C. Robinson Seed Company
100 J.C. Robinson, Box A
Waterloo, NE 68069
Office 800-228-9906 Home 402-721-9339
FAX Number 402-779-3317

Sustaining

Deanna J. Marquart, M.P.P. (Public Policy)
Marquart Policy Analysis Associates
2216 "L" Street
Sacramento, CA 95816
Office 916-443-3335 Home 916-441-6190

Membership Changes

Provisional to Voting

Mark A. Harrison, B.S. (Agronomy)
Consulting Agronomist
P.O. Box 969
Dalhart, TX 79022
Office 1-806-249-5130 Home 1-806-249-5130
Began business 1981
Services: Insect, weed, disease scouting, irrigation scheduling, soil sampling and interpretations, chemical and fertilizer recommendations, variety selection, computer.
Crops: Corn, wheat, sorghum, alfalfa, soybeans, drybeans, potatoes, sunflowers.

Hal Martin Tucker, B.S. (Agromny)
CENTROL of Cottonwood
Box 396
Minneota, MN 56264
Office 507-823-5423 Home 507-872-6357
Began business 1986
Services: Soil testing and interpretation of results, seed recommendations, crop monitoring, IPM recommendations and field records.
Crops: Corn, wheat, beans, edible beans.
IN THE NEWS

The March 1990 CPM magazine featured five NAICC members in their "Crop Consultants" column. The consultants highlighted problems with a particular crop and recommended solutions. Topics addressed included: Bill Nissen - Woolly cupgrass in corn; Michael Hutter - Cutleaf nightshade in wheat; John Kimbrough - Tobacco budworms in cotton; Steve Acquafresca - Cabbage looper in broccoli; and Richard Nelson - Two-spotted spider mite in strawberries.

The February 1990 Grower magazine included an article written by NAICC member, H. Charles Mellinger entitled "Whitefly feeds on Florida's tomatoes." Charlie discussed the complexities of successful fresh market tomato IPM programs. (Thank you Madeline Mellinger and Randy Van Haren for the article.)

The February 1990 Agri Finance magazine featured several NAICC members in four different articles. The first article, "Integrated crop management programs," was written by NAICC President, Dan Bradshaw. Dan discussed how government proposals present opportunities and concerns for consultants. The second article entitled "The crop scouting dilemma", was written by Ron Brunoehler. NAICC members Lee Haile, Randy Huston, Elton Barrett, Mark Otto, Vernon Meints, and Mike Brubaker were featured in the article. They addressed the issue of whether consultants can maintain quality when hiring seasonal help. Ron Brunoehler also wrote the third article, "Bottom-line advice from the field," which featured NAICC members Dwight Lincoln, Clyde Sartor, and John Vahalik. The consultants discussed their biggest cotton production problems and how they deal with them. The fourth article, "Cotton's new, improved crystal ball," was written by David Pelzer. In the article Dave featured how NAICC member James Powell uses the GOSSYM program. (Thank you Randy Van Haren for submitting the articles.)

The February 1990 Ag Consultant magazine contained two articles featuring NAICC members. The first article, "Economic IPM Thresholds," was written by NAICC member Nellie G. Call. Nellie discussed IPM practices in potatoes and cabbage. The second article, "Time to listen; time to speak," was written by Judy Ferguson and featured NAICC President, Dan Bradshaw. Judy reported on Dan's meeting with the ASCS.

The February 1990 CPM magazine featured five NAICC members in their "Crop Consultants" column. The consultants highlighted problems with a particular crop and recommended solutions. Topics addressed included: Vernon Meints - velvetleaf in narrow row soybeans; John Nordgaard - septoria leaf spot, tan spot, and leaf rust in wheat; Dwight Lincoln - nematodes in cotton; Dan Bradshaw - chinch bugs in grain sorghum; and Ronald Meyer - tarnished plant bugs in peaches. (Thank you Madeline Mellinger and Randy Van Haren for submitting the article.)

Bring LISA to the Party
Former Secretary of Agriculture, John Block recommends 9-point plan

At the recent "Agricultural Issues for the 1990's Forum," sponsored by IMC Fertilizer, Inc., held in Tampa, FL, former Secretary of Agriculture, John Block addressed the issue of agriculture's image. John Block is the current President of the National American Wholesale Grocers Association. Highlights of his nine-point plan for image building follow:

1. Work together to pass food safety legislation.
   It will build consumer confidence and demonstrate national unity. There is a need for an over-sight group.

2. Spend some money to improve our image.
   Will provide confidence with consumers as well as "insiders".

3. Food industry should unite to give the public a common message.
   Need to emphasize that the U.S. food supply is the safest in the world.

4. Bring LISA to the party.
   We shouldn't be over-worried, good economies will drive agriculture.

5. Put a good word in for the conservation reserve.
   We must accept a few compromises.

6. Support lower target prices in the Farm Bill.
   Work for lower subsidies.

7. Demand flexibility in the Farm Bill.
   Must satisfy the consumer - we work for them ultimately.

8. Minimize the amount of annual acreage reduction.
   Looks bad to the public to set aside best land when people are starving.

   Remove trade barriers - feed the world.

Garry Raymond represented the NAICC at the forum.
Wisconsin Consultants Head For New Horizons

The Wisconsin Association of Professional Agricultural Consultants (WAPAC) held its 3rd Annual "NEW HORIZONS" meeting on December 12th in Madison, Wisconsin. The new horizons meeting was geared toward issues of new technology and controversy in agriculture. This year's meeting focused on "Food Safety - Issues and Answers" with Wisconsin's Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Howard Richards delivering the keynote address. Mr. Richards expressed his view that America's food supply is the safest in the world, but added; "it can be better". He added that farmers must receive a higher return on their investment in agriculture than they are currently receiving and crop consultants play a vital role in this regard.

Dr. Terry Smith, Chairman of the New Food Safety Task Force showed the controversial new video "Big Fears - Little Risks", which addresses the relative risks of natural and synthetic chemicals occurring in our food. The video is narrated by Mr. Walter Cronkite and provides an in-depth look at this issue.

A representative of the food processing industry, Mr. Dick Wood of Basic American Foods - American Potato, provided the view of his industry and the public's perception of food safety. He indicated that most of the pressure felt by his industry is indirect since their product is processed. He felt confident that the raw products that his company uses are safe based on their residue testing program. One of his concerns as an industry is the inconsistency between regions in terms of bans on agricultural chemicals and its fairness to producers.

In addition, representatives of the FDA spoke on their 25 year old chemical residue testing program. The results of the most recent market basket study agreed with the statement of Mr. Howard Richards that we do indeed have a safe food supply with regard to ag-chemicals but improvements can be made. The issue of BGH, or bovine growth hormone, use in the dairy industry was also covered in this meeting. Dr. Terry Smith of the Dairy Profitability Center indicated that BGH has a public perception problem and should not be a public safety issue. This issue continues to provoke hot tempers throughout the dairy industry.

WAPAC's 3rd annual NEW HORIZONS' Meeting was well attended and gave an informative look at the issue of food safety. WAPAC will be holding it's 3rd annual general meeting in mid-March at the Holiday Inn of Tomah, Wisconsin. Topics for discussion will include expert witnessing, contract research and the proposed SP-53 Integrated Crop Management program and it's implementation in Wisconsin. For more information contact; Randy Van Haren at (715) 335-4046.

Notice: A copy of the video "Big Fears-Little Risks" is available to NAICC members for use by contacting Randy Van Haren, Pest Pros., Inc., P.O. Box 188, Plainfield, WI 54966 (715) 335-4046

Wisconsin State Informant
Randy Van Haren

Expert Witness Follow-Up
We're Experts -- Let's Act Like It

I enjoyed reading Dr. Robert Ascheman's article in the January issue of the NAICC Newsletter regarding the Expert Witness as a source of additional revenue for agricultural consultants. I agree with his six practical matters to consider before one considers to pursue expert witness assignments.

I feel that agricultural consultants should involve themselves in the areas of claims investigations and accepting expert witness assignments. It is a source of tremendous PR for the agricultural consultant and the NAICC. My experience has taught me that there are several areas which should be stressed in order that we as independent private consultants can be most effective. The first, as Dr. Ascheman stated, is to be committed to your task. This will require doing you "homework" and will involve time for which you will not be compensated. The second is to realize that that compensation for investigating claims is much slower than you might realize. If you expect payment by return mail, you will be disappointed. If you expect payment after 60 days, you may still be disappointed. The legal procedure requires time and involves appeals prior to settlement.

When court appearances are involved, it is extremely important that the agricultural consultant be presented to the court as such. For example, my educational training is in Entomology, but I was accepted by the court as an expert witness on soybean production. I might add that this was accomplished because in Louisiana, agricultural consultants are licensed and certified by the Louisiana Department of Agriculture. If I had been accepted by the court as an Entomologist, rather than a person knowledgeable in soybean production, I would have been allowed to

(Cont. next page)
Expert Witness (cont.)

answer questions only on the entomological impact on the grower’s crop loss. This particular case involved crop loss due to a faulty design of equipment. As an expert in soybean production, I was allowed to comment on the loss of stand, the herbicide damage caused by improper seed placement and costs of soybean production.

For those consultants who oppose licensing and certification, this serves as a very good example of their value. Certification by a national organization such as the NAICC would greatly have enhanced my being accepted as an expert on soybean production. One may be qualified to serve as an expert witness in areas other than his/her educational training, but may not be allowed by the court to express his/her opinions. Certification by the NAICC would relate to professionalism by the court.

Written by,
Richard L. Jensen, Ph.D.

Institute of Food Technologists
NAICC Represented

Madeline and Charlie Mellinger attended a meeting sponsored and coordinated by the Institute of Food Technologists (IFT) February 25-27 in Washington, D. C. as representatives of NAICC. Participants were representatives of 29 professional societies and invited resource personnel from different segments of the agricultural industry.

The objective of the meeting was to provide an evaluation of the current status of IPM programs and recommend avenues for expanded implementation of IPM, taking into consideration consumer values of safe food and production criteria of a profitable and salable product. The approach used was to divide the delegates into specialty groups: vegetable, citrus, fruit and nut, grain and animal. Each group devoted a day toward evaluating the commodity in 4 areas: (1) current status of IPM programs, (2) cosmetic standards (3) economics and (4) expanded implementation needs. A position paper (white) will be prepared by IFT and circulated to all participating societies, including NAICC, for approval before being hand delivered to certain key Congressmen and mailed to all other Congressmen, Executive branch personnel, state legislators and other interested parties.

The thrust of the paper as we interpreted the group concerns is that IPM has sort of only scratched its potential surface to enhance food safety, reduce groundwater contamination, other environmental risks, and worker exposure. IPM programs therefore need to be majorly expanded. And this will require (you guessed it) MORE FUNDS. The consensus of this group and a couple others seems to be at this point that the research needed for significantly expanding IPM is best conducted by Cooperative Extension personnel. We are of the opinion that much of the work should be conducted by commodity research specialists and media specialists. A large part of the implementation problem (certainly from the experience of Glades Crop Care, Inc.) is not due to biological science inadequacies but a socioeconomic one of how people (farmers) deal with and accept innovative systems into their lives.

It is critical that private consultants continue to be recognized as integral part of IPM policy planning and programs. We are eagerly awaiting the "white paper" and we hope we can support it in full.

James P. (Jim) Akin
1937-1990

Jim Akin died at Valley Baptist Medical Center, February 19, 1990. He had been ill since September, 1989. He was born in Donna, Texas on January 25, 1937, lived in Raymondville and graduated from Raymondville High School in 1955. Jim married Audrey Anderson on February 28, 1959, and graduated from Texas A&M with a B.S. in Entomology that same year. In 1970, he received his masters degree from Texas A&I, Kingsville.

Jim was a valley entomologist for Swift and Co., 1959-63, then held teaching and coaching positions in the Rio Grande Valley through the 60's and 70's and spent the summers as an independent cotton consultant. He became a year-round independent consultant in the mid to late 70's, spending his winter months in vegetables working with several companies including Griffin & Brand and Valley Onion.

Jim was a long-time member of the Texas Association of Agricultural Consultants and NAICC. He served on numerous committees, held the office of director of TAAC and was a faithful member and supporter of the organizations. He was one of the most respected private consultants in the Rio Grande Valley and will be sorely missed by his peers, clients and the ag industry as well as the many young men and women he influenced while in public education.

In addition to his wife, Audrey, Jim is survived by a son, Curtis Lee Akin and a daughter Doria Akin Conklin and two grandchildren.

Written by,
John E. Christian
Report of Activities
Deanna Marquart

Development of "Plant Health" Draft Paper

Throughout February, Deanna Marquart worked collaboratively with Dan Bradshaw to write a paper tentatively entitled "American Agriculture Needs Doctors of Plant Health: A Proposal to Establish and Educate a New Profession." The current draft is the fourth revision. Deanna and Dan anticipate making a change in the title for the final version of the paper, partly in response to a recommendation from Chuck Benbrook, Executive Director of the Board on Agriculture, that we should propose bachelor's and master's level programs in plant health as well as a doctor's level program. The draft paper was circulated to a select group of readers in addition to NAICC Board Members to solicit comments and reactions. The reactions have been uniformly and enthusiastically favorable, and the comments have been extremely helpful in improving the coherency of the arguments made in the paper in support of establishing and education the proposed new profession.

Development of Foundation Grant-Seeking Strategy

Deanna has been analyzing annual reports from foundations that have a stated interest in agriculture to determine the patterns of funding — that is, what kinds of organizations are these foundations funding and what types of activities and projects are they funding? She is working on a strategy to request grants from several foundations simultaneously, using a proposal that will show each foundation how its support will contribute to the overall level of funding needed to enable NAICC to have the desired impact. Specifically, that impact is being conceptualized as promoting the practice of environmentally responsible agriculture through the development of professionals with the ability to integrate a range of relevant agricultural/scientific disciplines. As an association of such professionals, NAICC is seeking funds to:

1. Support the institution of professional degree programs for multi-disciplinary practitioners; and

2. Enhance the Alliance's internal capabilities to inform the public and relevant government agencies regarding the role multi-disciplinary practitioners can play in ensuring food safety and environmental protection in the implementation of Agriculture's existing and future technologies.

Attendance at REAP Meetings in Madison

Deanna attended meetings held on March 6-7 in Madison, Wisconsin where representatives from the professional and scientific societies committed to the formation of a combined professional registry met to discuss the REAP concept and, if appropriate, to plan a strategy for bringing the registry into being. The group did decide to implement not only what is now being discussed as a "federation" of registries but also formation of a new association — Association of Agricultural and Environmental Professionals (AAEP).

Future Activities

The next meeting of the National Research Council's Board on Agriculture will be in Washington D.C. on April 24-26, Chuck Benbrook, who attended the first day of REAP meetings in Madison, suggested that the group plan to make a presentation regarding the federation of registries and AAEP at the Board's meeting on April 24, which is dedicated to hearing from the relevant professional societies. Equally promising, Benbrook invited NAICC to make a presentation regarding our proposal to establish and educate a new plant health profession. Deanna Marquart will prepare presentation materials for both purposes (the American Society of Agronomy has contracted with her to make the presentation on the federation and AAEP).

Calendar

March 30 - April 1, NAICC Board of Directors Meeting, Houston, TX. Contact: Dan Bradshaw (409) 543-3416

April 23-25, North Central Regional Water Quality Conference, Clarion Hotel, St. Louis, MO. Contact: Gary Jackson, (608) 262-1916

November 8-10, NAICC Annual Convention, Grovenor Resort, Walt Disney World Village, Lake Buena Vista, FL. Contact: Madeline Mellinger (407) 746-3740
Consultants and Industry Back Food-Safety Story

California is at the center of a food-safety firestorm, and the California Agricultural Production Association (CAPCA) and Sandoz Crop Protection Corporation are unveiling a public relations program, "Setting the Record Straight."

"For too long, agriculture has taken the brunt of unfair criticism and misinformation. The time has come for us to work together toward setting the record straight for California," says CAPCA president Fred Strauss.

The program is possible through sponsorship of Sandoz, which is underwriting the availability of its public relations firm, Chapman/Warwick Advertising. The program focuses on major metropolitan area strategies:

* A school education program will be developed where "plant doctors" (pesticide control advisers) will be classroom speakers and provide informational materials for parents.

* CAPCA will use the general media for timely news stories, profiles, and feature stories.

* CAPCA will work with other ag organizations in planning public relations programs.

"No single group can accomplish the task at hand," says Strauss. "With the support of Sandoz we can help be a catalyst within the industry by bringing groups together and forging a cohesive public relations program...," Strauss says.

(Reprinted by permission from Agrichemical Age, February 1990, HBJ Farm Publications, San Francisco, CA)

SP-53 Hotline
Member requests a phone call regarding SP-53

Michael Brubaker represented the NAICC at the National IPM Meeting on February 23. Michael was visiting with David McNeal, Extension Service - USDA; Dr. McNeal was surprised to hear that, in some states, consultants were being left-out of the SP-53 process. If you are in a state where private consultants are excluded from competing for SP-53 funding, please call Michael (today) at 717-627-0065.

Please Take The Time

Enclosed in this newsletter is an insert from the NAICC Public Relations committee. Please take a few minutes to complete the survey. The survey can then be folded, taped, stamped, and mailed to Randy Van Haren. The committee will use your responses to formulate the NAICC public relations policy.

"The Voice of the Professional Crop Consultant"

National Alliance of Independent Crop Consultants
401 Liberty Drive
Bolingbrook, IL 60449
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