



NAICC NEWS

Official publication of the National Alliance of Independent Crop Consultants

Volume 5, Number 7

The Voice of the Professional Crop Consultant

July 1991

Industry Steering Committee Puts Final Touches on REAP



Members of REAP's 15-member steering committee agreed on a plan to turn REAP's operations over to a transition team and interim director, Dr. Richard V. Carr.

The four-year old dream of a Registry of Environmental and Agricultural Professionals (REAP) moved into its final formative stage in June. At NAICC's urging, the 15-member industry steering committee agreed on an official prospectus for "marketing" the unified registry, hired a part-time coordinator, and adopted an operational plan for the remainder of the year.

"It's time to move REAP from volunteer to 'active' status," NAICC Executive Vice-President **Paul Weller** told the group. "First major step is to market the concept to professional and scientific groups to gain membership and funds."

The REAP concept was pioneered in the late 1980s by NAICC past-president **Dan Bradshaw** and other industry representatives, as a national registry of consultants and allied professionals. It would become a third-party organization to certify and authenticate credentials of individuals not already covered by existing professional registries. NAICC has invested hundreds of hours and thousands of dollars to bring the concept to fruition.

Landmark decisions on REAP came at June 10-11 meetings at USDA and NAICC headquarters in Washington, D.C. Steering committee members voted to hire **Dr. Richard V. Carr**, staff official of the American

Registry of Professional Entomologists, as interim staff director. He will work from his base in the Maryland suburbs of Washington. The committee also agreed to publish a 12-page official prospectus, which outlines in detail the REAP aims and purposes.

REAP's master plan is to move immediately to a "transition team," which will work with Dr. Carr to bring in all major professional and scientific organizations with an interest in member certification and professional registries. "It's obvious that our current membership is agricultural," he says. "We need to develop an action plan to bring in the environmental professionals."

The new prospectus places major emphasis on these areas of REAP's program: 1) REAP is dedicated to raising the certification standards of professionals through continuing education; 2) REAP will be a credible organization to authenticate credentials; 3) REAP will address such key issues as air/water pollution and environmental education programs.

An international flavor was also added to REAP, with a steering committee authorization to explore implementation of official "REAP Groups" to visit foreign nations. First initiative is possible formation of a delegation of agricultural and environmental professionals to visit the Soviet Union. Steering committee member **Audrey Binder** of EPA is exploring a tie-in with the People-To-People Ambassador Program, which could provide added credibility to REAP's program and participants.

Although NAICC voted earlier this year to initiate its own internal certification program, the broader scope of a REAP certification system, tied in with a national database of certified professionals in all major disciplines, holds added promise for NAICC members. NAICC will continue to explore ways to assist and coordinate with REAP as it moves ahead with its certification activities.

"REAP is a long sought-after goal now being achieved," says NAICC's Weller. "We intend to see it through to final implementation and operation. NAICC leaders could not have predicted the need for national certification as is being demanded today by both the government and private sectors. Its time has come, and we are pleased to be on the leadership team."

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Public Perceptions of Agriculture: The Crop Consultant's Role

According to a recent survey of public perceptions toward agriculture, conducted by the American Farm Bureau Federation, Americans think farmers are trustworthy and are doing a good job of producing healthy food for consumers. However, the general public is not convinced that farmers are conscientious about protecting food safety and the environment.

The use of pesticides is the predominant food concern among consumers, according to the survey, with 61 percent of respondents agreeing that "farmers often make mistakes or are careless in their use of farm chemicals. Sixty-nine percent of the consumers polled feel that "farmers are too easily convinced by chemical companies to use chemicals in farming."

According to the survey, the vast majority (78%) of Americans support "the adoption of new farming methods that will allow for a reduced use of chemicals." The bottom line for most consumers is that "farmers should limit the amount of chemicals they use."

Public perceptions of farming practices, especially the use of agricultural chemicals, is of vital importance to everyone involved in American agriculture. Educating the public about the precautions taken to ensure a safe food supply and to protect the environment is a responsibility shared by all. America's independent crop consultants are in a unique position to reach out to the American public and communicate the positive story of advancements in the food production system. No one is better qualified than crop consultants to educate Americans about how farmers and growers tap scientific knowledge and experience in developing methods to control pests and diseases in a safe and environmentally conscious manner.

NAICC President **Madeline Mellinger** and NAICC Outreach Committee Chairman **Patrick Weddle** shared with NAICC News their efforts to reach out and communicate with the general public. Their stories follow.

Local Efforts Count

Madeline Mellinger, NAICC President

I'd like to share two examples of public outreach activities with which I have been involved that might be similarly available to you in your community.

"Career Day for 6th graders" at my children's elementary school offered me a chance to tell some very urban kids about careers in agriculture, especially agricultural consulting emphasizing sick plants and plant medicines.

A surprisingly large percentage of the students came to hear my presentation and saw our NAICC display. I was "competing" with physicians, attorneys, and professional golfers for student turnout – so a good size group in my sessions says there's hope for America's youth in agriculture!

Another local effort my firm, Glades Crop Care, Inc., and I have helped to found is a county Ag Awareness Council funded by the private sector and supported in part by county extension staff. The purpose of the Council is to publicize agriculture's contribution to our county and help the general public understand and appreciate the need for agriculture's role here. The Council draws everyone up and down the food chain from supermarket produce buyers to chemical producers and sales people to growers and independent ag consultants to achieve a unified voice and approach to issues confronting county agriculture.

Our chief message to the public is that food production is being conducted in a safe, conscientious, environmentally sensitive, resource sustaining way. We hope to impact schools, promote and conduct farm tours, develop a speakers bureau for civic groups and issue regular news releases to the media. If the "squeaky wheel" approach is as effective a tool as usual, we will be hearing a lot of commotion!

Environmentalist Outreach: California Style

Patrick Weddle, Chair, NAICC Outreach Committee

The "March Miracle" (rain in California!) was in full swing on March 26, 1991, when I hosted the first of three "Environmental Field Days."

Participants gathered at 8:00 AM on that day to travel in a rented van from Sacramento to the fruit growing region 20 miles to the south in the delta of the Sacramento River. Before leaving, I had the participants introduce themselves to each other, and offer an explanation of his/her interest in learning about Integrated Pest Management (IPM).

They were: **Ralph Lightstone**, staff attorney for California Rural Legal Assistance, who specializes in farm-worker safety issues related to pesticide use; **Gary Sandy**, a communications consultant with experience in recycling policy both as a legislative staffer and private consultant; **Sam Wilson**, ag journalist with *California Farmer* magazine; **Deanna Marquart**, an independent policy analyst with experience in state, national and international ag issues and who was interested in translating the Field Days dialogue into policy positions that will be made available to legislators and policy makers; and **Randy Hansen**, vice president of Weddle, Hansen & Associates, Inc. and general manager of Loomis Fruit Growers Association.

Despite heavy rains, wind and cold, the group was able to spend enough time in the orchards to learn

about the use of codling moth traps, pheromone confusion (mating disruption), and irrigation monitoring equipment.

While visiting the Greene & Hemly Orchards, participants met with **John Callis**, ranch foreman, to hear his concerns about this year's pear and apple crop. Much of the discussion centered around his experiences in the growing of organic apples. The conversation highlighted the economics of pest control and marketing of fresh produce.

Throughout the day, invited guests expressed much interest in the specifics of new pest control products and technologies, especially biotechnology. Lightstone was enthusiastic about the potential development of products that would facilitate reduction of pesticides that pose particular worker safety problems. His concerns stemmed from documented field worker illnesses related to pesticides.

Participants lunched at a restaurant where locals meet. Conversation focused on public policy concerns, primarily impediments to regulatory approval of safer crop protection products. Lengthy discussion of the role of private consultants versus the dealer fieldpersons arose with regard to the potential for conflicts where pesticide sales and recommendations are linked. There was keen interest in the political processing of ideas to improve regulation and promote IPM.

A subsequent tour was held May 21 and one is scheduled for July 23, allowing participants to see crop protection efforts and problems unfold throughout the season and into harvest.

Editor's Note: If you have participated in activities that help promote public awareness of agriculture, please share them with NAICC News. Your ideas are welcome and needed!

Ethics Case Study

Applying Scriptural Stewardship Principles to Ethics in Consulting

Dr. Reuben B. Beverly, University of Georgia

*Editor's Note: The following ethics case study was submitted by **Dr. Reuben Beverly**, a horticulturist and soils research scientist at the Georgia Experimental Station, at the invitation of the Ethics Committee. Dr. Beverly has experience in crop consulting on a paid basis and has published an article in the Journal of Agronomic Education on making ethical choices in the agricultural domain. His provoking questions are the type that will be discussed at the Ethics Seminar on November 10th at the national convention. Dr. Laurence Hawkins of Blanchard Training and De-*

velopment, Inc. will lead the discussion again this year on more complex topics of ethical choices and decisions. Plan to be a part of this special Sunday afternoon workshop at the annual meeting.

"Stewardship" refers to the management of resources that belong to someone else. In a recent article on agricultural ethics (*Journal of Agronomic Education* 18:122-124), **Stephen Ott** and I presented a framework for ethical decision-making based upon application of three of Jesus' parables on stewardship. Briefly, we suggested that the elements of stewardship in any context include the physical estate, subordinate laborers, consumers and the steward's personal interests.

In the agricultural context, we let the physical estate represent the capital inputs to production, as well as the broader environmental resources including soil, groundwater, etc. Subordinate laborers represent both family and hired laborers employed in agricultural production, and by extension also include the tractor manufacturer and fertilizer salesperson. Consumers include not only first receivers such as a grain elevator operator, but ultimately all consumers who rely on farmers for safe, wholesome, abundant and economical food and fiber. Finally, we also recognize the legitimate personal interests of the farmer to provide the physical, emotional, and spiritual needs and amenities for his or her family. The challenge of stewardship, then, is to allocate the finite supply of resources available to the steward in such a way that the owner's interests are best met.

In order to illustrate the operation of this conceptual approach in addressing ethical decision-making in the context of agricultural consulting, consider the following hypothetical situation. The characters and situations described are fictitious.

Russell T. (Rusty) Goodcrop, founding partner of Goodcrop Agri-Stewardship, Inc., subscribes to the scriptural stewardship view in developing pest and soil management programs for his clientele of agronomic and vegetable producers in southwest Georgia. Rusty was recently contacted for advice on whether or not to apply additional nitrogen (N) fertilizer to a 200 acre center pivot-irrigated field of turnips grown for greens. The farm manager applied slightly more than the amount of preplant and sidedress N recommended by the state soil testing laboratory. However, recent heavy rains coupled with the sandy soil in the field have led the farm proprietor to suspect that much of the applied N has been leached and that the turnips are at risk for N deficiency. The crop is currently about three weeks from harvest.

Rusty knows that turnip greens require a ready supply of N for good yield and color. He agrees that the recent heavy rains have likely depleted the available N in the root zone, and so N sidedress would very likely increase yields. Soil and plant analyses confirm a borderline N deficiency. The agronomic indications support a recommendation to apply N in order to assure the profitability of the crop.

However, using the stewardship approach, Rusty con-

siders the implications of such a recommendation on the subordinate laborers, consumers and the environment. Rusty sees no particular danger to the workers from exposure to the chemicals involved. The question of effects on consumers is somewhat more complicated. If the weather remains cloudy and cool, nitrate-N could accumulate in the plant tissue and present a health risk since the turnip greens in question are intended for use in baby food. Finally, Rusty must consider the environmental implications of his recommendation. The fact that N is marginally deficient despite preplant and sideward application indicates the potential for N loss from the soil system at hand. The field is located in the recharge zone of a major aquifer, and surface drainage flows to a river which eventually empties into a bay where shrimp, oyster, mullet, and sportfishing are major enterprises. Excess N lost from the local agricultural fields can therefore affect the quality of both groundwater and surface waters.

What, then, should Rusty do? He could recommend N application, which is economically justified, and hope that consumer and environmental problems do not arise. He could take a conservative stance on the consumer and environmental issues, and recommend no fertilization, even though it might cost the grower potential income. He could provide all the information and considerations to the farmer without any recommendation, and let the farmer make his own decision. He could decide that the issues are too complex to make a satisfactory recommendation, and decline the assignment. What would you recommend Rusty do?

ARS "Eye in the Sky"

The Agricultural Research Service is developing "eye in the sky" technology that combines computers, aircraft, and video equipment to gather and interpret data from the air. The system could one day be used by crop consultants to rapidly advise farmers on the progress of their crops or the extent of attacks by insects, weeds or disease.

The February issue of *Agricultural Research* magazine details the research being conducted by ARS range scientist **James H. Everitt** involving this technology. So far, according to Everitt, the team has coached the system to evaluate about two dozen different weeds, insect pests, plant diseases and other crop and soil conditions.

Copies of the article can be obtained from NAICC headquarters by returning the enclosed reply card requesting *Agricultural Research Magazine* "Eye in the Sky" article.

Subscriptions to *Agricultural Research* magazine, published monthly, are available from: Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402-9325, or call Order and Information Desk at 202/783-3238. Cost is \$24.00 for one year subscription.

NAICC BUSINESS NOTES

NAICC Financial Report to Membership

Submitted by **Mark A. Otto**, NAICC Treasurer

At the Kansas City NAICC Board of Directors Meeting, the NAICC Financial Report through May 15, 1991 was reviewed. On the income side, \$2,700 profit was generated by the Education Committee meetings and the Contract Research meeting. This will allow NAICC to continue offering quality educational programs to our members.

The news on membership was not positive. Membership revenues are only 76 percent of budget. The reason for this is that membership is basically unchanged from last year and we had forecast growth continuing at 50 percent per year. This is going to take a renewed commitment from each member to sell the benefits of membership to other consultants and allied industry personnel. If every member convinced one new member to enroll, we would be in great shape. Individual members should think about potential organizations that might become sustaining members as well. If a contact from **Paul Weller**, NAICC Executive Vice-President, would help make the sale, he is willing to do that.

In 1990, with a big effort from the Board and Convention Committee, NAICC revenue from the annual meeting was greatly increased. In order to sustain that increase, and to allow time for the development of the Educational Foundation, the NAICC Board entered into an agreement with *Agri Finance* to recruit exhibitors and sponsors for the annual meeting.

Expenses are at 54 percent of budget, which is about what we would expect now with our annual meeting still ahead of us.

NAICC FINANCIAL STATEMENT JANUARY 1 to MAY 15, 1991

	Actual	Budget	%
Beginning Bank Balance	\$44,032.40		
Current Bank Balance	\$47,044.20		
Membership Dues	58,467.50	77,100.00	76
Sponsorships	7,000.00	17,000.00	41
Meetings	8,180.00	56,250.00	15
Misc.	709.73	1,650.00	43
TOTAL INCOME	74,357.23	136,700.00	54
TOTAL EXPENSES	71,345.43	131,700.00	54
	3,011.80	5,077.00	

WASHINGTON NEWS

Kennedy/Waxman Food Safety Bill Hearings Held

The Subcommittee on Health and the Environment of the Energy and Commerce Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives held hearings on June 19 on H.R. 2342, otherwise known as the Kennedy/Waxman Food Safety Bill.

Officially entitled the "Safety of Pesticides in Food Act of 1991," H.R. 2342 amends the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA) to "revise the authority under that Act, to regulate pesticide chemical residues in food."

Here are the major changes incorporated in the bill:

The bill will require the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to set tolerances for all residues, including inert ingredients, metabolites, and degradation products. Currently, all active ingredients and certain metabolites and degradation products (those present in significant quantities and/or of toxicological concern) are required to have established tolerances.

The bill attempts to do away with the "Delaney Clause" or "Zero-risk" concept by establishing a "Negligible risk." According to the bill, "a tolerance may be established for a pesticide chemical residue only if the risk to human health from dietary exposure to the pesticide chemical residue is negligible." The bill defines negligible risk as, "A risk to human health from dietary exposure to a pesticide chemical residue is negligible only if dietary exposure to the residue is reasonably certain to cause no harm to human health..." If a pesticide chemical residue is found to cause cancer in animals or humans or cause any other adverse health effect in humans at any level of exposure, the EPA Administrator may establish a level of tolerance only if that tolerance "will not cause or contribute in individuals exposed to such pesticide chemical residue a lifetime risk of an adverse human health effect which occurs at a rate of one in a million or a risk of an adverse human health effect which occurs at a rate of one in a million divided by 70 for any single year of exposure during the first 5 years of the life of an exposed person." In other words, the bill replaces the "zero-risk" concept with that of a "One-in-a-million" risk concept.

However, the bill requires that in assessing the one-in-a-million chance of adverse health effects that the Administrator "consider the exposure to be the level of exposure that would occur if all the food, for which the tolerance for the pesticide chemical residue is in effect, has amounts of the pesticide chemical residue equal to the tolerance proposed or in effect, if all other sources of dietary exposure to such residue occur, and if human exposure to the pesticide chemical residue at the tolerance level occurs for a period equal to a lifetime." The

bill also disallows the consideration of any benefits, economic or otherwise, of the chemical in setting the tolerance level. This "worst case scenario" assumes that if a pesticide is approved for tomatoes, that all tomatoes are treated with that pesticide at the maximum tolerance level and that the consumer is exposed to the chemical residue for a lifetime.

The bill does not contain a provision for national uniformity of tolerances.

These and other controversial elements of H.R. 2342 have caused EPA and the National Agricultural Chemicals Association (NACA) to oppose the bill in its current form.

NACA President **Jay Vroom** testified at the hearing saying, "It is obvious that the authors of H.R. 2342 have expended a great deal of effort in responding to shortcomings, both real and imagined, with the current system of regulating the permissible level of pesticide residues in America's food supply. However, H.R. 2342 goes far beyond what is needed. Indeed, it is difficult to suggest amendments that would fix this bill. Instead, NACA proposes that we start over with a new bill which addresses attainable goals, which is based on sound science and utilizes realistic risk assumptions, and which is sensitive to both agriculture and the broader public policy issues involved."

EPA Assistant Administrator for Pesticides and Toxic Substances **Linda J. Fisher** testified on behalf of the Administration. "Food safety has long been a high priority for this Administration, and we are continuing our efforts to make the U.S. food supply – already one of the safest in the world – even safer," said Fisher. "The Administration believes that new legislation amending both the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FFDCA), and the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) is necessary to advance our efforts."

"We are concerned, however," said Fisher, "that as currently drafted, certain key provisions of H.R. 2342 have the potential to cause serious disruption that cannot be justified in terms of anticipated food safety and public health gains. Our principal concerns relate to the overly stringent standards set for risk management decision-making; the effect of these standards in terms of exacerbating inconsistencies between FIFRA and FFDCA; the omission of benefits considerations in the tolerance-setting process; the lack of any provision for national uniformity of tolerances; and the inflexibility of provisions that prescribe how EPA must conduct risk assessments."

With regard specifically to the "worst case scenario" risk assessment, Fisher said, "The overall result of compounding all of these assumptions and standards would force the Agency to regulate at levels that would eliminate many pesticide uses, without achieving meaningful incremental reductions in risk."

NAICC headquarters has copies of H.R. 2342 for your information. Please use the enclosed reply card to indicate your interest in receiving a copy of the "Kennedy/Waxman Food Safety Bill."

NEW MEMBERS

VOTING

Jimmy Carter, B.S. (Agricultural Education)

Carter Consulting Services

P.O. Box 951

Andalusia, AL 36420

Office: (205) 222-9680 Home: (205) 222-9680

Crops: Cotton, peanuts, wheat

Services: Fertility, herbicide, nematode, disease, insects, harvest aids

Mark J. Dostal, B.S. (Agronomy)

Central

207B Graham Street

Roberts, WI 54023

Office: (715) 672-8304 Home: (715) 749-3205

Crops: Alfalfa, corn, soybeans, small grains

Services: Fertility management, scouting, soil sampling

Paul W. Gordon, B.S. (General Agriculture)

Gordon Consulting

P.O. Box 327

Cambridge City, IN 47327

Office: (317) 478-4801 Home: (317) 478-4298

Crops: Corn, soybeans, wheat, alfalfa, oats, barley, canola, turfgrasses

Services: Analytical, cost analysis, fertility, nutritional recommendations

Don Harlan, Ph.D. (Entomology)

Mid-South Ag Research, Inc.

Rt. 1, Box 261

Proctor, AR 72376

Office: (501) 732-2981 Home: (501) 735-7752

FAX: (501) 735-7752

Services: Contract research

David R. Mowers, M.A. (Environmental Science)

Mowers Soil Testing Plus, Inc.

117 E. Main

Toulon, IL 61483

Office: (309) 286-2761 Home: (309) 286-2761

Crops: Corn, soybeans, wheat, alfalfa, seed corn, sweet corn, milo, oats

Services: Pest management, soil fertility

William Daniel Stangel, B.S. (Soil Science)

Soil Solutions Consulting

2213 East Washington Avenue

Madison, WI 53704-5209

Office: (608) 242-8063 Home: (608) 242-8061

Crops: Corn, soybeans, alfalfa, small grains, vegetables

Services: Soil testing, input selection, IPM scouting, deep profile nitrate analysis, irrigation scheduling, contract research/demonstration

Duane S. Woebbekeing, B.S. (Ag-Business)

Agri-Testing

P.O. Box 189

Gladbrook, IA 50635-0189

Office: (515) 473-3102 Home: (515) 473-3264

Services: Soil fertility

CALENDAR OF EVENTS

July 24 - USDA Grasshopper Intergrated Pest Management Field Day – Watford City, North Dakota. Contact **Douglas L. Hendrix**, USDA/APHIS/GHIPM, 3380 Americana Terrace, Suite 340, Boise, Idaho 83706. Telephone: 208/334-9320.

July 24-26 - National Fertilizer Solutions Association Round-Up '91 – Hyatt Regency Hotel, Indianapolis, Indiana. For more information contact **Dale Little** at 314/256-4900.

July 25 - 11th Annual Milan No-Till Crop Production Field Day and Planting Equipment Demonstration – Milan Experiment Station, Milan, Tennessee. For more information contact **John F. Bradley**, Superintendent, 205 Ellington Dr., Milan, Tennessee 38358. Telephone: 901/686-7392.

July 27-30 - ASA Soybean Expo '91 – Nashville, Tennessee. Contact the American Soybean Association at 1-800-TALK SOY (825-5769).

August 4-7 - Florida Entomological Society's 74th Annual Meeting – Ritz Carlton Hotel, Naples, Florida. Contact **David Williams** at 904/374-5982.

August 4-7 - Soil and Water Conservation Society 46th Annual Meeting – Featured speakers include: **James Moseley**, USDA Assistant Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment; and **Bill Richards**, chief of USDA's Soil Conservation Service. For a copy of preliminary program and registration materials, contact: SWCS, 7515 Northeast Ankeny Road, Ankeny, Iowa 50021; Telephone: 1-800-THE SOIL.

August 22-27 - International Symposium on Soil Testing and Plant Analysis in the Global Community – The Hotel Royal Plaza, Orlando, Florida. For additional information, contact COUNCIL headquarters, P.O. Box 2007, Athens, GA 30612-0007, or call: 404/546-0425.

November 8-10 - American Society of Farm Managers and Rural Appraisers 1991 Annual Meeting – Hyatt Regency Hotel, Phoenix, Arizona. Contact: **Nancy Morgan** at: 303/785-3513.

November 10-13 - NAICC Annual Meeting – Hyatt Regency Crown Center Hotel, Kansas City, Missouri. Contact Executive Secretary **Paul Weller** at: 202/785-6711.