NAICC Sets Policy On Spokesperson

Like many other organizations, NAICC wants to communicate its policies, beliefs and procedures in a concise, consistent manner. But this is difficult to achieve without some guidelines on who may speak on behalf of NAICC and when.

At its March meeting in Baton Rouge, the NAICC Executive Board adopted a three part policy on communication. As passed by the board, the policy states:

1. NAICC members in all categories are encouraged to request staff assistance in the preparation of written or oral remarks.
2. In the case of individuals speaking for themselves, it is important to clarify that they are not representing NAICC.
3. All external communication, written or oral, representing NAICC’s positions must receive prior approval from the Executive Vice President.

Coalitions

Find the Common Ground

by Bill Tarter Jr.

A coalition can be defined as “an alliance of distinct parties, persons or states for joint action beneficial to all members.”

Crop consultants by their very nature are well educated, highly motivated and self-assured. If these terms are spoken in anger, they become “consultants are pushy, arrogant, college-educated idiots.”

Perhaps we have been guilty of using similar terminology to describe someone or some organization with whom we have a difference of opinion.

All of agriculture—the diversified growers of California, the fruit or wheat growers in the northwest, the farmers of the heartland, workers who till the picturesque fields of Dixie and the multifaceted growers of the northeast—have a profound interest in the long-term economic health and environmental well-being of production agriculture.

Consultants (both independent and commercial), dealers, basic manufacturers—everyone in agriculture—face ever-increasing environmental and economic pressures from divergent sectors of our complex society.

It is imperative that NAICC and our state consultant organizations work to form as many mutually beneficial coalitions as humanly possible.

This can be a tedious and trying task for those involved. However, the long-term benefits and rewards are well worth the effort.

Tolerance and understanding of other positions or viewpoints are the cornerstones required to define the common ground upon which a mutually beneficial coalition can be built. If harsh words and rash statements are allowed to cloud the issues, useful dialogue is lost. When dialogue is lost, we soon devote time and energy (of which we have too little) to berating those with whom we have differences.

If a situation has degenerated to this point, put on your best diplomatic hat and take the first step to extend the olive branch. Think of that individual or organization as an upset client who needs you to set things right. A calm and congenial conversation over a cup of coffee can accomplish many things when communication—not arguing—is the agenda.

When setting up such a meeting, YOU establish the ground rule that “nobody gets mad.” We are all adult enough to adhere to this position. If that individual were a client, we would certainly be very willing, even anxious, to listen to his/her feelings and concerns. It is paramount to our long-term benefit that we extend to others the same consideration we give our clients.

NAICC should not totally capitulate on its positions, but we need to listen to others in agriculture and find that common ground from which to launch mutually beneficial positions and programs.

NAICC is a strong, vibrant and growing organization. As we become more politically astute and build additional, stronger coalitions, we gain additional friends who have resources we can use. With this comes a stronger position from which to represent our own interests as well as those of our many friends in agriculture.

Remember to listen carefully to others and find the common ground upon which we can all stand and work together. That’s coalition-building.

(More about coalitions on page 3.)
President's Message
What is YOUR Vision for NAICC?
Maggie Alms, NAICC President

One way to imagine the future is to read science fiction. Another is to read a newspaper. In 1994 the future is happening before our eyes; we don’t need Mr. Spock to show it to us.

No where is there more change than in agriculture. Our clients are not farming the way they did in 1974, 1984, or even in 1992. They think and manage differently. They face new regulations and challenges. They are using new methods and tools to meet those challenges.

We, as consultants and researchers, are providing much of the guidance they need to adapt quickly and efficiently. We’re charged by our clients to keep them informed! They look to us for new solutions and innovations. How can we be ready? How can we prepare ourselves so we can better prepare our clients?

We need information, a continuous flood of technical information. We need business training. We need emotional support. We need political awareness and representation.

For all of those, for technical support, for business support, for moral support, for political voice, we need each other. And together, we need a strong and healthy NAICC. It is the organization which (from the mission statement) is dedicated to "supporting" us and to "providing a forum for information exchange". It is the organization which is our "unified" voice.

What is your vision for this organization?

Our annual meeting in January of 1995 will be held in California, a state with its own EPA and many laws and regulations which may be forerunners for the rest of the country. It is a state with hundreds of potential new NAICC members.

In many ways, California represents change. It offers a glimpse into the future, and our meeting will focus on that subject. The theme will be “Maintaining Clear Vision on Agriculture’s Information Highway”. The information is out there, ready to be used.

The challenge is maintaining the clear vision.

Who will be helping producers implement the administration’s goal of IPM on 75 percent of the nation’s farmland by the year 2000? Who will be helping producers implement federal soil and water quality programs? WHO will be the people transferring new technology TO THE FIELDS?

It must be the private sector. The economic and environmental health of this nation’s agriculture will be ensured only through the private sector working in cooperation, and with the support of, the public sector.

NAICC is ideally positioned to speak for those private sector field practitioners for the next several decades. We represent pure science blended with from-the-fields common sense. Our voice IS being sought and it IS being heard! Do we have the vision necessary to carry out that task?

The NAICC mission is for “independent crop consultants and contract researchers”, those who (from our Constitution) “receive no compensation or financial benefits, direct or indirect, from a client’s purchase of products based on those recommendations or data.”

We also benefit from the experience, the business and technical expertise, of others in the private sector who advise farmers, but who may directly (or indirectly) receive compensation from product purchase.

That “indirect” connection to product sales is difficult to define. In my last column I talked about “gray areas”, and the fact that, as agriculture changes, and as our membership increases, there is more and more blurring of the lines between black and white. Individual consultants define “indirect” differently. They also define “compensation” differently and “products” differently.

Have we sorted through our OWN definitions of those terms? And don’t answer too quickly. I haven’t met a consultant yet who didn’t have some of his/her own “gray” areas.

Before we can have a vision for the future, we must understand where we stand in the present.

I—and most of you I think—want “independent” to remain the foundation of this organization, and it must. But, as I’ve said before, independent does not mean alone. I would like to see this organization more welcoming of others in the private sector who are also advising and influencing farmers. More of us can mean more technical support, more business support, more moral support and more political voice.

All of us in NAICC need to look into the future. We all need to try to “maintain clear vision”. We need to think about the changes occurring in agriculture, and then imagine the role we want the profession of crop consulting to occupy in the future. We must also visualize this organization in the future and select a plan for growth that will best serve our members, our mission, and our profession.

This fall we will vote on the future of the NAICC. We will vote on who should be encouraged to join, and the standards by which all will be judged. The Membership Committee and the Board will make recommendations. But the choice will be yours.

With opportunities like that, who needs science fiction?

Award Nominees Sought

What person has served NAICC and the business of agriculture more than anyone else? Who has worked to educate the public, relieve the strain placed on farmers or consultants? Who has supported the goals of NAICC even though he/she may not be a member?

That person should be nominated for the NAICC Service to Agriculture Award.

This award, presented at the NAICC annual meeting, honors a public figure who has been a friend to NAICC and the larger agriculture community.

The last recipient of the Service to Agriculture Award was Keith D. Bjerke, then administrator of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service of the USDA in Washington.

Please fax or mail nominations to NAICC headquarters by Sept. 15.
Building Relationships Means Reaching Out

by Bob Boehle

Reaching out to others is a rather difficult endeavor when trying to improve relationships between people or groups of people—especially when that reaching out may be for the purpose of changing a personal or group attitude, position or idea.

Those of us involved in the various aspects of agricultural consulting need to be reaching out and forming ties or coalitions with many different groups of people, particularly with those not directly associated or involved with agriculture. They need a better understanding of agriculture and we are in a position to educate them.

The people who probably have the least knowledge of agriculture or farming are those who are the farthest from any of it and have very little chance of learning from traditional sources. These are primarily children—and perhaps their parents, too—who live in cities and towns. They are shielded from agriculture by the very area they live in. These children need to be made aware of what is going on in agriculture by those of us involved. Their “education” by those who aren’t may not be telling it like it really is.

There are programs that can do some of this education in the schools. In Illinois, the Farm Bureau has created a program to be used in schools, as well as youth organizations, Girl Scouts, Boys and Girls Clubs, etc., to paint a true picture of farming today. This program can help dispel some of the myths about agriculture, such as “all chemicals are bad” and “only organic crops are healthful.”

But can we as consultants and researchers do better for the children? Will we be able to tell them what is really happening rather than just give them some generalities that may not reflect the true situation? How can we do this?

We need to build a good relationship with students, teachers, and parents by promoting the use of programs such as the Farm Bureau one. Why not even ask to participate in this kind of educational opportunity? What, you say there isn’t one in your area? Then maybe one can be started with your help and input. Such an educational program doesn’t have to be fancy. Any presentation that emphasizes agriculture, crops, soils and/or livestock will be helpful in educating people, young or old. Something is better than nothing.

Another group of people who sometimes have a bad image of agriculture—or perhaps no image at all—are those in state legislatures who come from urban areas.

These elected officials need to make many decisions that affect farms and farming. Their understanding of the farm situation is sometimes very limited. To be able to talk to them about agriculture and to help them understand its significance is a big task. Not many are really interested in giving up their time to listen—it just doesn’t affect them much, so why should they be concerned. After all, their constituents aren’t farmers.

The Illinois Department of Agriculture sponsors an annual event specifically for the members of the General Assembly. This year it was a legislative breakfast held just across the street from the capitol building. Each legislator was personally invited by either a letter or phone call.

The sponsors of the gala affair were the many agricultural organizations in the state, such as the Professional Crop Consultants of Illinois, Illinois Pork Producers, Illinois Soybean Association, Association of Illinois Electric Co-ops, Illinois Farm Bureau, Illinois Fertilizer and Chemical Association, and several others. Each of the representatives of these groups were assigned to a table so they could talk with the legislators.

This format gave sponsoring organizations the chance to talk about some important legislative matters with the people who would or could influence the political outcome. The various groups have many items on their agendas, but it’s not often they have a chance to talk to someone other than their own elected legislator.

The opportunity was there for everyone to benefit. Too bad only a handful of legislators bothered to show up.

But that’s the way it goes in this business of building coalitions and bridges and relationships. Sometimes we make progress and sometimes we don’t. Failure to connect means we need to keep on trying. In the end, we will succeed.

(Bob Boehle of Boehle Consulting in Bloomington, Ill. is a voting member of NAICC.)

---

Calendar

JUNE 30-JULY 1 “Agricultural Formulations for the 1990s and Beyond”, Formulations Forum ’94, Washington Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C. Contact: (212) 244-5225.

JULY 4-9 Eighth International Congress of Pesticide Chemistry, Washington, D.C. Contact: Formulations Forum ’94 Planning Committee at (212) 244-5225.

JULY 21 “Consultants Seminar: Focus on Business Organization”, sponsored by the American Society of Farm Managers and Rural Appraisers, Rochester, Minn. Contact: Bill Holstine, Hertz Farm Management, Inc. (515) 382-6596.

JULY 29-31 Soybean Expo at the Kansas City Convention Center in Kansas City. Hosted by the American Soybean Association. Contact: Larry Kroeger at (314) 821-7220.

AUGUST 4-6 Plant Growth Regulator Society of America 1994 Meeting, Portland, Ore. Contact: David Fritz of the society, Rhone-Poulenc Ag Co. at (919) 549-2408.

SEPTEMBER 13-16 "Introduction to Good Laboratory Practice and Auditing", International Center for Health and Environment Education, Alexandria, Va. For more information contact Robert Morris at the center at (703) 658-8888.
Give Away Your Time as Advertising

by John Gruber

A g consultants’ time is the commodity that they have to sell. It’s time, information, knowledge and more tied up in a bundle. It’s the consultant’s “product.”

The old statement, “It pays to advertise,” is important to consultants as well as any other business. Giving away your time may be the best form of advertising you can use.

It also may be the best way to increase your reputation as an “expert” in one or more areas. And this can lead to more business, new clients or new types of clients.

A brief look at a few ways to give away your time may help you in your business efforts. I think budgets are an important part of running a successful business. If you are going to give away part of your time to help attract new business, you have to budget a value for that.

Mike Brubaker of Brubaker Agronomic Consulting Service in Pennsylvania has successfully given away time which resulted in expanding business. Mike has told me in the past that his volunteer time on local government committees has resulted in new contacts which led to new sources of income for his business.

The big problem area for many consultants is the non-client who calls with a question. How do you handle “free” advice when your customer/client is paying for the same information? It’s simple to me. You offer a product sample.

Answer the question—and maybe the second or third. Then use the situation to explain the service you can provide to help that caller avoid the problem or situation in the future.

My approach in my business is to say, “It sounds like you could use our consulting service,” and then proceed to explain why. It’s a free sample, but it can reap more benefit sometimes than paid advertisement.

Bill Blair of JBC Consulting in Ohio, past NAICC president, has a very successful entomology consulting business with dealers and industry.

He publishes an in-season newsletter called the “Blair Report.” It’s available by subscription. But, he also provides sample copies to non-subscribers to let them know the kind of information they can receive.

Bill is giving away his time when he provides a sample copy. He does not send a full year’s set, just a copy here and an issue there.

Bill’s sample issue idea works the same way as a consultant who answers questions for non-clients. I like to look at each non-client question as a potential for new business.

What about committees and committee work? Now here is an excellent opportunity to give away your time. As a local independent business, you should be involved in community affairs. But the involvement must be first out of genuine community concerns, NOT just to make new contacts.

I’ve served in organizations where it’s been apparent that some folks are there just to promote themselves or their business. That does not work. If you get involved in community projects, the contacts will come over time as a secondary benefit.

I could give a list of examples, but here’s just one. I started my business, Ag Consultants, Inc., to consult with farmers and manage farms for absentee owners. An offer was made to become an industry/business representative on the local Extension Agronomy Committee.

Because of my experience I was immediately put on their Field Day committee. This was in 1982 or 1983. I had experience, so I got to plan the herbicide demo plots and make the applications. A few chemical reps noticed the plots. They began asking about the company’s availability to do plot work.

That involvement with Extension—an organization I was genuinely interested in—has led to a 10 year growth in contract research that now consumes 75 percent of our total company business. But remember, it was not the reason for getting involved. It was a secondary benefit.

I believe in advertising by giving away time when possible. Our friends in industry give away sample products at meetings as door prizes—anything from a free bag of seed to 50 acres of herbicide. Have you thought about giving a door prize of 25 acres of soil testing, 50 acres of herbicide recommendations or something similar?

Our time as consultants is our product. And it pays to advertise your product.

(John Gruber of Ag Consultants Inc. in New Holland, Ohio is a member of the NAICC Executive Board.)
Why Not Give Your Time Away?

by Calvin Viator

One of the questions often posed to me by young agricultural consultants is: "How can I prevent giving my time away?"

My standard answer to this question is, "You can't—but why do you want to avoid it?"

Giving your time away probably goes against conventional wisdom, but it has served me in good stead over the years. The development of relationships with at least 30 percent of my clients can be traced to some act of rendering what we sometimes call "free services." Sometimes it's called volunteering.

Among the practices found to be most effective are working with young farmer groups, sponsorship of Field Days, addressing chemical distribution meetings and most importantly, going the extra mile for customers or potential customers.

When a client says, "I know this is not part of your job, but could you _____," I know that if I can fill in that blank, carry out the request, I will have a satisfied customer in the future. I can't count the times a client's neighbor has stopped me on the road and asked about a particular problem he had encountered.

By taking the time to answer his questions, I gained a new customer in subsequent years.

Spending time with a client's son, educating him about the goals that we are attempting to achieve also can pay dividends in future years when he takes over his father's operation. In several instances I am now dealing with second generation clients.

There are pitfalls in giving away time. The number one rule is: it cannot interfere with serving paying clients. If it becomes too time consuming, priorities must be set so one can adequately service his customers.

The second pitfall involves the few individuals who will try to take advantage of one's expertise with no return—but these are usually readily identified.

Finally, many of the activities that I have "given away" over the years have been incorporated into our Crop Management Plan which includes, in addition to pest management and soil management, such activities as variety selection, budgeting, consulting with clients' lending agencies, crop damage estimates, etc. I facetiously tell clients that this program includes everything but baby-sitting the kids and taking their spouses to dinner.

It was surprising when 50 percent of our clients registered for this comprehensive program when they had been provided some of these services gratis over the years. The response of one of my clients summed up the attitude of most. "I feel better paying for all that free advice you have been giving me over the years," he said.

(Calvin Viator of Thibodaux, La. is a voting member of NAICC.)

Giving Away Time Pays Dividend

by Mervyn Erb

Giving time away was not something I had planned to do—nor intended—when only in my first year of business in 1989.

I vividly remember my first year—11 clients and 3,058 acres. (Thank God my wife had a good job!)

One thing I did have was an excess of spare time and it allowed me to service my clients to death.

Secondly, during that previous winter I had read Tom Peters' book entitled "A Passion for Excellence," which gave me the insight and drive to succeed in business.

In late April that year I was contacted by a friend who had a young family, a new farm and an off-farm job. He was "going in circles" and had many questions on crop production and this new idea he'd heard about called "no till." He wanted to retain my services and I wasn't too sure about his ability to pay.

However, I waived the initial payment and jumped in, figuring it was sink or swim for both of us. We seeded down some land with such bad erosion problems it had no profit potential, no-tilled some soybeans—which was a first in his area—and had nearly 100 percent weed control on a 30-acre piece of black, 15 percent organic matter soil.

But 1989 was hot and dry and the July/August heat took its toll. I remember a neighboring dairy farmer cutting corn silage in September.

His corn was so full of smut that his forage harvester and self unloading wagons were so black you couldn't tell what brand they were. Local corn yields were 60 to 70 bushels per acre. My client fared no better and I knew he was in a jam.

On my final fall wrap-up visit, I could sense the tension in his voice. After we danced around the topic for a few minutes, he blurted out that he had no money to pay me—and all the time I was stumbling for words to say I wasn't wanting to be paid. There were a few seconds of silence while we rolled stones around with our feet. I cleared my throat, as I had something stuck in it, and my friend poked at a piece of dirt stuck in his eye. He promised to pay as soon as he had some money and I told him that wasn't possible because I wasn't going to send him a bill.

Since then, I've learned to handle similar matters with a little more tact. My friend decided to keep his off-farm job and contract-feed some hogs. His neighbor rented the farm and hired me as consultant since he was so impressed with my work that first year using no-till. It turned out he wanted to try no-till himself. As for that nearby dairy farmer, he hired me too and now he's 100 percent no-till. To this day both these farmers are clients of mine.

As for me, I've given away my time in two other cases like the one I've told you about. In both cases I've been "repaid" many times over.

I think that just goes to prove that if you "do good work" things will usually work out in the end.

(Mervyn Erb of Huron AgVise in Brucefield, Ontario is a provisional member of NAICC.)
Family Corporation Could Be Tax Trap
A tax specialist reports on IRS scrutiny of compensation to corporation employees who are also stockholders.

by A. J. Cook

Crop consultants and contract researchers who run their businesses as corporations will want to take a look at the salaries they pay themselves or their relatives before the Internal Revenue Service does.

The IRS is cracking down on unreasonable compensation to corporation employees who are also stockholders. Corporations deduct salaries as a business expense.

Thankfully, the IRS is not interested in partnerships or so-called S corporations (which is sometimes a handy way to organize a small, family business) for unreasonable compensation problems since these two types of businesses don’t deduct salaries as expenses.

One recent court case might illustrate the problems family-owned corporations have with unreasonable compensation.

Dr. and Mrs. Curtis each received a salary of $942,000. The IRS accepted his compensation as reasonable, but claimed the corporation overpaid Mrs. Curtis and disallowed part of its salary deductions.

In court, experts from both sides testified to the value of Mrs. Curtis’ work. The court criticized, then rejected the expert reports.

Because Dr. Curtis owned the company, the judge said, the compensation arrangement for Mrs. Curtis was not the result of a free bargain.

To determine if it was fair, the judge placed himself in the position of a hypothetical independent shareholder. The question would be, was the shareholder getting an adequate return on his investment?

Because the doctor as a shareholder never received dividends, and earnings on equity were inadequate after Mrs. Curtis’ large salary, the judge reduced the corporation’s deductions for her compensation to $466,000.

A planning tip: Closely held corporations should challenge the reasonableness of compensation paid to shareholders and relatives of shareholders. The Curtis case gives an example of a principal test used to see if a corporation is vulnerable.

As the judge did, consider the corporate net worth and compare it to net earnings. Is this an adequate return?

In the Curtis case, the corporation had a loss for both years. Because of the corporation’s small equity, a small reduction in salary would have produced an adequate return to the hypothetical shareholder—and kept the IRS at bay.

Other factors considered in judging unreasonable compensation are a person’s responsibility in the company, what executives in similar jobs are paid, the character and condition of the company and compensation paid to an employee who is not a shareholder.

If the unreasonable compensation issue isn’t manageable, consider this opportunity: operate as an S corporation or a limited liability company.

(Cook writes A.J.’s Tax Fables, a copyrighted weekly column, for “The Commercial Appeal” in Memphis. He is a tax lawyer and CPA with the firm of Harris, Shelton, Dunlap & Cobb. As with all tax and financial matters, Cook suggests consulting an attorney or CPA about individual situations).

Committee Seeks More Cooperative Members

NAICC is working with its cooperative members—and seeking more such members—in a new structured way, thanks to the Liaison Committee.

Phil Cochran of Cochran Agronomics in Paris, Ill. is heading up the new committee.

Other committee members include: Roger Dennings of Dennings & Associates in Elsie, Minn.; Chuck Farr of Mid-South Ag Consultants in Crawfordville, Ark.; John Jackson of Dennings & Associates in Pinconning, Minn.; Dana Palmer of Lubbock, Tex., and Lee West of Research Designed for Agriculture in Yuma, Ariz.
NAIICC Certification Procedures Refined
by John Kimbrough

The Certification Board has recently refined the procedure for certifying non-members through the NAICC program, which is administered by REAP through a contractual agreement.

The program is open to all professionals who meet the experience, education and ethical standards to become certified as Independent Agricultural Consultants.

Those who are not NAICC members are sent a questionnaire which includes the questions concerning consulting experience and independence which are on the NAICC membership application form. A request for references is also issued at this time. It is suggested that more references be submitted than the minimum of three required to process the application successfully.

There have also been several changes that should lead to more rapid processing of all applications for certification through NAICC.

First, the application is forwarded to the REAP office for normal processing as soon as the letter of explanation and request for references is returned to the applicant. Copies of the form, letter and application are retained at the NAICC office. Next, once the letters of references verifying independence have all arrived and been checked, a letter is sent from NAICC to REAP headquarters stating that the applicant’s independence has been checked.

After REAP has approved the application for certification, the Memphis office of NAICC is notified and a letter and certificate are sent from REAP headquarters.

Some of you may be wondering why this all takes so long and if it really has to. Well, many of your clients do not promptly send the letters of reference to NAICC. Also, certificates are grouped into batches of 25 by REAP to be sent to the calligrapher, then mailed to the NAICC certification board chairman to be signed, thence to the REAP board chairman for signature and back to REAP for a gold seal. Folks, that takes time. We’re trying to improve it.

For those of you contemplating applying for NAICC certification without joining the Alliance, consider that for the same money you can have your cake and eat it too. By joining NAICC first you can join the organization that represents independent ag consultants and contract researchers well in many arenas and benefit from the friendships that form from common goals.

You receive this monthly newsletter that will keep you informed on vital issues. And, it is worth mentioning that you will be listed in the NAICC’s prestigious directory that is circulated in high places of both industry and government.

(Please note, John Kimbrough III of Pro-Tech-Ag in Lexington, Miss. is chairman of the NAICC Certification Board.)

PURRF Takes Over From PUAC
by Earle S. Raun

Another “alphabet soup” is added to the menu of government acronyms: PURRF replaces PUAC.

PUAC, Pesticide Users Advisory Committee, is no more. Instead Washington has created PURRF, Pesticide Users Research and Regulatory Forum.

As a member of PUAC, I’ve been representing ag consultants in the U.S. since the committee was formed about 15 years ago. The committee has operated to provide EPA with pesticide user input on policies and regulations. EPA paid expenses of representatives to the meetings.

The transition from PUAC to PURRF has been taking place during the fall and spring meetings. It will be “programmed” by a regular membership steering committee with a two year membership rotation. EPA will not pay the expenses of PURRF representatives.

I rotate off the steering committee with the Fall 1994 meeting along with seven others representing other ag pesticide user organizations. The other eight will rotate off with the Fall 1995 meeting. Replacement representatives will be from the various ag constituencies.

Beginning with the Fall 1994 meeting, PURRF will be facilitated by another alphabet group called NFIPME. The National Foundation for Integrated Pest Management Education will be the contractor to help PURRF if EPA confirms the contract proposal.

The purpose of the new Forum is for EPA to provide outreach to pesticide users on policies in the formulation stages and when the policies are implemented. The intent is for EPA to provide information to various groups in agriculture through PURRF. Pesticide users will be able to comment on how EPA policies and their implementation may affect them, either as a group or individually. In other words, the Forum will focus on education and outreach by its members to their various constituencies.

Although the fall meeting agenda has not been established, I will get some information when it becomes available this summer. The fall meeting will be in El Paso, Tex., in mid-October. An exact date has not been set.

NAIICC needs a new representative to this Forum.

(Earle S. Raun of Pest Management Co. in Lincoln, Neb. is a past president of NAIICC.)
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NAIICC Video On Consulting Still Available

The eight-minute video explaining what a crop consultant does is still available on VHS tape for $25 a copy. Just mail your check to NAICC headquarters to receive your copy.

The video is intended to educate those outside agriculture about some of the problems and benefits of American farming and the consultants who help them.
Cooperative Member Roster Adds Three

Three organizations have joined the growing list of NAICC's cooperative members. NAICC exchanges directories with cooperative members, each gains a place on each other's mailing list and seeks ways to work together for common purposes.

The three new cooperative members include: National Pork Producers Council; the Texas Pest Management Association (TPMA) and the American Society of Farm Managers and Rural Appraisers (ASFMRA).

National Pork Producer's Council was founded in the mid-1950s but formally organized into its present form in 1965. With about 85,000 producer members in 45 affiliated state associations, the council is the largest commodity organization in the country. Its mission is to enhance U.S. pork producers' opportunities for success. More than 300 major programs address issues affecting pork from production to consumer demand.

TPMA is the only statewide, multi-commodity, nonprofit, producer organization in Texas dedicated to the implementation of Integrated Pest Management programs. TPMA represents over 2,000 growers of cotton, grain sorghum, wheat, peanuts, citrus, vegetables, corn, alfalfa, soybeans and sunflowers. TPMA also represents 12 commodity organizations and has 22 grower pest management units throughout Texas.

ASFMRA was founded in 1929 by a core of Illinois, Iowa and Missouri farm managers who felt their profession was critical to the future of farming. In 1936 the organization was expanded to include appraisers who specialized in determining the value of farms and other rural properties. Today the organization has 37 chapters across the country, Canada and other foreign countries.

New Members

- **Provisional**
  
  Lee Duane Fraise, B.S. (Agronomy)
  ASA, CSSA, SSSA, ASAE
  Central of Iowa
  R.R. 2
  Nevada, IA 50201
  Office: (515) 382-3928
  Home: (515) 382-2978
  Fax: (515) 382-6030
  Crops: Corn, soybeans and alfalfa.
  Services: Crop monitoring, soil fertility, crop planning and farm records.

- **Voting**
  
  James D. Calkin, M.S. (Entomology)
  ESA
  AgSolutions, Inc.
  2444 NW Green Circle
  Corvallis, OR 97330
  Office: (503) 327-1838
  Home: (503) 757-3437
  Fax: (503) 757-3437
  Crops: Vegetables, fruit trees, grain, grass seed and ornamentals.
  Services: Field research, contract research and crop consulting.

  Tom Davis, B.S. (Botany/Zoology)
  AACA
  Davis Agricultural Consulting Service
  1306 Quail Terrace
  Rogers, AR 72756
  Office: (501) 621-8590
  Home: (501) 621-8590
  Crops: Cotton and rice.
  Services: Fertility, PGRs, IPM, defoliation, irrigation, weed control and disease monitoring.

  Robin Dean Hulst, B.S. (Agronomy)
  Control, Inc.
  R.R. 2, Box 172B
  Crookston, MN 56716
  Office (218) 584-5107
  Home: (218) 281-4024
  Crops: Wheat, barley, sugar beets, corn, sunflowers, soybeans and dry beans.
  Services: Provide fertility, weed and disease control recommendations.

Malone Rosemond, M.S. (Weed Science) SWSS, CWC
American Agricultural Services, Inc.
P.O. Box 1293
Cary, NC 27512
Office: (919) 469-1800
Fax: (919) 469-5749
Services: Contract research and GLP project management for registration of crop chemicals.

Larry Sax, B.S. (Agriculture)
MNICCA, ASA
Central, Inc.
215 Atlantic Avenue
Morris, MN 56267
Office: (612) 589-4293
Home: (612) 246-3323
Fax: (312) 589-4301
Crops: Corn, soybeans, wheat, alfalfa, sugar beets and edible beans.
Services: Fertility, hybrid selection, crop planning, crop monitoring and associate recommendations.

Robert Thomasson, B.A. (Ag Business) ACAND
Bob’s Ag Service, Inc.
Rt. 1, Box 130
Gardar, ND 58227
Office: (701) 993-8446
Home: (701) 993-8446
Crops: Wheat, barley, potatoes, sugar beets, pinto beans, corn, sunflowers, soybeans, canola and flax.
Services: Computerized field records, soil testing, fertility management and chemical recommendations.

Bill Webster, B.S. (Entomology)
AACA
North AL Agri Services, Inc.
449 Kelly Spring Road
Harvest, AL 35749
Office: (701) 280-1260
Fax: (701) 280-6706
Crops: Cotton, corn and soybeans.
Services: Insect pest management, fertility, weed control, harvest aid usage and irrigation management.