Making Beautiful Music

by Daney D. Kepple
Executive Vice President

"A single musician can play by ear, but an orchestra needs music.”

This quotation comes from Doing Good Better, a book on effective organizational leadership that has been Harold Lambert’s Bible for the past 12 months. The title of the chapter in which the sentence appears is “Planning.”

Planning has not been a historical strength of NAICC, probably because the organization was volunteer run for so many years, and because there were more day-to-day demands than a small group could be reasonably expected to manage. On two or three occasions the former presidents of the organization gathered and spent several intensive hours setting the future course. They did a great job, too. Yet we have never, to my knowledge, committed the resources required to go through a thorough planning process.

Professional association managers have identified a development progression that all organizations, much like people, must navigate. According to accepted wisdom, it’s unrealistic to expect an organization to effectively handle sophisticated processes, such as strategic planning, until it has passed through its tumultuous young years and achieved a degree of stability. In other words, trying to do a strategic plan several years back wouldn’t be unlike turning a three year-old loose in the family car.

Today, though, I believe we’re ready to apply for the learner’s permit and start doing some test driving. Because what I see when I look at NAICC is:

• A growing membership that appears to be relatively satisfied with the organization.
• Stable relationships with government and a broad segment of the industrial sector of agriculture.
• Productive interactions with other organizations.
• Leadership with a demonstrated ability to set policy.
• Greater awareness on the part of the ag media and, to a lesser extent, the consumer media.
• An annual meeting that is becoming more successful and visible each year.

All of these were strong priorities identified by the past presidents’ group and the Steering Committee report in 1993, so we all have a lot to be proud of. We should celebrate that. Overall, we are healthy, stable, and ready to take on new challenges. The question is, “What should those challenges be? Where should we focus our energies and other resources?”

Strategic planning is a widely recognized method for identifying appropriate focus. In fact, I’ve heard planning defined as “consensus attached to a time line.”

Apparently we can also expect some additional bonuses from our investment. Here are some more quotes from Harold’s “Bible” on that subject:

“Proper planning and bad planning, but not planning is not an option for a nonprofit that wants to be around to greet the twenty-first century.”

“Planning not only helps us to anticipate the future, it permits us, within limits, to create our future. In the absence of planning we are the victims of our fate. We take what we get.”

“By planning we anticipate the likely outcome of an action, permitting adjustments which lessen the negative consequences and accentuate the positive consequences. Good planning is one of the most cost-effective activities an organization can undertake.”

Having become convinced that a planning process is the next logical step for NAICC, we did a lot of research on the subject. After reading dozens of articles, watching and listening to tapes, talking to other association managers, and interviewing several planning consultants, we drafted a “plan to plan” which we hope will utilize the lessons learned by other organizations that have been through the process while answering the unique needs and qualities of NAICC.

Among those who know about planning, either because they have been through the process several times or because they are professionals, there is broad agreement on several concepts:

For a nonprofit organization, the plan must be consensus driven. That means the planning team must be as diverse as possible.

The plan to plan adopted by the Executive Board in October defines the planning group as follows: NAICC Presidents for 1995, 1996, and 1997;

(Continued on page 4)
I once had a friend who celebrated her children's birthdays by granting a new privilege and a new responsibility on every anniversary of their birth. At age eight, for example, they might gain the privilege of crossing the street alone, but they also incurred the responsibility to look both ways first. That always seemed to me a very insightful method for teaching children about the dual nature of many things.

I've been thinking about that recently because it's election time at NAICC, and voting is one of the most important privileges and responsibilities that we have as members.

Holding office is a similar duty/right that in recent years—or maybe just this year—is moving toward the privilege side of the scale. If you question what I'm saying, take a look at the ballot you will receive in the next week. It is startlingly different from the last two that were presented to you because it has two names under the heading "President Elect."

That's right. Both Dennis Berglund and Billy McLawhorn agreed to run for our professional society's top office. More importantly, I understand that they would both like to win.

For the past two years, the Nominating Committee was unable to find a second candidate. Now, I'd like to think that's because Don Jameson and I presented such formidable opposition, no one was willing to take us on. Reason tells me otherwise, so I have to ask why people are more willing—maybe even eager—to run for office in 1995.

"Arm twisting didn't do it," Dennis claims. "I knew that unless I really wanted the job I wouldn't do well at it, and it would have been a mistake to accept the nomination. Then I talked to someone here in Minnesota whom I really respect. He is involved in dozens of organizations and causes, and his life appears hectic to me. I asked if he was one of those people who can't say no, and he said, 'Not at all. It's just that I've learned that I invariably get back more than I give.'"

"I started thinking about my experience on the NAICC Executive Board, and I realized he was right," Dennis said. "Most of the things I have gotten are intangible but no less valuable. How do you put a price tag on things like increased confidence, friendships, contacts, personal and professional growth, understanding of complex issues? When I began to think in those terms, I realized that I very much wanted to throw my hat in the ring. Not only that, I want to win."

Billy puts it this way: "NAICC has always been a high priority with me, and that's particularly true now. Our individual consulting business is more in control than it's been in the past, and contacts made through NAICC have definitely been a positive factor. There are several issues I'm interested in—certification, the altered state of Washington—so if there's something I can do to make a difference, I'd certainly like to try. And it's a real honor to be asked to run."

"Dennis is right about the benefits, too. My involvement with this organization has always been 100 percent positive."

I'm sure they're both right. I have certainly benefited from my years of service to NAICC. I also think the reason it's perhaps a little easier to find people to run for office today is that the nature of the job is changing as the organization grows and matures.

We have used some of our former presidents pretty hard in past years. With little staff support, they had to do way too much hands-on management, and that meant hundreds of uncompensated hours of service. That was difficult enough without the fact that some of us can be quite vocal and critical when we disagree with someone else's thoughts or actions. So we had people working too hard for no money and no praise. What they frequently got instead was harsh criticism. And we were surprised when people didn't want those jobs?

Today, with a professional staff in place, the Executive Board is able to govern more and manage less. The jobs are still not particularly easy, but they are at least possible to accomplish. And as this year's nominees have attested, there are some definite benefits to the service.

A strong slate of nominees eager to serve. That strikes me as a major accomplishment for any organization. The least the rest of us can do is to execute our ballots and exercise our responsibility to vote. Otherwise, without our input, the outcome will be like flipping a coin.

The good news is that with strong contenders for every position, NAICC can't possibly lose the toss.

---

**HAPPENINGS ON THE HILL**

by Allison Jones, Executive Director

House Agriculture Committee Chairman Pat Roberts (R-KS) introduced the Agricultural Regulatory Relief and Trade Act of 1995, which will take into consideration issues not addressed in the budget reconciliation package. The bill will amend the current policies for regulatory relief, credit, trade, and research.

Under the heading of regulatory relief, the bill will include measures to define in more detail whole farm plans outlined in the Clean Water Act legislation. The bill will define the parameters that the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) would use for the development of these plans. For copies of the NAICC position statement on integrated farm planning, please call the Memphis office.

Other provisions of this Act include moving the NRCS to the Consolidated Farm Services Agency at USDA, and authorizing existing research programs.

(Continued on page 6)
I wonder a lot. That’s wonder, not wander. I do that also, but that’s another NAICC News article. For instance...
• I wonder, how in the world am I going to have time to write this article?
• I wonder, did everyone have a tough year like we did in Illinois?
• I wonder, does my family still live on the farm that I’m paying for?
• I wonder, what goes into planning a meeting like the NAICC Annual Meeting, and specifically why the NAICC meetings are held at such fancy hotels?

For answers to these and other important questions, please read on.

I decided to find the time to write this article because it is a topic that has nagged me and my checkbook for awhile, and I know there are others out there who have asked the same questions.

I used to wonder how decisions for the NAICC Annual Meeting were made when I became involved in planning some WSSA as well as some of our state and local meetings here in Illinois. I learned meeting planning is an art, and if you are not careful, it can become a full time job which involves a lot of cow pies.

Well, thank goodness I took the time to find out just what goes into planning a meeting that drastically affects me. Attendance at our annual meeting last year ran about 250 people, including spouses, speakers, guests, etc. That is about average for an association with our budget, although we’re expecting a lot more people in Orlando. What sets us apart from other groups (and don’t we like being different from others—or at least as independent as a you-know-what?) is that as consultants and researchers we demand and thrive on the educational sessions. We have two distinct groups with different program needs. This requires two separate meeting rooms for about 120 people each. The facilities we use must be large enough to accommodate meals for 200 people, and have two separate breakout rooms that our group can immediately go into for our next sessions, AND at least 3000 square feet for our trade show. This automatically kicks us out of the local Red Roof Inn and Budgetel.

There just aren’t that many hotels located in the lower 48 that have the abundance of meeting space we require, and will NEGOTIATE reasonable rates. Also, when searching for a hotel, the staff looks for the facilities where we won’t get lost in the crowd. If you’ll notice the hotels we’ve chosen in the past have had only one or two other small groups in house at the same time. This assures us that we will receive the quality of service we demand from the hotel staff. Hopefully, one day NAICC will become so large and our meetings will be so well attended that we have to go to larger hotels to accommodate our growth.

Granted, we could rent the local Knights of Columbus hall and hold our meetings there. That would involve transporting people all over town in buses, and I can just imagine the amount of hell that would be raised! Besides, I’m not sure I want that to be the image we present to the Secretary of Agriculture when he comes to visit. We need to be in a professional atmosphere. I like my pickup truck, but I want decision and policy makers to know that I am a PROFESSIONAL!

Lots of other things are taken into consideration when planning a meeting. Recently, the Executive Board adopted a five-city rotation for the meeting. This helps our staff plan ahead and book hotels far enough in advance to get the best rates. I like knowing where we will be in the next five years. It certainly helps me plan ahead, and I don’t know about you, but I need all the help I can get in that area. (Where did I leave those field reports?)

Another thing I really wonder about each year is the annual meeting registration fee. We’ve all said things like, “Just what do these people think we’re made of, MONEY?” and “Money doesn’t grow on trees, or any other crop my clients grow!” when we receive the convention registration packet. Just what does this cover, I wondered? Well, being the quiet, shy type, I called Memphis and asked. This fee covers the costs incurred by the Alliance for printing the preliminary program; the final program; handouts; speakers’ meals, rooms, travel if necessary, and much more.

What I need to make this article really creditable is a Dennis Berglund pie chart. One slice would show the amount of money attendees contribute to the overall convention budget. Another piece would display how invaluable our sponsors are to our meetings. Then in a bright, neon color, it would show that the money we pay for registration and meals doesn’t come close to the cost of putting on a convention. The sponsors and exhibitors make up the difference and even allow NAICC to make a small profit. The profit will help to underwrite important activities for the rest of the year — such as sending people to Washington and elsewhere to represent our interests in this increasingly competitive political environment.

I mentioned speakers. Having served on the Annual Meeting Coordination Committee, I know that the first priority for speaker selection is to see what NAICC members can make presentations. I certainly enjoy hearing how my counterparts across the country deal with many issues, very similar to the ones I encounter daily. If there is a topic of interest that we as consultants or researchers need more information from outside our profession, the committee then looks outside the Alliance for a knowledgeable speaker. Each year a speaker budget is developed and speakers are asked to come based on those dollars and cents.

Have you noticed that the way we pay for meals at the annual meeting keeps changing? That’s because the staff keeps trying different ways to make us happy. In Memphis the registration fee included everything from registration packets to meals. We complained LOUDLY. Then in San Diego, we went to the meal ticket plan. That I know for a fact was a disaster, and really
annoyed many of us. As Chairman of the Membership Services Committee, I was denied access to my meeting luncheon because I didn’t have a ticket. To be honest, I couldn’t remember if I had purchased a ticket two months earlier when I filled out my registration form. Luckily, Allison Jones was standing nearby and told the door warden to let me in. The 1995 San Diego luncheon debacle cost the Alliance a nice piece of change, since this was the only free meal offered, and most of the people who signed up to attend decided to go sightseeing instead!! This year, the $200 meal plan is supposed to be a compromise. I’m not sure how well this will go over, but I know the staff will try everything humanly possible to accommodate everyone.

There are lots of considerations that go into making decisions for 250 hungry people. What do they want to eat? How many people will attend each meal? How much are they willing to pay? A final head count has to be given to the hotel 72 hours before each meal, and any miscalculations have to be paid for by the Alliance.

I wonder if Great Lines gets tired of hearing complaints about the Annual Meeting. I remember an article Daney wrote one time that said she gets more concerned when she doesn’t hear from us. I recommend that you let the Memphis staff know your thoughts — good or bad — about our Annual Meeting. They are good listeners and will try their best to make as many people happy as possible. Working with groups includes and requires compromises. Not everyone will be happy, but I guarantee you that everyone will get some of what they want.

I wonder how many of you will read this article. It really doesn’t matter, because I bet the ones who are reading it have a better understanding of what is involved in planning the outstanding meeting that NAICC is famous for sponsoring.

As for having a tough year, I look forward to visiting with you in Orlando about the trials and tribulations of the ’95 season, and yes, my family still lives with me on the farm.

Bill Tarter, Jr., of Alvey Laboratory & Associates in Carlyle, Ill., is a voting member of NAICC and the Chairman of the Membership Services Committee, as well as a member of the Annual Convention Committee and the Researcher Education Committee.

(‘‘Making Beautiful Music’’ continued from page 1)

two former presidents, elected by the Past Presidents’ Council; three “rank and file” members, at least one of whom must be a contract researcher, elected by the membership at the annual meeting; two presidents of state organizations, appointed by the NAICC president; one sustaining member, elected by the Allied Industry Committee; and the executive vice president.

The success of the process depends on the selection of the planning committee and the facilitator.

One of the purposes of this article is to alert NAICC members to begin thinking about involvement in the planning process—whether you yourself would like to be involved and, if not, what other members would be good representatives. The three “rank and file” members will be elected from the floor at the business meeting in Orlando.

We are exceptionally fortunate that sustaining member DowElanco is making available both their state-of-the-art computerized facilities in Indianapolis and their professional planner to be our facilitator. Mike Steckler is widely known throughout the industry for his facilitation skills, and he has already spent a considerable amount of time with the staff helping us prepare for the process.

The plan must be realistic. One phase of the process is to envision the best possible outcome for the organization. Then the planners must go through the difficult chore of introducing reality into the dream. As management guru Peter Drucker says, “If you don’t concentrate your institution’s resources, you are not going to get results. This may be the ultimate test of leadership: the ability to think through the priority decision and make it stick.”

To me, that will be the ultimate value to NAICC, and to any group with high aspirations and limited resources.

Having quoted Harold’s leadership Bible, it’s only fair to pull from Bruce Nowlin’s handbook, Cowboy Wisdom. Surely, somewhere in those pages the following quote appears: “If you chase two horses going in opposite directions, you probably won’t catch either one.”

HOW TO PICK A PLANNER

One of the exciting new opportunities at the business meeting in Orlando will be the election of three members to participate in a year-long strategic planning process for NAICC (see related story). This will be an important event in the life of the Alliance, and the membership should give careful thought to electing their representatives.

Here are some characteristics of good planners:

• Availability. The 12-person committee will meet in two-day sessions at least twice in 1996, and a third meeting may be necessary prior to presenting the final report to the membership in January of 1997 in San Antonio.

• Strong reasoning ability. Planners will be requested to think through abstract questions such as, “What are our strengths?” “What are our weaknesses?” “Where are we today?” “Where do we want to be?”

• An open mind. In order to reach consensus among a diverse group, it’s necessary for members to listen to each other and strive for compromise.

• Articulation skills. Ability to put one’s thoughts in words clearly understood by others is a real asset in a planning process.

• Ability to represent the thinking of the group. One of the purposes of creating a diverse planning team is to ensure that as many viewpoints as possible are represented.

Feel free to call the Memphis office if you have questions or would like more information about strategic planning.
Precision Agriculture in the Red River Valley

by Dennis Berglund and Mike Freeberg

The Red River Valley is an intensively farmed area located on the border between North Dakota and Minnesota. It has very flat terrain, and major crops include wheat, barley, sugarbeets, potatoes, soybeans, corn, sunflowers, and dry edible beans. Precision agriculture is in demand there, primarily in the form of variable rate application of fertilizer on sugarbeets according to grid soil tests. But this is only the beginning. Over the next few years, the Red River Valley will become a focal point of precision ag, as yield monitors, mapping, satellite positioning, variable planting rates, spot spraying for weeds and intensive soil sampling begins to be used on all crops grown in the region.

Precision agriculture is different from conventional agriculture, in that it attempts to put the appropriate amount of product only on areas that need it. Conventional agriculture applies crop inputs according to field averages, with some areas getting excessive inputs and others not getting enough. Precision agriculture is designed to give the maximum economic return to the grower while providing minimum impact on the environment.

Grid sampling and variable rate application involve several steps. First, the field is broken into three- to five-acre grids, or “mini-fields,” and plotted with satellite global positioning. Seven or eight cores of soil are taken per grid point, and each grid is identified and kept separated from the others. Three depths of soil are collected for sugarbeets—zero to six inches, six to 24 inches, and 24 to 48 inches. Careful handling of the soil is very important.

The soil is then analyzed at a quality soil testing lab. Interpretation of the results is a critical component; variability in nutrient levels can be due to disease, drought, soil type, water damage, old building sites, spreading of manure, or one of many other causes.

Mapping is the next step. We digitize the ASCS map in the computer software, then import the data. A computerized map file is made which contains the data needed to variable rate apply the fertilizer.

Finally, variable rate spreading is done by a dealer who owns a variable rate spreader. (The approximate cost of such a machine ranges from $275,000 to $300,000.)

The layman’s definition of site-specific farming might be “doing the right thing in the right place.” When fertilizers became widely available in the 1960s, growers fertilized all fields the same way using a standard fertilizer. Soil testing began to be utilized in the ’70s, and each field was fertilized according to the needs of the field average. Now we have the equipment, knowledge, grower demand, and financial incentive for the grower to soil sample intensively, and apply fertilizer on a grid-by-grid basis.

Another way to look at precision ag is to contrast a shotgun with a rifle. The shotgun approach treats the entire field the same, regardless of specific characteristics of different areas. This would result in three bags of soil collected—one sample for each of three soil depths.

The rifle approach uses known characteristics of areas of a field to develop a site-specific management plan. Using this method on a 60 to 80 acre field results in 54 bags of soil collected—three depths for each of 18 grid points.

What is the cost to the farmer? Grid sampling averages $11-15 per acre for sampling, analysis, and computer map file to run the spreader. The costs are $8-12 per acre for custom variable rate fertilizer application.

The net return to the farmer is hard to document. However, farmers that grid sample and variable rate apply one year usually increase the number of acres that they grid sample the following year—a trend that strongly indicates profitability!

What are some of the negatives? Grid sampling is very labor intensive and equipment intensive, and turnaround time for spreading must be two weeks or less. And there is a steep learning curve, with no adequate source of education. There are no industry standards for data compiling, global positioning, mapping, and hardware; access to GPS, geographical information, and satellite imagery is difficult; and research is lacking on the number of probes to take, optimum grid size, and the economic aspects. In short, precision ag is a new unknown.

Precision ag has been promoted to be more widespread and easily implemented than it really is. There are actually very few companies that are putting the various pieces together. Our experiences with precision ag have taught us some surprising things. For example, nutrient variability in fields that appear to be “uniform” is high. Also, grid soil sampling will not decrease the amount of fertilizer used. In 1994, in almost 200 fields that CENTROL of Twin Valley sampled, grid sampling increased the nitrogen fertilizer used by an average of 11 percent, when compared to how the field would have been fertilized using the field average.

One concern that we’d like to share is this: precision agriculture has grown and will continue to grow fast enough without being mandated. What is needed are efforts aimed at increasing education about precision ag methods to growers, consultants, and ag suppliers. Applied regional research at the grass roots level is a great place to start. Standards can only be worked out on a region-by-region basis, and as we get different types of data, we can make better decisions based on specific sites, rather than making decisions for the whole field based on a few areas.

Dennis Berglund

and Mike Freeberg of CENTROL Crop Consulting in Twin Valley, Minn., are both voting members of NAICC. Berglund currently serves as NAICC Treasurer, as well as Chairman of the Administrative Services and Evaluation Committee. Freeberg is the NAICC representative to the Alliance on Agriculture Information Technology. This article is excerpted from a presentation made earlier this year by Berglund and Mike Freeberg at a precision agriculture field day in Beltsville, Md., attended by Secretary Glickman and dozens of Congressional representatives and their staffs.
for two years. The Committee will request comments from the research community and plans to hold extensive hearings. Changes in research priorities would be made next year in a separate research bill. However, now is a good time to contact your Representatives and share your views on research programs.

At press time, the authors of this bill were also considering language to reform pesticide and food safety concern including the Delaney Clause.

**Research Plans Discussed in Washington**

Recently, NAICC President Harold Lambert met with Congressional staffers to discuss NAICC's role in research. He met with Kirk Mann and Dr. John Goldberg of the House Agriculture Committee and Doug Benevinto with the office of Congresswoman Wayne Allard (R-CO) to discuss the Committee's concerns with current research priorities at USDA. Committee Chairman Pat Roberts, Ranking Minority Member Kika de la Garza, Resource Conservation, Research, and Forestry Subcommittee Chairman Allard and Subcommittee Ranking Member Tim Johnson, (D-S.D.) sent a letter to USDA requesting responses to 57 questions relating to the Agency's handling of research issues. Lambert shared the Alliance's thoughts on what the 57 answers should be.

While in Washington, Lambert attended a planning meeting of the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges to develop the future agenda for research, Extension, and higher education in Land Grant Universities dealing with agriculture and natural resources. As a member of the National Advisory Committee, Lambert and others will develop recommendations on the scope and content of three futuring activities that will examine the current and future role of Land Grant Universities.

**Commerce Committee Expected to Take Up Minor Use Bill**

The House Commerce Committee was expected to mark-up H.R. 1627, the Minor Use Pesticide Act sometime in October prior to floor action late in the month. Committee Chairman Billey (R-VA) introduced the bill in May, which was approved by the House Agriculture Committee the following month. Similar legislation was introduced in the Senate in August (see September NAICC News).

**Endangered Species Legislation Approved by Resources Committee**

The House Resources Committee, chaired by Congressman Don Young (R-AK) approved on October 12, bipartisan legislation which will reauthorize the Endangered Species Act (ESA) and create incentives for the protection of vital habitat on private lands. H.R. 2275, the Endangered Species Conservation and Management Act of 1995 includes:

- Measures to encourage species protection with private land owners through cooperative management agreements, habitat conservation grants, land exchanges, species conservation planning, technical and financial assistance for the protection and recovery of species.
- Compensation for private property owners through short-term or long-term agreements when the ESA restrictions diminish property values by 20 percent or more.
- Creation of the National Biological Diversity Reserve - a proactive program to increase the populations of endangered species on reserve lands.
- Basing listing decisions on current factual information with peer review.
- Giving individual states a role in developing conservation plans.
- Giving priority to conservation plans that provide for more than one species.

Approximately 90 percent of the habitat for endangered species is on non-federal land.

**Under Reconstruction: NAICC Code of Ethics**

With a year of hard and successful work under their belts, the NAICC Ethics and Grievance (E&G) Committee is headed into the Orlando annual meeting with another big task to perform. “The first-ever grievance procedure is now complete,” says Robin Spitko, NAICC secretary, who has also served as liaison between the committee and the Executive Board.

“Next on the agenda is to revise the Code of Ethics.”

In fact, the Executive Board made some minor changes in the Code at its October meeting in New Orleans. President Harold Lambert explains, “We’re not trying to pre-empt the committee, and we certainly don’t mean to imply that there’s anything major wrong with the old Code of Ethics. It’s just that as things change and evolve within the organization, it becomes necessary to alter our official documents to conform to the changes made in the by-laws last year. Now, as we head into a strategic planning process (see related article), it’s pretty apparent that we will need to make other changes as well, and those should come through the committee.”

Such evolutionary changes in the organization, in fact, necessitated the drafting of the Alliance’s first-ever grievance procedure. Following recommendations of the Membership Recruitment and Rules (MR&R) Committee, procedures for processing membership applications have been modified. Rather than conduct exhaustive investigations of the backgrounds of prospective members, NAICC now poses pertinent questions on the application form. Based on the answers to those questions, the applicant is assigned to the appropriate membership category. “We begin with the assumption that people will tell the truth,” says MR&R chair Paul Gronberg. “We also understand that there will be the occasional instance when one of our members believes that facts have been misrepresented. That’s what the grievance procedure is for.”

Spitko and the E&G Committee members deserve major congratulations for their accomplishment, Lambert says. “This document has been through several drafts, based on input from the committee, the Executive Board, and two different attorneys,” he adds. “Robin is to be complimented for keeping the process moving, and the committee members have my thanks for doing a very conscientious job.”

Copies of the revised Code of Ethics are included with this newsletter. If you would like a copy of the Grievance Procedure, call NAICC Headquarters.
David Harms was profiled in the October 1995 issue of *Agronomy News*, the magazine of the American Society of Agronomy. A self-employed agronomist, Harms is a past president of both NAICC and the Professional Crop Consultants of Illinois.

Maggie Alms accepts the award from Brookside Chairman of the Board Roger Dennings.

Charles Mellinger has been busy this year, first serving as a tour director for the National Foundation for IPM Education and the International Food Information Council joint media workshop, "IPM: In Partnership with Nature" in Naples, Fla. Twenty-five local and national media representatives attended.

In May, Mellinger was a featured speaker at the International Food Policy Research Institute's workshop on "Pest Management, Food, Agriculture, and the Environment," held in Washington, D.C. In mid-summer, Mellinger was one of 28 agricultural professionals and agency representatives invited to participate in a meeting of the World Wildlife Fund to explore the measurement of pesticide reliance, use, and risks, and the adoption of bio-intensive IPM programs. At the meeting, held in Washington, D.C., Mellinger began a discussion on chemical vs. bio-intensive IPM.

### NEW MEMBERS

**VOTING**


Felicia L. Parks, B.A. (Botany) Glades Crop Care, Inc. 17397 Duquesne Road Fort Myers, FL 33912 Phone: 407/746-3740 Home: 941/267-2941 Fax: 407/746-3775 Crops: Field and greenhouse crops including tomatoes, peppers, strawberries, melons, squash, beans, eggplant, citrus. Services: Thrips identification, scouting.

### SUSTAINING

Delta and Pine Land Company Contact: Don Kimmel P.O. Box 157 Scott, MS 38772 Phone: 601/742-3351

Griffin Corporation Contact: Bill Champion 1301-D Sunset Drive Grenada, MS 38901 Phone: 601/226-6505

ISK Biosciences Corporation Contact: Elizabeth Owens 5966 Heisley Road P.O. Box 8000 Mentor, OH 44061-8000 Phone: 216/357-4188 Home: 216/225-0454 Fax: 216/357-4692

Stoneville Pedigreed Seed Company Contact: Jack Mace 5865 Ridgeway Center Parkway Suite 300 Memphis, TN 38120 Phone: 901/682-2732 Home: 901/854-0371 Fax: 901/682-8119 Mobile: 901/487-9501 Services: Stoneville® develops and markets high yielding, high quality cotton varieties. The company, a biotechnology leader, is also incorporating novel traits designed to lower production inputs.

### CERTIFICATIONS

James W. Chiles, Jr. Growth, Inc. P.O. Box 186 Clarksdale, MS 38614

Roger Dennings Dennings & Associates, Inc. 7881 Upton Road Elsie, MI 48831

Thomas Lamar Hardegree F&W Agriservices Route 1, Box 306 Desota, GA 31743

Stanley J. Winslow Peele Agricultural Consulting Route 1, Box 360 B Belvidere, NC 27919

---

Can you play “She’ll Be Coming ‘Round the Mountain” on your kazoo? Or tapdance to “Tiptoe Through the Tulips”? Maybe you can sing “Moon River” while hanging upside-down by your knees. Whatever your talent—yodelling, ballroom dancing, knock-knock jokes, juggling—we want to see it! Call the Memphis office at 901/683-9466 to sign up as a participant in the 1996 Annual Meeting Talent Show, to be held Friday, Jan. 26, immediately following the Awards Banquet. Prizes will be awarded!
DOERS PROFILE

Danny Bennett

Self-Employed:
Bennett Agri-Consulting in Cochran, Georgia

Services: Total management service on cotton.

Memberships:
NAICC, Georgia Association of Professional Agricultural Consultants

Education:
B.S. in Agronomy

Family:
Wife, Terri, Son, Ross, 3

Hobbies:
Hiking, hunting, fishing.

Danny, a crop consultant for 13 years, currently serves on the Annual Meeting Coordination Committee, and is the NAICC membership contact for Georgia.

CALENDAR OF EVENTS

NOV. 28-30, 1995
Nebraska Independent Crop Consultant Association Annual Meeting, New World Inn, Columbus, Neb. For more information contact: Mike Williams, 308/995-5197.

DEC. 1-2, 1995
Ag Retailers Association Convention, St. Louis, Mo. For more information call: 314/567-6655.

DEC. 7, 1995
California Department of Food and Agriculture’s Fertilizer Research and Education Program Conference, Kearney Agricultural Center, University of California, Parlier, Calif. For more information contact: Debbie Scott or Casey Walsh-Cady, 916/653-5340.

JAN. 8-12, 1996
Beltwide Cotton Conference, Opryland Hotel, Nashville, Tenn. For more information call: 901/274-9030.

JAN. 24-28, 1996
NAICC Annual Meeting, Grosvenor Resort at Walt Disney World Village, Orlando, Fla. For more information call: 901/683-9466.

FEB. 14-15, 1995
Independent Agricultural Consultants of Colorado Annual Meeting, University Park Holiday Inn, Fort Collins, Co. CEUs available. For more information, call: 719/346-9501.

NAICC
752 E. Brookhaven Circle
Suite 240
Memphis, TN 38117