For years NAICC representatives ventured to Capitol Hill and met with policy-makers on various matters affecting NAICC members. We have rarely asked for special attention, but have repeatedly offered our organization as a resource since independent crop and research consultants are an excellent source of information when it comes to agriculture production and environmental issues.

Well, it worked. NAICC has been asked to serve on two USDA discussion groups dealing with the Food Quality Protection Act (FQPA) and IPM. During the Executive Board’s Spring meeting last month, Board members and staff spent two days visiting with agency officials and legislators. The Board first met with Special Assistant for Pesticide Policy, Keith Pitts at USDA. Pitts was starting his third week on the job and gave an overview of Deputy Secretary Rominger’s plans for 1997. At the top of the list was implementation of FQPA.

Under this legislation passed by Congress in August 1996, USDA is responsible for leading government efforts to collect necessary exposure and use data to support EPA’s risk assessments for pesticides and for directing research efforts to ensure adequate pest management alternatives are available for U.S. growers. Plans are to bring together 8-10 representatives from major and minor crops, food processors, registrants, and the environmental community to discuss alternative approaches for implementing the FQPA. “Input from such a broad based group will make the agency more responsive to all stakeholders,” says Pitts. “We see NAICC as an important asset to this discussion group, especially with regard to the potential loss of important pesticide tools as a result of FQPA. You are the ones who are in the field and know what challenges growers face in regards to pest management; what tools are available to U.S. growers; and finally, how to achieve the risk reduction goals of the FQPA through IPM and stewardship rather than safety through the elimination of these tools. This information is extremely important for our job of collecting data.” Mike Brubaker will represent NAICC on the data group which will meet this spring.

Pitts also invited NAICC to participate in another discussion group concentrating on IPM. Harold Lambert will serve on this committee which will convene in late summer or early fall. USDA’s IPM Initiative calls for an increased total funding of $13.1 million to cover needs assessments, development of a knowledge base and technology transfers, IPM implementation, feedback, and accountability. Lambert’s role will be to bring the consultants’ and contract researcher’s perspective to this project.

Yet Another Invitation

NAICC was asked by Larry Elworth, now with the Program for Strategic Pest Management in Gettysburg, Penn, to serve on a task force which is a subgroup of the FQPA-IWG or implementation working group. Elworth is a member of the IWG which is an ad hoc umbrella working group responsible for coordinating, reviewing, and providing input in the development and execution of activities concerning FQPA. The group is charged with soliciting input from both EPA and USDA. Elworth is co-chair of one of five task forces, his specifically dealing with developing pesticide use information, alternatives and pest management needs information for consumers.

(Continued on page 2)
I have a confession to make. When I began my term as President, I was becoming more and more uncertain as to where our members wanted to go, who they wanted to be, etc. With the dramatic changes in the agricultural landscape, and particularly the consulting industry, recently taking place, there has been a little confusion.

We’ve been told we didn’t have the critical mass to effect change, and we didn’t necessarily represent the profession. I never believed that, but I kept hearing it. And, frankly, we have lost several key voting members who have taken jobs as consultants with sales organizations recently.

Is this a mega-trend beginning for our industry or just a few isolated situations?

Lately, answers to these questions and concerns have been appearing with amazing clarity.

In John Deere’s recent study of our industry, they determined there were around 880 independent consulting firms. And through our contacts with state associations, we’ve identified around 650-700 members of state consulting organizations. By doing a little arithmetic and cross-referencing, the NAICC has representatives from over one-third of all the firms in the country, and almost two-thirds of the members who are members of the state associations. Although there is plenty of job security for our other volunteers who work on membership recruitment, we do represent the industry. Independent consultants manage inputs on 12-15 percent of our country’s acreage (recent surveys from Doane and John Deere), representing the most innovative producers, and influence several times that much. (If you work with growers, how many of their neighbors try to extrapolate your recommendations to fit their situations? Probably a lot!) In addition, our membership among those who specialize in research is the fastest growing segment of our voting membership and shows much promise for the future. In our recent trip to Washington: 1) we were asked to provide representation on two advisory panels for the Secretary of Agriculture’s office on the Food Quality Protection Act; 2) Robin Spitko held a seminar on IPM in the real world for USDA officials; 3) we were asked to work with EPA as a “reality check” in administering FQPA; 4) we were invited to become part of the FQPA Implementation Working Group; 5) we had extremely productive meetings with both the Ag Retailers Association and the American Crop Protection Association, who have proven to be strong allies; and 6) when we went to Capital Hill and visited with the leadership of the House and Senate Ag Committees, they were very aware of our presence and our influence in the “real world”. Yes, Maggie, we now have a “seat at the table”!

We have the critical mass that is effecting change in a very dramatic and positive way. But what about the makeup of our membership in the next few years?

Since the first of this year, I have had the pleasure of spending two days with the Alliance of Association Leaders (state and NAICC leadership group), and about four days with the Strategic Planning Committee. In both sessions we did a lot of soul searching, trying to forecast the future and figure out how our consulting organizations would work in the future. Our individual challenges of attracting and training a new generation of consultants and keeping up with new technology are universal, and won’t get easier in the short run, and we will need help.

Both groups clearly identified the need to partner with other groups, other individuals, and other organizations on special issues, projects, educational meetings, etc. But they also made it clear that independence from product sales needed to remain a cornerstone for voting membership.

We’ve been told in recent years that our independence lends credibility to others we partner with in industry or government on specific issues. By definition, we’re not going to agree all the time, however, that understanding creates a base to build on. We should explore possible relationships with other groups, both formal and informal, but the NAICC needs to retain its identity in order to make the Vision become reality.

("NAICC Taps Representatives..." continued from page 1)

pesticides undergoing tolerance reassessment. Elworth stated, “Implementation of FQPA provides strong incentive and opportunity for agriculture to provide accurate information on how pesticides are actually used.”

NAICC’s Legislative Advisory Task Force Chair Robin Spitko and President Elect Lee West represented the Alliance at the first meeting of this task force on April 17 in Washington. “Here is a critical opportunity for input from the nation’s crop consultants. There are few persons with better knowledge of actual crop production inputs used, including crop protection chemicals, than crop consultants. They know how, much, and why pesticides can be used and if alternative control methods are available and economically feasible. This knowledge is critically important to the registration process under FQPA.

Crop consultants should be prepared to share information with their state regulatory officials who should be contacting them. If they are not contacted, they should make themselves known and available for input in the data collection process,” reports Spitko.

Lee West was serving double duty that week as she was also attending a meeting of the National Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Committee. West stated, “This was probably the last real working meeting of the ELAB GLP Subcommittee. The group decided on its recommendation, so we finally have that behind us. Now the task still remains to write up the final version of our report to present to the Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Board at the next NELAP meeting in July.”

Reality Check

While no formal working group exists, Therese Murtaugh, Branch Chief for Biological, Economic Analysis Division at EPA formally asked NAICC to be a source of information as her department provides economic and biological analysis of EPA actions under
FQPA. Described as the “reality check,” Murtaugh and her staff provide data for the risk assessment division at EPA. They assess and mitigate risks and are looking to NAICC members to provide input for in-the-field examples and suggestions. When specific instances arise, Murtaugh will contact NAICC headquarters and ask for input from members dealing with specific crops. In turn, we will be calling on our members to provide direct input. While some of the actions will take place during the consultants’ busy season, the benefits of having accurate data available will help EPA make decisions that will affect your growers directly.

Other highlights of the Board’s meeting with USDA and EPA officials included a seminar headed by Robin Spitko to USDA personnel on the private sector implementation of IPM. Spitko’s presentation was requested by Garrition Cuperous, USDA’s IPM Coordinator and Mike Fitchner, National Program Leader for IPM under USDA-CSREES in response to a similar presentation Spitko made while representing NAICC on a Congressional staff tour earlier this year.

Sandy Penn and Ron Lauster updated Board members and staff on USDA’s implementation of the Environmental Quality Incentive Program (EQIP). Focus was given to the third party technical service our members can provide to growers. Current plans are for people certified under CPCC and several other national or USDA programs to be eligible to write these plans. Other proposed criteria includes meeting minimum standards established by the State Conservationist; completing and submitting for review the design of five conservation practices; be subject to an annual quality assurance control review; complete by January 2001 five modules of a self-paced training course provided by the NRCS Conservation Planning Course; update conservation technical assistance skills once every five years; and be listed by a certifying organization as an approved provider of specific types of conservation technical assistance.

Jay Vroom, president of the American Crop Protection Association (ACPA) and Libby Mikesell, communications director, joined the NAICC Board for lunch and discussed ways to work together in coalition on regulatory and legislative matters, and on broader areas such as IPM implementation and ag education. ACPA is a cooperative member of NAICC. The Board had lunch with another cooperative member the following day, the Ag Retailers Association. Floyd Gaibler, vice president for governmental affairs and C.L. Pettit, director of regulatory affairs, gave an update on issues affecting ARA, many of which are similar to those affecting NAICC members. Both groups are committed to exploring ways to partner on areas of mutual concern.

Roger Irwin, Lee West, and Allison Jones met with Kevin Keaney, Field Operations Division, Office of Pesticide Programs at EPA to discuss WPS implementation as it pertains to contract research. Currently a proposal by the Weed Science Society of America is being considered by Keaney’s division to clarify certain aspects of WPS. NAICC plans to send a letter to Keaney addressing our understanding of the program and researcher’s compliance.

Billy McLawhorn, Daney Kepple, and Phil Cochran called on Roberta Perry, who represents EPA on the CCA Board. Discussions at that meeting centered around appropriate methods for certifying those who advise the nation’s farmers. On the second day of visits, Board members met with their Representatives, Senators, and staff of both the House and Senate Agriculture and Appropriations Committees. Billy McLawhorn, Lee West, Don Jameson, Loarn Buel, and Allison Jones talked with Paul Unger, Majority Staff Director and Pete Thomson, Legislative Director of the House Ag Committee and separately with Steve Haterius, Minority Staff Director. Both groups outlined the committee’s agenda for the new Congress which currently includes the ag research title, timber, and trade issues. The same group met with Russell Laird, Subcommittee Staff Director for Forestry, Resource Conservation, and Research and Dave Ebersole also of the Agriculture Committee. According to Laird, “The word from Appropriations is we’ll be lucky to keep current funding levels for all programs. This means that the reality is we should work on fixing the current program and find ways to improve the system with the same dollars.”

Scott Parsons with Congressman Chip Pickering (R-MS) as well as Brian Edwardson with Senator Pat Roberts (R-KS) both updated NAICC members on H.R. 725, a bill to amend the Competitive, Special, and Facilities Research Grant, i.e. the Precision Agriculture Research, Education, and Information Dissemination Act. The goal is to increase emphasis on competitive grants and promote ag research projects regarding precision ag. Roger Irwin met with Senator Tim Johnson (D-SD) and agriculture legislative assistant Bret Healy. Irwin reported that Healy was very knowledgeable about crop consulting and issues facing agriculture. He also commented that he was very aware of NAICC and reads our newsletters.

Congressman Richard “Doc” Hastings (R-WA) asked for Don Jameson’s views, based on meeting with EPA and USDA the previous day, as to why EPA actions and Section 18 approvals had been so slow during the last six months. Hastings also asked for Jameson’s views on the IRS electronic payment plans. As a direct result of this meeting Jameson was asked to testify before a congressional hearing on the matter.
STRATEGIC PLAN AFFIRMS AND EXPANDS FOUNDERS’ VISION

From The Strategic Planning Committee

Q: How is strategic planning like cleaning out a closet?

A: Often you have to make a big mess in order to create a tidy whole.

“If that’s the recipe for success, we did an outstanding job,” quips NAICC President Billy McLawhorn.

The strategic planning process is often a historic turning point for an organization. While it’s too early to predict whether this will be the case for NAICC, there is little question that the broad-based, 12-member group recommended a path to the future that can have far-reaching effects for the organization and its members.

Under the expert guidance of veteran coordinator Dale Darling of DuPont, the Strategic Planning Committee met first in San Antonio prior to the Annual Meeting. “That’s when we dragged everything out of the closet,” laughs NAICC founder Earle Raun.

“We spent two days looking at everything - revisiting all our past decisions and trying to predict the future of agriculture.”

At the follow-up meeting in Memphis, March 22-23, Darling led the group through a series of exercises designed to create strategy from chaos. “That was an amazing experience!” says immediate Past President Don Jameson. “It was the darndest thing to see all those pieces start falling into place!”

Former President Dave Harms, who chaired the NAICC Steering Committee for several years, was less surprised by the process but equally gratified by the outcome. “We used to do a form of strategic planning every five years or so,” he points out. “All the former Presidents would hole up for a weekend and look at the big picture. That was back in the days when staff resources were much more limited and the Executive Board had to use a lot of energy on managing day-to-day affairs.”

Harms credits Darling’s facilitative skills with much of the success of the endeavor. “There’s nothing like working with a pro. Dale and Molly Machamer just made sure we looked at all the issues and they kept us from getting off track.”

Bill Peele, who was elected by the membership as an at-large member of the committee, says he’s particularly encouraged that such solid consensus was reached by a broad-based group. “If there is a viewpoint that didn’t get aired in the course of those discussions, I can’t imagine what it was,” Peele says.

Steve Wagner was specifically charged with representing the researcher segment of the membership, and he’s amazed that his job was so easy. “When the plan started coming together, it became very apparent that the interests of our two membership segments aren’t as different as we initially thought. When there are areas of difference, the solution is easy to find. In fact, we discovered that most of the problems we thought we had are already solved. I’m very encouraged.”

President Elect Lee West says she may be even more pleased than the other committee members with the success of the effort. “This will make my job so much easier,” she points out. “It’s not hard to lead when everyone is headed in the same direction.”

WHAT’S IN A NAME?

There’s been a question hanging in the air for awhile now, although it has rarely been verbalized. Funny how often the most potent and significant fears are the ones that aren’t said out loud.

The NAICC bugaboo has been the organization’s name. Does it still fit or have we outgrown it? Does it accurately describe who we are? If not, is there a collection of fewer than 50 words that might more accurately convey who we are?

This was one of many tough issues tackled by the Strategic Planning Committee. Some argued that “national” was too narrow a focus. Similar assaults were leveled against the words “crop” and “consultant.” Some members were adamantly opposed to any name change, ever, period. Others took a wait-and-see attitude.

“I think we decided that a name change at this point would be premature,” says NAICC President Billy McLawhorn. “It’s possible that when we start tackling our action steps, a different picture will emerge, but it’s real clear to me that we need to wait and see.

“I’m really glad we had the discussions, though. That is such a healthy process. One thing I was surprised and happy to learn was that the contract researchers in the group concluded that the term “crop consultant” applies to them as much as anyone. They just define the terms differently.”
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NAICC VISION STATEMENT

The Alliance, a leader in agriculture, represents, educates, encourages, and increases awareness of professional, independent consultants. Its members serve as the primary source of knowledge-based decisions guiding environmentally-sound and profitable agriculture.

CRITICAL SUCCESS ELEMENTS TO REACH VISION

1. An Alliance program in which all members participate on an annual basis generates a tremendous amount of positive publicity and good will for the profession.

2. NAICC utilizes its critical mass to provide services.
   • Representation to industry and government.
   • Products and services which provide competitive advantages, cost savings, or increased revenues.

3. The integrity of NAICC is maintained with a support structure designed to fulfill the needs of its members.
   • Hire both competent and dedicated staff who have a willingness to share in the vision of NAICC.
   • The staff has clear and concise communication with NAICC and leaders.
   • The support structure functions as a mechanism which creates stability and strength within the organization.

4. The Alliance utilizes an optimal information exchange network to serve the needs of its members.

5. Formal relationships exist among the state independent consulting organizations and between these organizations and the Alliance.

6. People desiring to enter the profession have access to applied, multidisciplinary, advanced degree programs.

7. The Alliance has secured its future through relationships with industry, academia, and grower directed organizations that develop awareness and opportunities for a career pursuit into independent crop and research consulting.

8. NAICC finances its operations through annual membership dues, corporate sponsorships, grants, and services.
   • Services
     Fee for special projects, information
   • Membership Fees
     Types
     Cost
   • Grants
     Corporate
     Government
   • Corporate sponsorship
     Annual Meeting
     Special activities

9. The Washington presence is continued and enhanced by:
   • Member contacts with their own Representatives and Senators.
   • Alliance members aggressively seek membership on Federal Agency committees.
   • NAICC staff monitors governmental activities
   • NAICC Board visitations with key Agency officials

10. NAICC has increased its membership to 1,000 by creating specific and quantifiable benefits.

11. Annual review of vision and critical success elements by long-range planning committee.
   • Mentor from long-range planning committee for each critical success element.
   • Long range planning committee will report to Board of Directors.
   • Keep constituencies informed of progress.
   • DuPont sponsor long range planning committee meeting.

USDA EQIP PROGRAM AND THE ROLE FOR PRIVATE AGRICULTURAL CONSULTANTS

by Don Jameson

In the last two years, our membership and Board of Directors have heard much about the concept of NRCS whole farm planning. This is really what I understand to be a component of the EQIP legislation which has been approved and funded by Congress. During the April 7th and 8th meetings of your Board of Directors in Washington, D.C., we met with many representatives, including several at USDA who spoke about how crop consultants could play a role in providing EQIP service to the grower users.

While there are clearly national guidelines and a national level description of the program, it has been my own discovery that at the state level the process has moved very quickly to get up and running and be in place to approve proposals during the remaining latter spring months and have the awards or allocations decided by September 1997. It was indicated to me that the development of the program will vary from state to state and may even be moderately different between conservation districts. In Washington, the state is divided up into several geographic project areas (GPAs) each GPA may be comprised of several counties who have similar interests.

NAICC consultants who have an interest in working on this program should meet directly with their state or district conservationist to understand the terms of the program in that area, and how they can best be a part of providing technical assistance.

A clear distinction that was recently made apparent to me is that we have been talking at national level about providing technical assistance in writing "The Plan". In the Midwest this may apply to the whole farm, and perhaps it is a point where individual consultants could be finding a work niche. However in the west, the approach does not apply so much to work with a whole farm but
Rather particular fields or a plan for a particular system, i.e., conversion of surface furrow irrigation to drip irrigation to conserve water and minimize surface erosion. The procedure for putting together a plan a local grower would choose to submit for funding is fairly technical and would be something very quickly processed through the computer format of our local district office. While national legislation might in theory allow for private third parties to write these plans, in reality it would not be an area for private consultants in Washington to realize any appreciable benefit or financial opportunity.

Rather the opportunity for consultants will be to plug in and provide service support to farmers who choose or are required to apply certain new practices for satisfaction of “The Plan”. In Washington these new practices would largely focus on irrigation water management, nutrient management practices, and pesticides management practices. Within a proposal and individual grower who is so awarded will receive direct transfer dollars at so much per acre to help achieve improvements in these category practices. It is at this point that the individual grower or equipment supplier, chemical dealer, etc., will have the opportunity to supply goods or services as the grower chooses and directs the spending of his direct awarded dollars.

As private consultants our challenge will therefore be to inform potential recipients of EQIP awards as well as our clients that we are in a position to be a server provider who can help them achieve the objectives of these different improvement practices. In short, I believe it is important to our individual membership in each state to meet with their local district USDA conservationist and understand how they can be a part of the program or a part of the working group advisory committees that will be directing the selection of proposal themes within different geographical regions.

Don Jameson of Agrimanagement, Inc., in Yamika, Wash., is past-president and voting member of NAICC.

**SPOTLIGHT ON THE STATES**

**Georgia Association of Professional Agricultural Consultants, Kansas Association of Independent Crop Consultants, and North Carolina Agricultural Consultants Association** have recently made financial contributions to NAICC. The donations were placed in the general fund to further efforts to promote the consulting profession. While there is no financial obligation to become a state affiliate member of NAICC, several state organizations contribute money in support of our efforts on a national level. Thanks to these groups and previous donors for your support.

**SIMPLISM — A THING OF THE PAST?**

By Earle Raun, Ph.D., CPCC-I

As a long time member of NAICC I have had pride in the “Independent” part of our organization’s name. And of course my client producers are my employers, so I have considered my own independence as important.

I have not changed my mind about doing business independent of product sales or application. However, I recently read an article in “Bottom Line” which gave weight to something NAICC has been stressing. The “I” can stand for “Interdependence” just as well, and perhaps better than “Independent.”

I’m not advocating a name change for our organization, but rather want to comment on some thoughts in the article. It was written by a reporter who interviewed Dr. M. Scott Peck, a psychiatrist and an author of 8 best-selling books, including “The Road Less Traveled.” There are several thoughts in the article which triggered my interest and mental processing.

Probably the Interdependency issue is the most significant thread running through the article. From frontier days, when settlers produced their own food, clothing, shelter, and entertainment, “Independent” truly described the family. But even then they were dependent on one another. As settler numbers grew, shared work became commonplace. Today, we couldn’t exist without those on whom we are dependent, and who depend on us—“interdependent.”

As we consultants change our businesses to keep up with changing and burgeoning technology it is obvious we can’t continue to do all the things, individually, that we have tried to do previously. Only so much knowledge and expertise can be crammed into one brain. Each of us must develop his/her strengths and become interdependent with others whose developed strengths are different but compatible.

Dr. Peck warns us about what he calls SIMPLISM. He defines the word as the tendency to accept simple answers to complex questions. To me, the major role of an Ag consultant is to use what is often called “a systems approach” when she/he makes recommendations. This is no longer easy for an individual, no matter what his experience and training. Interdependency can provide the additional knowledge required of the systems approach. (Thus avoiding simplism.) It also provides the client with a better solution to the management efforts than would be available otherwise.

I guess a summary of the article (when related to NAICC members) would be, “Don’t be a rugged individualist. If your expertise is entomology, consider the thoughts and recommendations of a weed scientist before making an herbicide recommendation. Perhaps consider joining forces with others with different training, expertise, and compatible consulting businesses.” This in no way reduces your independence for consulting purposes. It does simplify providing your client a recommendation that fits the systems approach.

The competition of the Independent crop consultant will be the dealer-applicator business, such as the Coop. Joining forces with other “independent” self-employed, doesn’t require that you join them in a “corporate” way if you wish to stay “self employed.” Work out an arrangement by which you “trade work,” in order to “trade expertise.” Avoid simplism with interdependence!

Earle Raun of Pest Management Co., in Lincoln, Nebr., is a past president and voting member of NAICC.
The goal of the ASC this year is to save enough money in committee work to take all NAICC members, their spouses, and children to Hawaii, Fiji, and New Zealand on an extended (two month) all expenses paid trip. Upon return we hope to have saved enough money on the trip to buy each NAICC member and their spouses a Humvee (completely loaded) and the Porsche or Lamborghini of their choice. If we save enough money on these purchases we hope to purchase one night for each member and their spouse in the Lincoln bedroom at the Clinton’s residence.

Once we accomplish all of the above, if remaining funds allow we will address more pertinent issues. We hope to further develop an evaluation system to grade the working relationship between our association management staff and NAICC. Another goal is to write procedures for conducting the evaluation and reporting the results in a constructive manner.

Improving the clarity of NAICC’s contract with our management staff is also a goal so that both the staff and NAICC members, committees, and the Executive Board know the responsibility of the staff and the membership in our relationship.

Roger Carter of Agricultural Management Services, Inc., is the treasurer and a voting member of NAICC.

NEW MEMBERS

VOTING

Stephen G. Breight, MBA (Business Administration) NICCA, NCGA, NECGA
Agronomic Partners, Inc.
217 South Hall
Minden, NE 68959
Office: (308) 832-0642
Home: (308) 832-0642
Fax: (308) 832-0642
Mobile: (308) 830-0262
Crops: Corn and soybeans.
Services: Soil sampling; fertilizer, hybrid, and herbicide recommendations; equipment calibration and adjustment; disease, weed, and insect monitoring; moisture probing; irrigation scheduling.

William Englar, B.S. (Agriculture) WCSQA, NFFA, IFT
WM J. Englar & Associates, Inc.
PO. Box 1548
Moses Lake, WA 98837
Office: (509) 762-5922
Home: (509) 765-9506
Fax: (509) 762-9885
Mobile: (509) 750-2808
E-mail: wjenglar@atnet.net
Crops: All fruits and vegetables, small grains.
Services: GLP food processing for scientific research.

Dan Ramsdell, M.S. (Entomology) NWSS
Crop Management Strategies, Inc.
P.O. Box 510
Hereford, PA 18056
Office: (610) 767-1944
Fax: (610) 767-1925
Crops: Vegetables, turf.
Services: Field research.

Kevin Schwertfeger, B.S. (Agriculture) KAICC
Pro Ag Inc.
34918 W. Silver Lake Road
Turon, KS 67583-9701
Office: (316) 672-3781
Home: (316) 497-6512
Fax: (316) 497-6512
Mobile: (316) 546-4677
Crops: Corn, soybeans, wheat, sorghum, alfalfa, forage crops.
Services: Crop management; insect, disease, and weed scouting; fertility and chemical recommendations; irrigation scheduling; soil, water, and feed sampling.

PROVISIONAL

Justin McGee (Biology) NWSS
Crop Management Strategies, Inc.
P.O. Box 510
Hereford, PA 18056
Office: (610) 767-1944
Home: (610) 437-8828
Fax: (610) 767-1925
Crops: Vegetables, turf, tree crops.
Services: Contract research.

Doane Agricultural Services Acquires Magazine

Doane Agricultural Services Co., St. Louis, Mo., has acquired Agri Finance magazine and its related books from Century Communications Corp., Niles, Ill. Greg Reigh, formerly of Novartis, has been named publisher. Published since 1959, Agri Finance is the leading trade publication serving professional farm managers, crop consultants, and agricultural lenders in the U.S. Its readers manage and provide production purchases and advice on approximately 25 percent of the U.S. crop land.

"We are extremely pleased to add Agri Finance to our growing list of ag publications," said Lynn Henderson, President of Doane. "The magazine and its related publications are leaders in their fields and are a strategic fit with our operation.

"As U.S. agriculture becomes increasingly sophisticated and complex, the audience which Agri Finance serves will continue to grow in their influence and play a key role in the adoption of the exciting new tools and technologies," Henderson said.
Pat Robinson, Orvin Bontrager, Billy McLawhorn, John Gruber, and Phil Cochran were pictured in the May issue of *Ag Consultant Magazine* in recognition of American Cyanamid's Consultant of the Year Award.

Larry Sax and Danny Bennett were interviewed and quoted in an article in *Ag Consultant Magazine* regarding personal digital assistants, or PDAs. Sax commented on his pencil based field computer he uses to track crop planning and soil sampling records. Bennett uses his computer to produce spreadsheets for irrigation scheduling and sprayer calibrations.

Also, Robin Spitko was quoted in this issue based on a speech she gave at the 1996 NAICC Annual Meeting regarding the importance of consultants being familiar with new products and technology.

### CALENDAR OF EVENTS

**JUNE 5-7, 1997**  
World Pork Expo, Indianapolis, Ind.  
For more information contact 515/223-2600.

**JUNE 24-26, 1997**  
For more information contact Lyn Kirschner 317/494-9555.

**JUNE 29-JULY 2, 1997**  
American Seed Trade Association, Atlanta, Ga.  
For more information contact 202/638-3128.

**JULY 13-16, 1997**  
United States Feed Grains Council, Philadelphia, Penn.  
For more information contact 202/789-0789.

**AUGUST 2-7, 1997**  
U.S. Soil and Plant Analysis Council, 5th International Soil and Plant Analysis Symposium, Radisson Hotel South and Plaza Tower, Bloomington, Minn.  
For more information, contact Dr. Ann Wolf at 814/863-0841, or Dr. Robert Beck at 612/451-5383.

**JANUARY 5-6, 1998**  
South Dakota Independent Crop Consultants Association Annual Meeting. Location to be announced.  
For more information contact Rod May at central@brookings.net.

**JANUARY 20-25, 1998**  
1998 NAICC Annual Meeting, Washington Court Hotel, Washington, D.C.  
For more information contact Allison Jones at 901/861-0511.

**REMEMBER:** The NAICC membership booth is available for your state or professional meetings. To reserve the booth for your function, contact NAICC Headquarters.

---

**NAICC**  
1055 Petersburg Cove  
Collierville, TN 38017