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The 2012 Season: Offering Lots to Discuss in Jacksonville

This season will be one for the record books, from all time high commodity prices to extremes in weather. 2012 started off with a very mild winter, then either too much rain or too little. The roller coaster ride of this year will surely give us plenty to talk about at our annual meeting in Jacksonville.

I am now getting ready for two exciting NAICC events. The first is going on as this article goes to print. The NAICC Executive Board is holding their Fall Board meeting in my backyard. Not really, but they will be visiting some of my growers while participating in a local farm tour. The timing is perfect as sugarcane harvest is in full swing. We’ll tour a cane harvesting operation and sugarcane mill, as well as the local John Deere plant where sugarcane and cotton harvesters are made.

The next stop is New Orleans where we will tour and meet with representatives of the Sheraton on Canal, the home of the 2014 NAICC Annual Meeting. We also have two full days of meetings planned to discuss NAICC business and prepare for the 2013 Annual Meeting in Jacksonville.

Please make plans to attend the meeting in Jacksonville where we will celebrate NAICC’s 35 Years of Excellence. James Todd and the Annual Meeting Coordination Committee have done a great job with the program, and as usually, we have an abundance of pre-convention workshops for just about everyone.

Highlights on the Consultant portion of the program include yield data analysis, emerging technologies, extracting the value of remote imagery, tissue analysis, declining P & K in soil tests, and resistance management. Researchers will hear from experts on business management and legal issues, new technology adaptations, trial design/data analysis and project management. Hot topics for QAs include an update from the GLP/GMO working group, record keeping and reports, important details to look for when conducting an audit and even a game show testing your GLP knowledge.

There will be two joint sessions this year. The first joint session is for Research and QA professionals on Thursday, January 24. This Regulatory Update Session is always well attended as it starts off the meeting and sets the tone for regulatory issues that will be discussed throughout the week. The other joint session is for Consultants and Researchers and will how to value your business. It is scheduled for Friday, January 25.

New this year, the QAs will have two breakout sessions on Friday. One room will have a GMO debriefing and roundtable discussion while our LAB QAs will have a session on laboratory QA skills and techniques.

While the growing season comes to an end, meeting season is just getting started. Make NAICC your meeting place and attend the NAICC 2013 Annual Meeting and the Focus on Precision meeting next spring in Iowa, February 19-20, 2013.

2013 ANNUAL MEETING PROGRAM AND REGISTRATION MATERIALS WILL BE MAILED THE FIRST WEEK OF NOVEMBER. SIGN UP EARLY AND RECEIVE $50 OFF THE REGULAR PRICE!

NAICC Annual Meeting and AG PRO EXPO Goes Mobile!

By Gary Coukell

The NAICC Board is excited to announce that this year’s annual meeting agenda, speaker list, exhibitor list, maps, and much more will be available through an app that can be accessed through laptops, tablets and smart phones (all devices).

Speakers will upload short biographies and abstracts of their sessions prior to the meeting, including links to their company website. Attendees will also be able to log into the app to set up their own preferred schedule by starring the sessions that they would like to attend, and check session schedules by time or track (Consultant, Researcher, QA), and for the really adventurous, to take notes on sessions that they can email to themselves at any time. A personal schedule can be set up at the office by viewing the app on an office computer, and then picked up on the attendee’s mobile phone (or other device) at the 2013 NAICC Annual Meeting and AG PRO EXPO. Attendees can also upload a short biography or list of their own services.

Meeting organizers will be able to send out alerts regarding any last minute speaker, time slot, or room changes and updates or reminders as the meeting progresses.

For the Exhibitors and Sponsors, the app will include a list of exhibitors, a detailed map of the exhibit hall including the exact

The NAICC headquarters has a new email address: AllisonJones@naicc.org
Committe Corner
The True Story Of The Crawfish Boil
On The Hill
By Roger Carter,
Chair Crawfish Boil on the Hill Committee

As a new officer on the NAICC Executive Board, I had never been put into a situation of visiting anyone in Congress. I had never been to DC. Therefore, my anxiety levels ran high when we convened our Board meeting in the spring of 1997. As luck would have it I was blessed to be paired with Mr. Ray Young, for the first visits on the Hill. We were to meet with Senator Mary Landrieu’s (LA) staff and with Hunt Shipman, Chief Legislative Aide to Senator Thad Cochran (MS). I tagged along and listened and learned. We were lucky to meet Senator Cochran in the hallway and introduced ourselves. He was on his way to another meeting and we proceeded to his office to meet with Mr. Shipman. Upon entering Senator Cochran’s office we were welcomed by two of Mississippi’s most beautiful assets. One, named Mindy Buchanan, when she learned we were from Louisiana asked if we knew where she could get some crawfish. She explained that one of their staffer friends was leaving and they wanted to do something special for the friend. I didn’t have the slightest idea where or how to get crawfish to or in DC, but blurted out anyway, “When, where, and how many?” It was not the first or the last time that my mouth overloaded my capabilities while speaking to a beauty queen.

She gave me an approximate amount and as usual, I wished the job off to someone who could get the job done, my secretary at the time, Shirly Cnkovic. I asked her to find someone near Baton Rouge that could ship live crawfish overnight to Washington. She did. I called Mindy to let her know the crawfish would be there. She seemed surprised. Evidently I wasn’t the first person who had made promises to her, but maybe one of the first that did deliver.

Within two weeks I received a thank-you note signed by over 40 legislative staffers and aides and thought how kind it was for them to go to the trouble to do that. That fall, at an NAICC Executive Board meeting in Albuquerque, NM, I mentioned this at the Executive Board meeting. Phil Cochran, a board member, stated that he would like to attend a crawfish boil. And the idea was started.

If we could muster enough funding to put together a crawfish boil, we could meet many more staffers, aides, and possibly Congressmen and Senators, than by walking all over the Hill all day to visit only a couple of folks. Since our job was to just ask them to show most staffers (except those from Louisiana) how to “pinch the tails” to expose the delicious crawfish meat. After several years it was brought to our attention by someone that they did not attend because they thought the event had something to do with fathers (“Dads”). Therefore, Dads in DC, was renamed “Crawfish Boil on the Hill”.

Word rapidly spread of the event and it is now listed on several websites whose audiences are the staffers in DC. The Crawfish Boil on the Hill (CBOH) is listed on one site as the place to be on that particular night. Quite an honor. There were well over three hundred in attendance, including six Congressmen, at last years’ event. Past attendees included then EPA Administrator, Steve Johnson.

Several tales exist on how the event began. Well, the “tale” above is factual as I recall it. NAICC can be very proud that this event is considered the place to be on the night it is held. Staffers have dozens of events from which to choose, yet they would prefer to come visit and eat with NAICC. And it all began because someone let his mouth overload his capabilities.

After nearly half a century in agricultural consulting, Roger Carter with Agricultural Management Services, Inc., in Clayton, LA is retiring. Roger has faithfully served NAICC in many areas including President, President Elect, Treasurer and chaired numerous committees, including the famous Crawfish Boil on the Hill which he founded. Thank you Roger for your true-blue dedication to NAICC!

NAICC New Members Campaign and Boot Camp 2013

SIGN UP TODAY! All new NAICC Voting, Provisional and Associate members who join NAICC by January 24, 2013 receive complimentary 2013 Annual Meeting registration (includes convention meals)! New Members are invited to the Wednesday evening New Members’ Reception on the 23rd and also to our New Member Boot Camp on Thursday, January 24.

This is a great way to introduce your new employees to the educational opportunities that NAICC has to offer. It is also a great way to become the NAICC TOP RECRUITER! NAICC members who sign up two or more members are eligible for the Top STATE Recruiter award. The one who signs up the most new members will be crowned TOP RECRUITER for 2013. All winners receive a plaque and recognition at the Awards luncheon on Friday, January 25. It’s never too late to recruit!

To join NAICC and take advantage of these great offers, go to www.naicc.org and click on the Member Center tab and then click on the appropriate membership application. Register for the meeting using the registration form that will be posted on the NAICC website soon and mark it “New Member.”

We look forward to sharing our Annual Meeting experience with you.
QA Corner

EPA Regulatory Updates & GLP ALERTS

By Dr. Stu Mertz, PEAK Quality Consulting, Inc.

Unfortunately, the EPA presentations at our NAICC 2012 Annual Meeting in Reno, NV were canceled due to insufficient EPA travel funds. Also, the EPA was not able to travel to the SQA 2012 Annual Meeting in Miami, FL. However, Francisca Liem was able to present an “EPA Regulatory Review” by webinar on April 26, 2012, and some highlights for FY 2011 are summarized below (emphasis on Field Sites and Analytical Labs).

Totals: 64 site inspections; 164 data audits including new focus areas of human (2) and biotech (2) studies. These numbers are down from previous years because three retired-inspector positions were not replaced. EPA is undergoing an evaluation of various options to conduct more site and data audits with their reduced resources in FY 2012.

No. Inspections (% Total): 14 (22%) Field Sites, 9 (14%) Analytical Chemistry, 20 (31%) Product Chemistry, 4 (6%) Antimicrobial Efficacy, 12 (19%) Insecticide Efficacy, 5 (8%) Toxicology.

Findings: Field Sites (FS) and Analytical Labs (AL) had a good rate of compliance.

• 100% of FS had NO HIGH LEVEL Findings
• 64% of FS had NO Findings
• 89% of AL had NO HIGH LEVEL Findings
• 67% of AL had NO Findings

Thirteen Study Rejections were finalized from 4 labs - Product Chemistry & Insecticide Efficacy (IE). EPA now requires IE studies to be conducted per GLPS.

Spectrum Technologies, Inc., Joins as NAICC Sustaining Member

NAICC welcomes Spectrum Technologies, Inc., as a Bronze Level Sustaining Member! Spectrum Technologies Inc. is an industry-leading, 25-year-old company that develops and markets affordable and easy to use plant measurement technology and instrumentation. Spectrum tools help growers measure nutrient levels, soil quality, disease, light, weather, and other important factors that directly affect the health of plants and their development. The WatchDog Weather Stations, and data loggers measure, and record critical information that affect plant yield and growers’ bottom line. Data collected from Watchdog Weather Stations is recorded and monitored on soil moisture and irrigation, disease, leaf wetness hours, air temperature and humidity fluctuations, and other weather related events.

Spectrum customers and industry partners come from a wide variety of segments including major universities, the USDA-ARS, USGA, row crop growers, greenhouse growers, agricultural and turf consultants, Ag retailers, golf course superintendents, and research organizations. Spectrum Technologies is focused on four primary product groups and offerings: Weather and Environmental Monitoring; Nutrient Management Tools; Integrated Pest Management Tools; and Soil Moisture and Quality Measurement. Spectrum has received 19 AE50 awards from the American Society of Agricultural Engineers for innovations in new product technology. Two of our newest products include our Cellular Frost Alert and our FieldScout GreenIndex+ App. The Cellular Frost Alert notifies growers of approaching frost hazards from miles away. The FieldScout GreenIndex+ App instantly reads in season corn nitrogen levels and fertilization via image analysis and helps growers with their nitrogen prescription.

Spectrum’s Smart Irrigation soil moisture measurement technology helps growers make smart irrigation decisions with measuring changes in soil moisture content. Growers become informed when, where and if they should water by taking readings of the volumetric water content of the soil to see if the actual root of the plant is receiving water and how much water. FieldScout TDR 300 meters are the perfect tool for taking portable spot measurements of soil conditions in the field and the SMC 100 is a capacitance-type soil moisture meter that also responds immediately to changes in the soil volumetric water content.

Globally, over 18,000 customers in over 75 countries count on Spectrum’s easy to use, dependable plant measurement technology for the health of their plants.

GLP ALERTS

#1. Retention of raw data: true copies of original raw data are now acceptable. (see below)

#2. EPA will follow up on USDA inspection findings on Animal Welfare Act.

#3. A new EPA GLP Inspection website will list OPP study rejections. (not yet available)

#4. Study GLP Compliance Statement signed by Study Director, Sponsor, and Submitter. Even if a study was not conducted under GLP, a GLP inspection will be conducted.

If you have a question about a GLP Alert, please contact F. Liem, Director, GLP Program. (Liem.Francisca@epamail.epa.gov) Also, please see additional details from her Review that will be published in the 3Q 2012 SQA newsletter “Quality Matters”.

New EPA ADVISORY No. 83 and Discussion of Alert #1:

Previous interpretation of the EPA/FIFRA Books and Records requirement 40 CFR 169.2(k) was to retain all raw data. EPA Legal Counsel and the GLP Compliance Program, Office of Compliance, approved a change in EPA/FIFRA interpretation of requirements. The new interpretation is that raw data need only be retained as true copies and the original no longer must also be retained [now consistent with 40 CFR 160.195(i)]. This is formally described in EPA Advisory No. 83 (effective 6 March 2012) using the example of paper raw data converted to verified, true-copy electronic records (http://www.epa.gov/Compliance/resources/policies/monitoring/fifra/97/advisory83.pdf).

F. Liem recently confirmed that the scope of the new interpretation described in EPA Advisory No. 83 applies to all paper records required to be retained by 40 CFR 160.195 (see letter F. Liem to S. Mertz 24 July 2012 at http://naicc.org/links/for-qa/).

Be sure to attend the 2013 NAICC Annual Meeting in Jacksonville, FL for further EPA Regulatory Updates.
Recent Changes To Implementation Of The Eqip 595 Integrated Pest Management Standard

By: Christy Hursh, IPM Institute of North America on behalf of the NRCS & IPM Working Group

The Natural Resources Conservation Service Environmental Quality Incentives Program (NRCS EQIP) provides technical and financial assistance to help growers implement conservation practices and protect resource concerns. Since 2006, the NRCS and IPM Working Group has been working to increase access to EQIP for growers who adopt Integrated Pest Management (IPM). The working group is composed of both NRCS and IPM professionals who meet monthly by conference call. Activities have been funded by three of the four USDA Regional IPM Centers, with primary funding from the North Central IPM Center. Working group members have expressed several concerns about recent changes in the way NRCS is supporting IPM implementation. This memo provides background and outlines our concerns.

The NRCS 595 IPM Practice Standard is one of many standards developed by NRCS. NRCS 595 defines IPM and outlines general requirements for implementing IPM strategies to protect natural resources. EQIP-eligible growers may apply for a multi-year contract with NRCS to protect natural resources through IPM. The 595 Practice Standard is supported by contract payment schedules that describe financial assistance amounts for specific activities within general scenarios. Scenarios are designed for specific regions and cropping systems, e.g., tree fruit, diversified vegetables and small farms. Implementing 595 typically has required participation by a qualified third-party Technical Service Provider (TSP) to develop an IPM plan, annual evaluation and plan updates, and pesticide risk analysis using Windows Pesticide Screening Tool (WIN-PST). The plan must include mitigation for intermediate or higher pesticide risks.

2012 and 2013 Changes

In 2012, development of payment schedules and scenarios for 15 practices standards, including IPM, were regionalized and limited to eight scenarios per practice standard per each of eleven USDA Economic Research Service farm-production regions. Regional teams developed twelve practice scenarios using costs provided by state NRCS offices and NRCS economists. Payment schedules included costs to implement prevention, avoidance and monitoring strategies. These changes were designed to bring all states into compliance with policy for financial assistance for 595, ensure states had consistent 595 practice scenarios and reduce the time required each year to develop and approve payment schedules.

Beginning in fiscal year 2013, financial assistance for 595 will only be provided for pesticide mitigation practices such as application timing, partial substitution, setbacks, and monitoring and economic thresholds. Payments will not cover comprehensive prevention, avoidance and monitoring strategies for IPM. Potential mitigation practices are described and assigned a point value in NRCS Agronomy Technical Note No. 5. A mitigation index describes the number of points required to mitigate Intermediate, High and Extra-High risks identified from WIN-PST outputs. NRCS staff will work with growers to identify the mitigation points needed and prepare a contract accordingly. The grower may or may not work with a qualified IPM professional before, during or after this pesticide risk mitigation process.

Members of the Working Group have expressed the following concerns:

- The 2012 and 2013 changes were developed without public comment or input from IPM professionals.
- The 2012 changes delayed implementation at the state level and likely reduced participation.
- The 2013 changes reflect a lack of technical understanding of IPM and are designed to be implemented by NRCS staff who do not have crop and region-specific IPM knowledge.
- Based on the proposed 2013 program, here is a high probability that growers will receive substantial payments for calendar-based pesticide application programs, with no IPM, and with continued high risks to resource concerns, contrary to the 595 Standard. Conversely, growers with a strong IPM plan designed to meet resource concerns are likely to receive payments that are inadequate to support implementation of those plans.

The 595 payment rate will be based solely on mitigation points which are unlikely to reflect the full value of IPM practices or the true costs of IPM adoption.

- Under the new system, a grower with a calendar-based spray schedule that includes no IPM could be awarded a substantial EQIP 595 contract if they use high-risk products that require significant amounts of mitigation.
- Outreach conducted by working group members and others with specialty crop producers in Midwest states found that a lack of knowledge, financial constraints and productivity concerns were factors for low adoption of IPM. Financial assistance and eligible practices need to address these concerns by incorporating documented costs of IPM practices including a range of comprehensive prevention, avoidance and monitoring strategies.

NRCS lacks technical expertise and is not permitted by policy to make pesticide recommendations.

- Growers could receive a contract based on mitigation points from their current pesticide schedule with no input from a qualified IPM expert who could identify and help eliminate unnecessary applications and/or identify and recommend lower risk alternatives.

WIN-PST is difficult to operate and has limited capabilities.

- NRCS staff lacks training on WIN-PST.
- Application characteristics such as timing, frequency and rate of application are not reflected in WIN-PST.
- NRCS staff is unlikely to have the time or expertise to be able to verify implementation of mitigation or evaluate success in protecting resources, especially compared to other potential solutions.

The Pest Management Considerations in Conservation Planning Worksheet is not comprehensive.

- The Worksheet is used to compare how well mitigation
practices from Agronomy Technical Note No. 5 will achieve a desired level of risk mitigation. These estimates are derived from WIN-PST and do not include inhalation, aquatic invertebrate, aquatic algae, fish chronic, earthworm small mammal acute, avian reproductive or avian acute risks.

- Using the Worksheet on actual grower data, we were unable to mitigate all intermediate or higher risks. Additional IPM strategies -- including elimination of unnecessary applications and transitioning to effective lower risk alternatives -- were effective in reducing those risks but were not options within the Worksheet.

Other concerns which could engage growers and private sector consultants remain unresolved.

- Frequent program changes and a burdensome signup process discourage participation by growers and private sector TSPs. In some regions growers have been required to reapply for EQIP funding annually even though they were eligible for longer contracts. Fax and electronic signatures are not accepted, requiring multiple in-person visits to the NRCS office.
- Financial assistance does not reflect true costs of practices.
- Although TSP approval process has improved, inconsistencies and miscommunication regarding requirements continue.
- NRCS state and county staff are often not well informed about new program and policy changes, resulting in confusion and wasted time for staff, growers and TSPs to track down answers.
- The National Alliance of Independent Crop Consultants (NAICC) and the Certified Crop Advisor (CCA) program have attempted to work with the NRCS to streamline requirements for TSP certification. An advisory council including these organizations was formed by NRCS but does not meet. NAICC and CCA leadership indicate they have concluded working with NRCS to improve grower access and consultant participation is a low priority due to the lack of success.

Suggestions

- The level of mitigation needed for a grower should only be determined after development of an IPM plan with an IPM expert with crop and region-specific knowledge. This will eliminate the potential for overcompensating growers for unnecessary and high-risk pesticide use.
- Growers could also be required to first apply for a contract to develop an IPM Conservation Activity Plan (CAP), which would identify resource concerns, IPM and mitigation strategies, and alternative lower-risk pesticides.
- Growers need commensurate financial and technical assistance to implement IPM plans, not simply to implement mitigation for remaining risks.
- Dialogue between IPM stakeholders and NRCS headquarters needs improvement.

ADJUVANT LABELING

The EPA announced in mid-August that after examining industry’s analysis of the effect of adjuvants on pesticide residues they came to the conclusion that existing tolerances and risk assessments will be adequate and protective of public health, even if special field trials involving adjuvant use were not conducted.

EPA will no longer require an adjuvant restriction on labels. Amendment requests from registrants seeking modifications to existing labels related to adjuvant terms may be processed via the fast track process.

USDA-ERS REPORTS ON AG PRODUCTION CHANGES

The USDA Economic Research Service has released a report which charts key resources, including natural, produced and management resources that are affected by agricultural production as well as structural changes in farm production and the economic conditions and policies that influence agricultural resource use and its environmental impacts. Among the findings, The Study for the 2000-2010 period stated that total ag research and development funding generally increased since 2000 AND PRIVATE SECTOR FUNDING GREW TO EXCEED THAT OF THE PUBLIC SECTOR. Commercial fertilizer consumption fell from 23 million short tons in 2004 to 21 million short tons in 2010. (High prices contributed substantially to the decline). Organic food sales for the 2004-2011 period increased from $11 billion to $25 billion.

TSP TRAINING NATIONWIDE

NAICC is working with the USDA-NRCS to have TSP training at the 2013 Annual Meeting in Jacksonville, FL. Details will be mailed with the Annual Meeting program and registration materials in early November.

In the meantime, check out the following TSP training being held around the US:

**EPA will no longer require an adjuvant restriction on labels. Amendment requests from registrants seeking modifications to existing labels related to adjuvant terms may be processed via the fast track process.**
By Bill Cox, CPCC-I

I have been an Independent Crop Consultant since 1974. I have been a Certified Independent Crop Consultant since 1992. When I joined NAICC in the fall of 1991, I was in awe of the professionalism and dedication of the members and felt that it was my duty as a member to strive for the highest possible professional credentials so as to be worthy of membership in the organization. For years it seemed like nobody cared whether I was certified or not. My clients were aware of my association with NAICC but none ever asked or ever really cared if I was certified. The only time certification seemed to matter was when something went wrong and I was asked to testify in a damage claim or some other legal matter. Certification instantly becomes a big deal when lawyers get involved.

Well, times are changing, and all of a sudden my certification is becoming a lot more important to my growers. Food Safety is the new mantra of the Produce Industry. There are rules and regulations coming at the growers from all directions and the volume of paperwork and record keeping is staggering compared to what it was 5 years ago.

Produce growers are required to be GAP (Good Agricultural Practices) certified and the packing facilities are inspected and certified by 3rd party auditors. Many of the big, chain store buyers send their own inspectors to make random visits to insure the produce they are buying meets their standards for food safety and quality.

All of the inspectors and auditors operate with the same philosophy, “If it isn’t recorded, it didn’t happen”. Produce growers are now required to keep detailed manuals outlining all of the field practices involved in making the crop. As a result, my weekly field reports are part of that manual. Having a “Certified” crop consultant on the payroll lends credibility to the operation and my grower clients have found that having a certified consultant on staff carries a lot of weight with the inspectors and auditors. I now carry copies of my certification card and various licenses to give to my growers as they prepare for audits.

We are blessed in this country to have the safest, most plentiful food supply in the world. I am proud that my NAICC Certification is recognized as an integral part of the process.

By Brad Robb, Vice President of Communications, Cotton Board

The next version of COTMAN is here. COTMAN IV will be showcased during the COTMAN Workshop scheduled to be held on the first day (Wednesday) of Cotton Incorporated’s 2012 Crop Management Seminar at in Tunica, Mississippi, November 7-9 at Harrah’s Casino meeting facilities.

“Major software changes, that enabled the addition of some powerful new features, have been made to COTMAN IV,” explains Dr. Pat O’Leary, Senior Director, Agricultural and Environmental Research, Cotton Incorporated. In addition to a spatial data viewer that allows users to plot sampling locations and field borders on a map, a feature called “Site Groups”, that allows sampling sites to be shared between sampling activities that, once entered, can be subsequently imported into any other sampling activity for reuse, has also been added. Other changes, including enhancements to the mobile data collection software, will be highlighted at the COTMAN Workshop to be held on November 7th or may be viewed by logging on to COTMAN.org.

To register, please log on to: www.cottoninc.com/2012-Crop-Management-Seminar/. The size of the conference facilities may limit the number of accepted registrants, so please register as soon as possible. The hotel rate at Harrah’s Tunica is $55 and the block of rooms will be held until October 15th. Online registration is available now through October 26th. After that date, attendees can register on-site.

As you wind down from another busy season, consider your skills and interests and which NAICC committee they might best fit. By being active in one of our many committees, you’ll maximize your membership benefits, and it’s the best way to make the Alliance louder, bigger and better for all of agriculture!

If you are interested in serving on any of the following committees, please send an email to President Elect James Todd at toddagconsulting@gmail.com or Allison Jones at AllisonJones@naicc.org.

Allied Industry
Annual Meeting Coordination
Consultants Education Subcommittee
Research Education Subcommittee
Quality Assurance Subcommittee
Certification Board
Crawfish Boil on the Hill
Education Outreach
Consultant Subcommittee
RC/GLP Subcommittee
Ethics and Grievance
Government Affairs
International Outreach
Marketing
Membership Recruitment, Retention and Rules
Membership Services Subcommittee
Newsletter Subcommittee

A Case for Certification

Consultants of the Year
Nominations Needed Now!

BASF is again generously helping us honor three exemplary leaders within our organization through the Consultant of the Year Award (COTY). Please send in nominations for those who set the bar at its highest (and remember, you may nominate yourself!).


Winners will be honored at the Annual Meeting in Jacksonville, FL with plaques and special recognition during the Awards Luncheon. All winners receive complimentary hotel, airfare and registration to the 2013 Annual Meeting.
Jensen Memorial Scholarship Application Deadline Approaching

The deadline for the Richard L. Jensen, Ph.D. Memorial Scholarship is November 15, 2012. The Jensen scholarship is awarded to a deserving student who has completed a minimum of one year toward a four-year degree in Agriculture related to crop production. It commemorates one of the early members of the National Alliance of Independent Crop Consultants.

Open to any student meeting the qualifications, the application and other information should be sent to the NAICC headquarters and post-marked no later than November 15, 2012 in order for the Scholarship Committee to determine the recipient. The winner will be notified in late November. A copy of the application and required attachments at included in this newsletter.

RICHARD L. JENSEN, PH.D., MEMORIAL SCHOLARSHIP CRITERIA

1. Pursuing a four-year degree in a major or discipline closely aligned to crop production, such as Soil Sciences, Agronomy, Entomology, Horticulture, Plant Pathology, Weed Science, contract ag research or pursuing a Doctorate in Plant Medicine.
2. Completed a minimum of one year toward a four-year degree
3. Presently enrolled in the discipline of studies cited in item 1.
4. Submit to the Review Board an application found at www.naicc.org to include:

   THESE ARE IN ADDITION TO THE APPLICATION
   a) Application
   b) Transcripts
   c) Work History
   d) Reason scholarship is desired
   e) Résumé
   f) Proof of enrollment in college/university
5. Two letters of reference attached, or mailed separately.

We encourage NAICC members and friends to nominate someone for the $2000 scholarship or forward an application to a worthy student since preference is given to relatives and employees of NAICC members. Copies can be obtained from the NAICC website (http://naicc.org/foundations/scholarship/) or from the NAICC headquarters.

Look for Ballots

Next week, NAICC voting members will be receiving an email with information on how to access their electronic ballot for 2013 candidates. Please take time to study the information you receive to make informed voting choices, and cast your vote by the deadline to ensure the process moves smoothly and efficiently. Members without emails will receive a ballot by mail.

It’s Not Too Late!

There is still time to be listed in the 2013 NAICC Directory. Just pay your dues and return the renewal form by November 16, 2012 and we’ll place your listing in the directory!

Renew ON LINE at naicc.org. It’s fast and easy – don’t forget to retrieve your INITIAL password from the email you received in early October. Contact Allison Jones at AllisonJones@naicc.org with questions.