In a surprise move, Michigan Gov. John Engler included the entire $70 million capital outlay required for the Michigan Animal Livestock Initiative in his 1994 fiscal year budget recommendation. If approved by the Legislature, it means that actual construction of new animal science and research facilities at Michigan State University could begin as soon as 1994. It also means Michigan’s livestock industry will benefit from improved research and facilities much sooner, according to Ag and Natural Resources Dean Fred Poston.

The capital outlay proposal follows on the heels of a $1 million appropriation last year for design and architectural work of the new facilities. The university has four architectural firms working on designs for new facilities, mostly not a new education/animal livestock pavilion and total renovation of Anthony Hall, as well as new facilities for the dairy processing and meat labs.

"We were having difficulty in terms of federal inspection because our meat line simply wasn’t up to code," Poston explained. "Anthony Hall currently isn’t capable of handling the demands put upon the electrical system by all the computers and research equipment. Upon completion of the renovation of Anthony Hall, it will be essentially new and capable of lasting for another 50 to 100 years."

Despite the current state budget crunch, Poston is confident that the Legislature will support Gov. Engler’s proposal, based on the potential return of the livestock initiative, referring to expanded processing capacity in swine, dairy and poultry sectors of Michigan. Currently, several meat packing facilities import as much as 40 percent of their production, simply because Michigan doesn’t meet needed production levels for full operation, says Poston.

"There are some things that have happened recently in the private sector that could mean we’ll see as much as a 50 percent increase in hogs over the next 18 to 24 months - that’s about 5,000 jobs by itself," said Poston, referring to on-going discussions between the Michigan Livestock Exchange and Farmland Industries. "In these hard economic times, that’s awfully significant for the state of Michigan."

The animal livestock initiative will not be complete, however, without follow-through on budget requests for staffing and research, cautioned Poston. As part of the original proposal, an annual allocation of $6 million was requested to meet those needs once the renovation and new buildings were completed.

"We were beginning to lose people, not because of salary, but because of inadequate facilities," Poston said. "Now, hopefully, we’ll have the facilities which the governor has indicated would not make good investments. Someplace along the line, we hope the state will consider that."

**Court of Appeals Decision Questions P.A. 116 Procedures**

A recent Court of Appeals ruling regarding P.A. 116 administrative rules called Rule-43 for contract terminations has created additional questions about the procedures and validity of P.A. 116 contracts, and exactly the Department of Natural Resources’ (DNR) role in the program.

According to Kevin Smith, Michigan assistant attorney general, the Court of Appeals overturned three Circuit Court decisions, but also added that the DNR has no authority in reviewing a local governing unit’s decision in P.A. 116 terminations.

The ruling was the result of a DNR appeal on a previous Circuit Court of Appeals decision that said DNR rules for P.A. 116 termination were unconstitutional because they exceed the authority granted by the original act, that the rules did not comply with the underlying legislative intent, and that the rules were arbitrary and capricious. In other words, the termination rules weren’t rational, explained Smith.

"The Court of Appeals held that Rule-43 was valid and that DNR could adapt standards to define when somebody can get out of a P.A. 116 contract agreement," explained Smith. "The ruling also says that local units of government are bound by the DNR rules and they cannot allow somebody out of a contract, unless they comply with DNR rules. The DNR, however, cannot review the local determination to make sure it’s an accurate application of the rules."

Smith says the attorney general’s office filed a request for a rehearing on March 22, on that portion of the decision that says the DNR cannot review a local decision. "I’m fairly confident that it will be appealed, but I can’t say for sure," he said. "It’s difficult to predict when the Court of Appeals will respond, but I wouldn’t expect it to take more than a couple of months."

The case involves Daniel D. and Barbara Dykstra, Barry County farmers who wanted to terminate their P.A. 116 contract to allow for the sale of enrolled farmland, after health problems and a death in the family forced them to quit farming, according to their attorney, Laurie Strong.

Just how the case ended up in the courts is not clear. Strong claims that the Dykstras pursued normal DNR termination procedures and had received township and county approval to do so, but received no opinion from the DNR, before seeking legal remedies and the subsequent lawsuit.

Smith, on the other hand, says that the DNR can find no records that would support that claim. In addition, Smith said the lawsuit doesn’t state why the contract should be terminated. "It just says they wanted to terminate the contract and they didn’t like the rules under which they had to terminate and, therefore, they wanted the rules declared invalid," he said.

Strong maintains the court case is the result of inaction by the DNR on two separate occasions - their inaction on the original termination requests, and their inaction on the declaratory ruling. Under the Michigan Administrative Procedures Act, the Dykstras asked the DNR to issue their own opinion, or declaratory ruling, on specific rules regarding the validity of Rule-43.

"To the best of my knowledge, the DNR never acted on the original requests to terminate the P.A. 116 contract," Strong said. "The DNR also refused to issue a declaratory ruling on Rule-43. If they had done so, we would have been required to stay within an administrative branch of government to resolve this matter."

Continued on page 5, see "P.A. 116"
"Clinton Economic Package Hits You Where It Hurts"

A major goal of our 33rd annual Washington Legislative Seminar, held March 23-26, was to try to help Michigan's congressional delegation understand just how hard our state's farmers will be slapped by President Clinton's proposed energy tax.

So we hit lawmakers with the facts. We told them that Farm Bureau estimates that the tax, when phased in by 1996, will boost the cost of gasoline by 7.5 cents a gallon, diesel by 8.3 cents a gallon and propane by 2.3 cents. That will add $800 to the direct fuel costs of a typical grain farmer. That figure could skyrocket if Michigan farmers again face the atypical drying costs that went along with the cold and wet fall.

These higher costs will burn up about two percent of total net farm income. And it doesn't even begin to figure in the added transportation costs that will be borne by farmers and all rural drivers, who don't enjoy access to subsidized mass transit like their city cousins.

We told the congressmen that boosting our transportation and handling costs can't help but trim farm prices, too. Markets respond to national and international demand. Farm prices, we explained, reflect international prices minus the transportation and handling costs of moving farm goods to the buyers in the diversified markets. With increased marketing and transportation costs, farm prices will tend to decline to offset these margins. The slender profits of the agricultural economy are about to get pared even further.

That adds up to lower farm income, hitting us at a time when we're also facing reduced farm price supports, a highly competitive world economy and increasingly shaky world trade talks.

By and large, the Michigan congressional delegation was receptive to our information. I think that our credibility was boosted by the fact that Farm Bureau offered a logical and sound alternative to the president's tax plan. Rather than boosting revenues as a way to cut the deficit, we suggested controlling expenditures.

Farm Bureau's plan to do that involves the goal of a freeze in total federal spending, including entitlement programs, at the previous fiscal year's level. We call for the president to be given line-item veto power and write-down authority in appropriations bills. We support fundamental reform in federal entitlement programs and cost-saving adjustments and we support a constitutional amendment to restrict the spending authority of the federal government.

To my point of view, the refreshing thing about our annual lobbying trip to the nation's capital is that Farm Bureau is recognized as not just another pleading special interest group. We back our proposals with facts and figures and offer sound alternatives. As our Michigan lawmakers debate the president's economic plan in the weeks ahead, I hope they'll remember the logic of our suggestions.

Higher Farm Program Loan Rates Considered

Members of the House say they are considering some combination of higher farm program loan rates and a reduction in acres eligible for subsidies as a means of cutting farm spending over the next five years.

Members say more budget cuts would be hard to swallow on top of cuts already affecting agriculture programs, but they agree further cuts may be inevitable, according to a report by Knight-Rider News. "It's going to come down to choosing our poison," said Rep. Tim Johnson (D-S.Dak.), chairman of the subcommittee on general farm commodities.

Russian Power Struggle Hits Food Supply

Russia's food supply could be in for double barreled difficulty because of the political strife going on over its democratic reforms, according to a University of Iowa economist in Moscow to help the former Soviet republic with its agricultural reforms.

At the same time, the political uncertainty is deepening the credit problems, which has its time and resources on confrontation rather than keeping things moving in the agricultural sector. "I'm not optimistic that there is going to be an efficient and orderly flow of agricultural inputs," Helmuth said.

He said Russian people outside government are not paying much attention to the political strife; they only laugh at it, but it is affecting their lives. He thinks the majority of Russians entering private enterprise will opt for cooperation rather than private profits. "They feel strong and support working with groups," he said.

February Farm Prices Lower

The index of Prices Received by Farmers in Michigan for all products as of Feb. 15 was 126 percent of its 1977 base, according to the Michigan Agricultural Statistics Service. The February index is down 3 percent from January's index of 130 but 2 percent higher than last February's index of 124.

The price index for all crops in Michigan fell 4 percent from a month ago. Hay led the decline by falling 12 percent, while dry beans and winter wheat fell 8 percent and 4 percent respectively. Potato prices rose slightly from last month, gaining 3 percent for large.
Agricultural Worker Protection Reform Act of 1993

MFB Position:
The American Farm Bureau has said that the bill is in direct opposition to Farm Bureau policy in every respect and will be vigorously opposed.

Action Needed:
Advise your Representative in Congress about your thoughts on this bill.

MFB Contact:
Howard Kelly, Ext. 2044

No-Fault Automobile Insurance Reform

The Michigan House of Representatives agreed to reform Michigan's automobile insurance law by passing H.B. 4156 (H-2) with a 65 to 43 vote. The bi-partisan proposal is expected to reduce auto insurance rates an average 16 percent by enacting reforms which:

- Allow consumers to select PIP medical coverage limits from $1 million up to $5 million. Present law requires that consumers purchase unlimited PIP medical coverage.
- Prohibit lawsuits by motorists 50 percent or more at fault and limit non-economic lawsuits.
- Control medical and rehabilitation costs.
- Reduce subsidies to high-risk parts of the state by lower risk communities.
- Allow discounts for airbags, seatbelts, anti-theft devices and long-time customers.

Perishable Commodity Frost Weight Exemption

MFB Position:
A substitute to House Bill 4121 was considered in the House Transportation Committee on March 10. This substitute required that county road commissions and the state Department of Transportation establish mechanisms for exempting milk and other highly perishable commodities, as designated by the Commission of Agriculture, from seasonal weight restrictions.

The substitute granted MDOT and local road commissions the ability to deny permits, but required that written notice stating the reason for denial be made within 30 days and include alternative routes. The Michigan Milk Haulers, The County Road Association and Michigan Farm Bureau were not opposed to the substitute.

The substitute was amended by the Transportation Committee to delete the requirement for a permitting mechanism and limited the exemption consideration to only milk.

Local Pesticide Ordinances

MFB Position:
Farm Bureau opposes local regulation of pesticides and, therefore, strongly supports H.B. 4344 as introduced.

MFB Contact:
Vicki Pontz, Ext. 2046

Michigan Property Tax Reform Proposals Plentiful

There is an apparent consensus among legislators that Michigan's property tax needs reform to reduce reliance for schools operating on the tax. Unfortunately, they haven't reached a consensus on a variety of proposals for property tax reform, according to MFB Legislative Counsel Ron Nelson.

A package of ten bills that deal with property tax reform is moving through the House and a Senate bill has also moved through the Senate. Nelson says that all of the proposals would accomplish, in varying degrees, property tax reform.

"The debate on property tax reform is driven by several factors; the removal of the freeze on assessments, the fact that new members of the House were elected, many on promises of property tax relief," Nelson explained. "The complicating factor is that any significant reduction on property tax reform requires a substantial amount of dollars to replace at least a portion of the property tax cut."

The three options most often talked about for replacement of lost property tax dollars include:

1. Simply replace the needed revenue from the existing General Fund.
2. Increase in sales tax (which requires a vote of the people to raise the current 4 cent limit).
3. Increase in the income tax rate to generate the additional revenue.

"All of the proposals have advantages and disadvantages," Nelson said. "The downside of taking money from existing general funds raises the question of which existing programs will be reduced or eliminated. The concern on raising the sales tax is that it will be difficult to offset the property tax reductions, according to Nelson."

Even with substantial property tax cuts, the governor has indicated a concern for raising taxes on the basis that Michigan needs to further down-size, or right-size, government. Additional revenue, unless very carefully structured, may not find its way to offset the property tax reductions, according to Nelson.

In addition to legislative discussion, a number of groups and organizations either are developing or have proposed solutions to the property tax dilemma. All of these proposals have the possibility of lending confusion to the issue or the opportunity to surface a variety of options and creative approaches to resolve the property tax dilemma.

Proposed Ethanol Rules Published

The proposed rule concerning ethanol's inclusion in the Clean Air Act's reformulated gasoline program has been published in the Federal Register. A plan to include ethanol in the program was proposed last fall by then-President Bush, but publication of the rule to implement it was delayed. The Clinton administration, shortly after taking office, put a temporary hold on the ethanol rule and several other not-yet-finalized regulations.

The proposed rule would allow a local unit of government to pass a pesticide ordinance if unreasonable adverse effects on the community. This means that "agricultural workers" would be the only workers that could use the pesticide and also collect workers' compensation benefits.

The Michigan House of Representatives agreed to reform Michigan's automobile insurance law by passing H.B. 4156 (H-2) with a 65 to 43 vote. The bi-partisan proposal is expected to reduce auto insurance rates an average 16 percent by enacting reforms which:

- Allow consumers to select PIP medical coverage limits from $1 million up to $5 million. Present law requires that consumers purchase unlimited PIP medical coverage.
- Prohibit lawsuits by motorists 50 percent or more at fault and limit non-economic lawsuits.
- Control medical and rehabilitation costs.
- Reduce subsidies to high-risk parts of the state by lower risk communities.
- Allow discounts for airbags, seatbelts, anti-theft devices and long-time customers.
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Spring Canola Could Be a Worthwhile Crop

An oil crop that could provide northern Michigan growers upward of $200 gross return per acre may be worth looking into. The crop, which is canola, and there are several reasons why it could be suited into northern Michigan crop rotations, according to Larry Copeland, Michigan State University Cooperative Extension Service agronomist.

"Spring canola does best in a cool climate, which is characteristic of northern Michigan and the Upper Peninsula," Copeland says. "Farmers in northern Michigan can produce canola crops as abundant as those in Canada, where canola is a major oilseed commodity."

"We have a milder, more stable climate than is found on the Canadian prairies or provinces," Copeland observes. "If the crop is planted in late April or early May, it will be ready for harvest in 90 to 100 days."

Field trials in 1990 at MSU’s Lake City Experiment Station on 17 varieties of oilseed canola showed yields ranging from 2,760 pounds to 3,474 pounds per acre.

"With good market planning and proper crop management, canola should provide a return of 40 bushels an acre," Copeland says. "With current prices at about $5.67 per bushel delivered to Windsor, Ontario, that's a fairly good return on investment."

Canola has become a sought-after crop because of its oil and protein content. Canola typically has 40 to 44 percent oil and 23 percent protein. The soybean typically has 18 percent oil and 37 percent protein.

Because of that similarity, canola market prices rise and fall in sympathy with the volatility of the soybean market. Nevertheless, the canola market tends to be quite dependable throughout the year, Copeland says.

Canola debuted in southern Michigan in 1988 on about 100 acres. The estimate for the 1993 crop is about 10 acres, down about 75 percent from 1992.

Copeland isn’t too concerned about the acreage fluctuation, but he hopes farmers won’t give up on canola because of one or two years’ bad experience.

"Canola has not found stability in Michigan agriculture, but it needs to be given a chance," Copeland says. "While I encourage farmers to try the crop, I also urge them to remain with it for at least three years because we are still on the upside of the learning curve for this crop."

That probably was the case with farmers who began growing soybeans in Michigan in the early 1960s. By 1990, there were only about 1,000 acres planted to soybeans, with yields running about 10 bushels per acre.

Michigan’s 1991 soybean crop of 1.39 million acres averaged 38 bushels per acre and produced 52.8 million bushels worth more than $296 million.

Several stations carry additional market reports throughout the day.

** Station airs various farm reports between 5:50 and 6:20 pm.
*** Station airs various farm reports between 12:00 and 1:00 pm.
Some stations carry additional market reports throughout the market day.

- Alpena 19.4 5.1 0.83 1.37
- Bad Axe 19.4 5.1 1.16 1.81
- Bay City 19.4 5.1 1.97 1.99
- Escanaba 19.4 5.1 0.19 1.66
- Flint 21.9 6.1 0.74 1.99
- Grand Rapids 23.2 5.3 1.35 2.02
- Houghton 21.9 6.1 1.21 1.63
- Houghton Lake 21.9 6.1 1.24 1.67
- Jackson 23.2 5.3 1.45 1.91
- Marquette 15.2 1.2 0.92 1.63
- Muskegon 24.7 5.3 1.10 1.96
- Pellston 18.2 1.5 0.49 1.60
- Saginaw 21.9 6.1 0.95 1.81
- Sault Ste. Marie 16.6 2.0 0.15 1.66
- South Bend 23.2 5.3 1.64 2.02
- Traverse City 21.1 5.3 1.00 1.86
- Vestaburg 21.1 5.3 1.38 1.87

Normals are based on district averages.

[Jeff Andresen, Ag Meteorologist, MSU]
Gov. John Engler announced his initial appointments to the Michigan Corn Marketing Committee (MCMC) March 8, 1993, according to Michigan Farm Bureau Community Specialist Bob Boehm.

The MCMC, created by the December passage of the Corn Marketing Program of Michigan (CMPM), will be made up of nine corn farmers, one from each of the nine districts created by the program. In addition, four non-voting members will serve on the committee as well. The four non-voting members will represent the Michigan Department of Agriculture, the Michigan State University College of Agriculture and Natural Resources, the Michigan Agri-Business Association, and the Michigan Corn Growers Association.

The MCMC will be responsible for the investment of all assessments collected by the program. These investments will be aimed at improving the profitability of Michigan's corn farmers. According to the program approved by Michigan's corn farmers, committee appointments are to be three years, though these appointments, however, will be of varying lengths in order to stagger the expirations of member's terms.

The appointments, the districts they represent, the counties in their district, and the length of their terms are:

- 1/Tom Bootke/Allagan, Van Buren, Barry, Cass, Berrien/1 year
- 2/Steve Gazdag/Kalamazoo, St. Joseph, Branch/3 years
- 3/Vacant/Calkbourn, Hillsdale, Jackson
- 4/Elgin Darling/Lenawee, Monroe, Washtenaw/1 year
- 5/Dan Putman/Inkoma, Clinton, Eaton, Ingham/2 years
- 6/John Knoerr/Sanilac, Lapeer, St. Clair, Macomb, Oakland, Wayne, Livingston/2 years
- 7/Ray Schaub/Genesee, Shiawassee, Saginaw, Gratiot/2 years
- 8/Gary Krug/Huron, Tuscola/3 years
- 9/Rob Rosenow/balance of state/year

P.A. 116 continued from page 1

Strong said that since the DNR refused to issue a declaratory ruling either affirmatively or negatively, the Dykstras then had the right and option to take the issue to Circuit Court to ask for P.A. 116 contract termination declaratory ruling.

Strong declined to have her clients comment on the issue, since they are still involved in a possible appeal. She said she did not know how many acres are involved in the case, nor who the purchaser of the Dykstra property would be if the P.A. 116 contract is successfully terminated.

According to MFB Legislative Counsel Ron Nelson, farmers in general could stand to lose the most if a DNR appeal on the local government decision-making ability is unsuccessful, since the ruling puts the future of the P.A. 116 program in doubt.

"The practice since 1974 has been that the P.A. 116 contract is between the individual landowner and the DNR as the agent for the state of Michigan," Nelson said. "The total impact of the Court of Appeals decision is unknown at this point. Early indications are that it may have substantially weakened the law and raises serious questions of contract law if a township, which isn't a part of the contract, has the authority to dissolve an agreement."

So what's the answer to the seemingly endless confusion and discussion of P.A. 116 contract terminations? Smith suggests that the holes in P.A. 116 contract rules be filled and dealt with legislatively. "The statutory scheme is particularly unclear. There's no question that it's a very poorly drafted statute with respect to the termination process. Clearly the Legislature could amend and clarify this issue," Smith concluded.

The first meeting of the MCMC was held March 9, 1993, in Lansing at the Michigan Farm Bureau Center. At that time, the committee elected Dan Putman chairman, Ray Schaub vice chair, John Knoerr treasurer, and Tom Bootke as secretary.

The MCMC has decided to enter into a temporary contract with the Michigan Agricultural Cooperative Marketing Association to manage the MCMC and to facilitate the printing and distribution of a manual containing MCMC operation guidelines.

The new guidelines will include procedures and remittance forms for licensed grain dealers to use in the collection of checkoff funds. It's expected the temporary contract will last 90 to 120 days to allow the committee time to select an administrator for the program.

Under the program, the 1 cent per bushel assessment began March 1, 1993. Elevators and other first purchasers are required to withhold assessments on all corn sales since March 1, and remit these funds monthly. The first remittance will be due by April 15.

Members of the recently appointed Michigan Corn Marketing Committee include (l-r): Tom Bootke, Elgin Darling, John Knoerr, Ray Schaub, Bob Rosenow, Gary Krug, and Dan Putman. The committee met for the first time at the Michigan Farm Bureau Center in Lansing to elect officers. (Not pictured, Steve Gazdag.

Michigan Corn Marketing Committee Appointed and Operating

Can Your Annuity Save Your Retirement?

In his autobiography, Groucho Marx tells how an annuity helped him at a crucial point in his career. The annuity, he said, gave him such a feeling of security that he was able to pursue his career with a lighter heart and more confidence.

An annuity from FB Annuity Company may not save your career, but it can save your retirement. Our IRA annuity guarantees you a lifetime retirement income - a check every month for as long as you live.

Consider the tax savings, too. You may qualify to deduct up to $2,000 in deposits each year from your federal income tax. And your interest earnings are tax deferred, protected from taxes until you take your money out.

An IRA from FB Annuity Company currently earns 6.25% Effective Annual Yield and guaranteed to never fall below 4%.

You can't replace the secure feeling of an IRA. Call your Farm Bureau Insurance agent today.
Market Outlook...

### Wheat Seasonal Commodity Price Trends

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wheat</th>
<th>Corn</th>
<th>Barley</th>
<th>Soybeans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Index:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T: Topping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BT: Bottoming</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bottom:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The USDA will also release the Prospective Planting Report which will show how many corn acres U.S. farmers intend to plant this spring. When you hear the estimate late afternoon on the 31st, you can easily adjust your 1993-94 figure for acres planted in Table 1. From that, subtract 7.1 million acres not harvested for grain and you will have the estimate for acres harvested. Multiply by 121 bushel per acre and you will have the production estimate for 1993-94.**

Adjust the beginning stocks numbers for any changes you made in the 1992-93 ending stocks number and you have total supply for 1993-94. If it is higher than mine, wheat stocks will likely increase and vice-versa. At this point, I feel the futures markets expects a planting figure lower than mine.

### Soybeans

- **The USDA only made a minor change in their March version of the 1992-93 Soybean Supply/Demand Report shown in Table 3. They increased projected imports 15 million bushels to 760 million.**
- This lowered projected ending stocks by the same amount to 340 million bushels. While this stocks level is by no means tight, it is low enough that the market could get excited by poor planting conditions or a drought scare.
- As with corn and wheat, the USDA will report March 1 soybean stocks and 1993 soybean planting intentions at 3 p.m. on March 31. The number will affect Table 3 for soybeans just as described for corn. Again, the USDA will update their Supply/Demand Reports given the new information on April 12, but you can approximate the changes by making the appropriate changes in Table 3 yourself.

### Cattle

- **I suspect that the Cattle-On-Feed Report released March 19 showed we still have a lot of cattle coming and the question is, "when is it going to get here?"**
- At this point, weather has continued to hold up the flow, but the reports have consistently shown they are coming.
- At this point, the most important strategy is to keep current and try to get your cattle market ready as soon as possible in order to take advantage of these very strong prices.

### Milk Production Down Slightly

- Dairy herds in Michigan produced 425 million pounds of milk during February, down 4 million pounds from a year ago, according to the Federal/State Michigan Agricultural Statistics Service. Milk per cow averaged 1,250 pounds, decreasing 20 pounds from a year ago. The Michigan dairy herd was estimated at 340,000 head, 2,000 more than February 1992.

- The preliminary value of milk sold averaged $12.30 per hundredweight (cwt.) in February, $1.03 less than last year. Mid-month February slaughter cow prices averaged $50.00 per cwt., $3.10 more than the previous year.

- Milk in the 21 major states totaled 10.0 billion pounds, down 2 percent from production in these same states in February 1992. The number of cows on farms was 8.20 million head, 74,000 head below February 1992 and 11,000 less than January 1992.

- Dairy manufacturing plants in Michigan produced 2.1 million pounds of butter in January, 24 percent more than a year ago. Ice cream output totaled 1.7 million gallons, 4 percent less than January 1992.

---

**Table 1** Supply/Demand Balance Sheet For CORN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USDA Proj.</th>
<th>Hilker Proj.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1991-92</td>
<td>93-94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corn Acres (Million Acres)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acres Set-Aside and Diverted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acres Planted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acres Harvested</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu./A. Harvested</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stocks (Million Bushels)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beg. Stocks</td>
<td>1521 1100 2237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>7474 9479 6373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imports</td>
<td>106.8 131.4 121.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Supply</td>
<td>9016 10,582 10,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feed</td>
<td>4897 5200 5200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FoodStead</td>
<td>1434 1665 1535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>6331 6965 6735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exports</td>
<td>1584 1650 1700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Use</td>
<td>7915 8345 8435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Stocks</td>
<td>100.0 1237 2180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Use</td>
<td>13.9% 26.8% 25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Loan Rate</td>
<td>$1.62 $1.72 $1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: USDA &amp; Hilker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2** Supply/Demand Balance Sheet For WHEAT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USDA Proj.</th>
<th>Hilker Proj.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1991-92</td>
<td>93-94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheat Acres (Million Acres)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acres Set-Aside and Diverted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acres Planted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acres Harvested</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu./A. Harvested</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stocks (Million Bushels)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beg. Stocks</td>
<td>866 472 541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>1981 2459 2496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Supply</td>
<td>2885 2996 3080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td>785 810 850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seed</td>
<td>94 95 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feed</td>
<td>259 225 175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic</td>
<td>1137 1130 1125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exports</td>
<td>1275 1325 1350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Use</td>
<td>2413 2455 2475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Stocks</td>
<td>472 541 605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Use</td>
<td>16.5% 22.0% 24.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Loan Rate</td>
<td>$2.04 $2.21 $2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: USDA &amp; Hilker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3** Supply/Demand Balance Sheet For SOYBEANS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USDA Proj.</th>
<th>Hilker Proj.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1991-92</td>
<td>93-94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soybeans Acreage (Million Acres)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acres Planted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acres Harvested</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bu./A.Harvested</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stocks (Million Bushels)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beg. Stocks</td>
<td>329 278 340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>1987 2197 2048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imports</td>
<td>2 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Supply</td>
<td>2319 2477 2390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle</td>
<td>1254 1265 1250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grains</td>
<td>685 760 720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residues</td>
<td>102 110 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Use</td>
<td>2040 2137 2070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ending Stocks</td>
<td>278 340 320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent of Use</td>
<td>13.6% 15.9% 15.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular Loan Rate</td>
<td>$5.02 $5.02 $5.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source: USDA &amp; Hilker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source: USDA & Hilker**

---

Dr. Jim Hilker, Dept. of Agricultural Economics, MSU

**Table 2 for wheat in the same manner that**

The latest Wheat Supply/Demand Balance Sheet is shown in Table 1. I have made some minor changes in my estimates for the 1993-94 corn marketing year since February. However, two major USDA reports are to be released on March 31, about the time you receive this issue, which could substantially change both the USDA’s 1992-93 and my 1993-94 estimates in Table 1. They are the quarterly Grains Stocks Report and the annual Prospective Plantings Report.

The Corn Grain Stocks Report will help determine the amount of corn that has been fed through the first six months of the 1992-93 crop year. Check to see how much the USDA corn stocks figure differs from the trade estimates.

If the USDA figure is larger than the trade estimates, that probably means 1992-93 ending stocks will be increased. This would be negative on both this year’s and next year’s prices. If the stocks figure turns out to be lower than expectations, ending stocks will likely be lowered, which would be positive for corn prices.

The USDA will not update their Supply/Demand Report until April 12, but you could approximate that update by changing their February estimates. Projected 1992-93 feed use and ending stock in Table 1 by the amount the numbers differ from expectations.

**Wheat**

- Because it appears that we will produce 93 exports were lowered 25 million bushels and projected food use was lowered 10 million bushels. This lowered total use and increased expected ending stocks by 35 million bushels.

- That implies a stocks build-up over the next couple of years with normal yields and low set-asides.

**Soybeans**

- The question of "were the hogs ever there?" should have been answered in the USDA March 1 Quarterly Hogs and Pigs Report released March 26. While the December report showed we would be slaughtering 3.5 percent more hogs this winter, we have slaughtered 3 percent less hogs year-to-date.

- At this point, I feel the futures market is low enough that the market could get excited by poor planting conditions or a drought scare.

- If the report was positive and the markets rallied further, consider forward pricing some of your future production. We will discuss the March report in the next issue.

---
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**BUSINESS OUTLOOK**

Dr. Jim Hilker, Dept. of Agricultural Economics, MSU
Michigan State University

Michigan's agricultural future is directly tied to national and global scenarios. The pace of population and income growth at home and abroad, how consumers modify their tastes and preferences, what policy makers decide to do about domestic and international agricultural programs are all crucial to the outlook for Michigan farmers.

Another set of questions relate to how well Michigan agriculture would do compared to other states and nations in the years ahead in supplying the projected food demands. Does Michigan have any comparative advantage?

Most of Michigan's agriculture and food industry is near large metropolitan areas and non-farm employment opportunities. Not only are markets close at hand within the state and just outside its borders, but Michigan is favorably located in the North American market. Just under half of the total population of the U.S. and Canada is within 500 miles -- a reasonable one-day drive. The state's advantage, then, is being closer to markets than many other major producing areas, with consequently lower transportation costs.

The urban interface provides certain unique opportunities for extensive direct marketing through roadside stands, "pick-your-own" operations, and farmer's markets. Also, with industry close at hand, farm families have the flexibility of earning off-farm income. Farm families in places like western Iowa have few of these alternatives. For this reason, the percentage of part-time and hobby farming is higher in Michigan than elsewhere.

In addition to the urban-rural connection, the diversity of Michigan agriculture also contributes to stability. With more eggs in one basket, the cyclical stress, which is a trademark of many agricultural enterprises, is counterbalanced by the wide scope of agriculture in the state. Diversity does have drawbacks, however, as it challenges the infrastructure (Extension, research, teaching, finance, agribusiness, government agencies, etc.) to serve a vastly different clientele adequately.

Of course, the close interface of agriculture and the non-farm population also presents some handicaps -- some comparative disadvantages. Animal waste issues are more serious than in some other states and this may be a handicap in animal feeding, etc.) to serve a vastly different clientele. Of course, the close interface of agriculture and the non-farm population also presents some handicaps -- some comparative disadvantages. Animal waste issues are more serious than in some other states and this may be a handicap in animal feeding, etc.) to serve a vastly different clientele. Of course, the close interface of agriculture and the non-farm population also presents some handicaps -- some comparative disadvantages. Animal waste issues are more serious than in some other states and this may be a handicap in animal feeding, etc.) to serve a vastly different clientele. Of course, the close interface of agriculture and the non-farm population also presents some handicaps -- some comparative disadvantages. Animal waste issues are more serious than in some other states and this may be a handicap in animal feeding, etc.) to serve a vastly different clientele.

The competitive position of an industry in a state often focuses on the combination of resources to maintain and strengthen its position in agriculture in the years ahead.

To assess Michigan agriculture's competitive position, the efficiency of the farm production plant must be evaluated. Are economies of scale for operation being realized? What is the level of management skills? Related to this is the progressiveness of farm organizations, agribusiness, marketing agencies, processors, and the entire infrastructure involved.

The competitive position of an industry in a state is not static, but is ever changing as new markets evolve, as costs of production, processing, and transportation change, and as leadership emerges to effect change.

The dynamics are illustrated in a "shift-share" analysis of major Michigan farm commodities in 1960-90. Looking at the last half of this period, 1976-90, the results can be seen in Table 1. Sugar beets topped the list as Michigan's share of U.S. production increased by .37 percent per year in 1976-90, i.e., from 1 percent of U.S. output in the mid 1970's to nearly 12 percent by 1990. Egg production barely outpaced U.S. output. A number of commodities lost out.

Of special interest is the number of commodities gaining share in 1976-90, which had been losing share in 1960-76. This list includes oats, turkeys, hay, peaches, hogs, cattle on feed, wheat, fall potatoes, and eggs. In other words, 10 out of the 14 commodities exhibiting comparative strength in 1976-90 had been losing out in the previous 15 years. Of the commodities losing ground in 1976-90, only beef cows and blueberries had gained in 1960-76.

Understanding why shares have shifted can provide insight into future prospects. For example, Michigan has been a relatively low cost sugarbeet producing state. Processing capacity and low corn prices have contributed to the growth in turkey and egg production. Cash field crop production fits well into part-time farming.

Michigan's important dairy industry lost ground to California and the South due to economies of scale in those regions and also due to an effective "whole-herd buyout" program in Michigan, among other reasons. Further expansion in California may be limited due to resource constraints, particularly water. The existence of new cheese processing in Michigan should help stabilize the industry in the future.

The accelerated decline in dairy cow numbers in the 1980s contributed to a turnaround in cattle feeding. More important, however, was an innovative financing program of the Michigan Live Stock Exchange.

Other reasons might be cited for the patterns observed in the shifts in Michigan's share of U.S. output. One caution for interpreting trends in shares is that trends in absolute production may present a different picture. For example, while Michigan's share of beef cows had declined, total production has increased in Michigan.

### Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commodity</th>
<th>1960-76</th>
<th>1976-90</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sugarbeets</td>
<td>Lost</td>
<td>Gained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherries, tart</td>
<td>Lost</td>
<td>Gained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potatoes, summer</td>
<td>Lost</td>
<td>Gained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dates</td>
<td>Lost</td>
<td>Gained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkeys</td>
<td>Lost</td>
<td>Gained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hay</td>
<td>Lost</td>
<td>Gained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peaches*</td>
<td>Lost</td>
<td>Gained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hogs</td>
<td>Lost</td>
<td>Gained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soybeans</td>
<td>Lost</td>
<td>Gained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle on feed</td>
<td>Lost</td>
<td>Gained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheat</td>
<td>Lost</td>
<td>Gained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corn for grain</td>
<td>Lost</td>
<td>Gained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potatoes, fall</td>
<td>Lost</td>
<td>Gained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eggs*</td>
<td>Lost</td>
<td>Gained</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not statistically significant. **Based on trends from 1982 to 1991.
Farm Trucks: Make Each Trip a Safe One

Your farm trucks get as much use -- and sometimes abuse -- as any vehicles you'll ever own. But proper operation and maintenance will help prolong the life of your trucks and protect everyone who drives them. Here's how to make each trip a safe one:

- Comply with all federal and state regulations that apply to your trucks: licensing regulations, transportation of hazardous materials, wide loads, placarding, and the like. Contact your local state motor vehicle branch or the Michigan Department of Transportation for the information you need.
- Keep your trucks in good operating condition. Make sure all lighting works, brakes and tires are sound, and first aid kit available. And be sure to have your driver's license, vehicle registration, and proof of insurance on hand.
- Train new drivers in safe truck operation. Make sure they realize that a heavily loaded truck can't accelerate, stop, or turn as quickly as an unloaded truck.
- Keep loads within rated capacity. Overloading adversely affects handling, braking, and engine performance -- and adds stress to components.
- Secure the load if necessary, so it can't shift or fall off. When hauling machinery, load it for minimum overhang.
- Wear your safety belt. Avoid alcohol -- and if you take medications, ask your doctor if they might affect your ability to handle a truck safely.
- Obey speed laws, and drive slowly if you're on a country road, an unpaved street, or a construction site. Be prepared to stop suddenly in case of a problem.
- Be alert to hazards such as weeds, mudholes, trees, and ditches. These can slow you down or even stop you.
- Keep an adequate following distance, especially if you're hauling a heavy load or the road is slick. You'll be better able to avoid rear-ending someone who suddenly slows or stops.
- Don't allow riders in a pickup or other truck bed.
- When driving a semi or a long-wheelbase straight truck, or towing a trailer or wagon, be sure to clear all obstacles -- posts, mailboxes, culverts, ditches, and the like. On farm lanes, and in lots and fields, watch for objects such as rocks, mud, posts, farm equipment, fences, animals -- and, of course, people. Make certain everyone is clear before backing up or moving ahead.
- If your truck has a hydraulically lifted bed, don't rely on hydraulics to hold it up. If you must attend to trouble with the bed up, block it securely. Stay clear when lowering the bed and keep bystanders back.

A NEW MONEY SAVING HEALTH PLAN

FOR FARM OWNERS & OPERATORS

In these tough economic times all business owners are looking for ways to improve their bottom line. Now Farm Bureau can help with a new money saving group Health Plan from Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan. These new plans are guaranteed issue no matter what your health history, locally serviced by our 89 county offices and 400 agents statewide, and competitively priced to save farm owners and operators hundreds or even thousands of dollars off their health insurance bill. So, if you're a sole proprietor or if you have one or more employees, you should call Farm Bureau today for benefit and rate information.

FOR A FREE, NO OBLIGATION RATE QUOTE — FILL OUT THE COUPON BELOW OR CALL DIRECT 1-800-292-2680, EXT. 3239 OR 3240.
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Exercise EQUIPMENT

How to select a machine that's right for you

You've decided a piece of indoor equipment is the perfect solution for exercising on rainy days or in cold weather. Now you're faced with the question, "What to buy?"
Exercise EQUIPMENT

The choices can be overwhelming. But if a machine at home will help you maintain a fitness routine, it's worth the money and effort of shopping.

WHAT TO LOOK FOR

"You get what you pay for" is an old saying, but apt when it comes to exercise equipment. The $19.95 ready-to-assemble stationary bicycle may do nothing more than raise your blood pressure, especially when you realize it's unstable, unsafe and uncomfortable. Before you buy, consider the following:

Construction • Make sure the machine is built solidly with no exposed cables or chains. Avoid equipment with spring operated components. They can make sudden jerky motions that cause injury. Look for a machine that offers continuous, smooth motion.

Fit • When you get on a piece of equipment, it should feel comfortable; if it doesn't you won't use it for long. A quality machine can be adjusted to fit you. A comfortable seat is particularly critical for cycles and rowing machines.

Trial period • Never buy an exercise device you haven't tried. Some vendors allow a trial in your home. Or visit a fitness center and try different equipment.

Instruction • Vendors specializing in exercise equipment often offer free instruction. Take them up on it. If you have questions, call back or revisit the store. If free instruction isn't available, be ready to pay for training.

Machines with a flywheel and chain drive generally are easier to operate and more effective than piston-type rowers, which are less expensive and more compact. With either rower, proper technique is important to avoid back strain.

Treadmill • You can walk or jog as fast as you choose. Several models offer adjustable inclines simulating hills. All models build leg strength and aerobic capacity. Higher horsepower models run smoother and are less likely to develop mechanical problems.

Stair-climber • This machine helps tone and strengthen your hips, buttocks, thighs, hamstrings, calves and lower back. Compared to jogging, it reduces wear and tear on your ankles and knees while providing an effective aerobic workout. Still, the device can aggravate knee problems.

Cross-country ski machine • This may give you the best overall workout, but it can be a difficult machine to master. Your arms and legs move in rhythmic opposition, like walking. At first you'll probably feel off balance. You'll need to practice to achieve the smooth skiing motion that's required.

FIVE BASIC MACHINES

Each device has something different to offer. Some exercise only your lower body. Other machines build strength, or aerobic (cardiovascular) capacity. The following machines build both strength and aerobic capacity.

Stationary bicycle • A versatile machine that builds leg strength and cardiovascular capacity. It's useful for both the beginner and the serious exerciser.

Some cycles have moving handlebars that provide an upper body workout as well. Putting all four limbs in action increases calories burned and can reduce stress on your hips and knees. If you have knee problems, however, be sure the resistance can be adjusted to a low setting.

Rowing machine • This device puts your whole body in action. It offers a good aerobic workout and helps strengthen your back, shoulders, stomach, legs and arms.

Extras • Today's exercise machines are often laden with costly gimmicks to monitor your performance — calorie counters, timers, computer printouts and video displays to name a few. Decide which gadget, if any, you want, but don't get talked into something you don't need and won't use.

Warranty • A comprehensive warranty is usually a sign of a quality machine.

SOME REMINDERS

See your physician for recommendations before making an investment and beginning an exercise program.

Start at a comfortable level of exertion and frequency, then work up. Even a 1 or 2 minute workout can be beneficial as a starting point.

No matter what device you invest in, you must use the equipment regularly. To encourage ongoing exercise, set goals and keep records. Be accountable to someone.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, make exercising fun — read a magazine, watch television, use headphones, or carry on a conversation. If you're working so hard you can't talk, you're working too hard.

Reprinted from the September 1992 Mayo Clinic Health Letter with permission of the Mayo Foundation for Medical Education and Research, Rochester, MN 55905.
NICOTINE PATCHES: A better way to quit?

Patches fight nicotine with nicotine. They can help. But you still need plenty of will power. While the patch may be working wonders for drug makers profits, it's not a magical solution for smokers. Some patch users may "step into a life free from cigarettes," as one ad promises. But most won't. And, last summer, reports of heart attacks among users of the patch raised questions about its safety. Here's a realistic look at what nicotine patches can and can't do.

A NEED FOR NICOTINE

When a cigarette smoker tries to quit, the odds are less than 1 in 10 that he or she will succeed for more than a few months. That's because smoking is not just psychologically addicting, but physically addicting as well. Most smokers develop symptoms of nicotine withdrawal within a few hours after their last puff. Those withdrawal symptoms can include hunger, insomnia, and difficulty concentrating, as well as feelings of anxiety, irritation and anger.

Before patches came along, the best way to fight nicotine withdrawal was by chewing nicotine gum (Nicorette). But using nicotine gum properly isn't as easy as it sounds. Chew it for less than 20 minutes or so, and you won't get enough nicotine; chew it too vigorously or too continuously, and you get too much, which can cause burning in the mouth and throat, nausea, or vomiting. Many foods and drinks, particularly highly acidic ones like coffee and soda, can interfere with the absorption of nicotine if you use the gum too.

Patches are a simpler, more reliable way to ease withdrawal symptoms. You stick the 2 to 3-inch adhesive patch on your upper arm or torso and replace it once a day. The patch continuously releases small amounts of the drug, which then seeps into the skin, supplying the daily equivalent of up to three-quarters of a pack of cigarettes. Each brand comes in two or three dosages, so you can gradually wear yourself from nicotine during the treatment period which lasts anywhere from six weeks to several months.

Initially, using the patch alone can work well. In one study at the Mayo Clinic, for example, 77 percent of people who stopped smoking immediately after a six-week course of treatment, compared with 39 percent using placebo patches that delivered no active drug. But such success doesn't last:

A similar study with a longer follow-up has found that only around 15 percent of people in the patch group and fewer than 5 percent in the placebo group managed to stay away from cigarettes for a full year after treatment.

While the patches ultimately aren't much use by themselves, they can be moderately effective when combined with counseling aimed at a smoker's psychological dependency. In the typical study, smokers wearing nicotine patches participate in weekly or biweekly hour-long group counseling sessions for anywhere from three weeks to three months. That two-pronged approach typically keeps about one of every five smokers away from cigarettes for at least one year. By contrast, counseling alone works as well for only about one of every five smokers.

Experts on smoking and patch manufacturers themselves agree that patch users should indeed have behavioral counseling and support. Consumers Union's medical consultants recommend group programs such as those run by the American Lung Association or the American Cancer Society.

WHAT ABOUT THE RISK?

The only serious side effect associated with the patch was reported recently by a Massachusetts hospital, which had five heart attack cases in patch users who continued to smoke. But at least a dozen clinical trials, involving a total of several thousand smokers, have found no more heart attacks among people who wear the patches than among those who wear placebo patches — even though many patch-wearers continued to sneak at least an occasional cigarette.

Smokers who are at highly increased risk for heart attack would be better off kicking the habit without the help of patches. (Factors that strongly increase the risk include a recent heart attack; diabetes; or uncontrolled angina, or heart related chest pain and abnormal heart rhythms.) However, any smoker who can't quit without the patches is probably safer trying them than continuing to smoke.

Other side effects are better established. Up to half of patch users experience itching, burning, or reddened skin around the patch, but these symptoms are generally minor and transient. Some patch users also report insomnia or nightmares — both caused by wearing the patch around the clock. The newest patch on the market, Nicotrol, is designed to be taken off at night, since it provides a full daily dose in 12 hours.

Consumers Union's medical consultant suggests starting with a 24-hour patch (Nicotrol, Nicoderm, or PROSTEP). Then, if nighttime problems arise, you could simply remove the patch before going to bed. While that reduces the total amount of nicotine you get, you might do fine on the lower dose. If not, you could just switch to Nicotrol.

Other than that difference, no patch has any apparent advantage over the others. They all cost about $25 to $30 per week. Some insurance companies and even some health plans will cover that cost.

The following questions and answers come from Lansing's Sparrow Hospital's physician referral and information service called "NurseLine." They are timely and commonly asked questions.

Q. With so much coverage in the media today about the high cost of health care and treatment in a hospital emergency room, recognized as one of the most expensive places to receive care, how do you know if a visit to the emergency room is appropriate?

A. Each year, over 50,000 people are evaluated and treated in Sparrow Hospital's Emergency Department. Dr. Bruce Reinoehl, has treated thousands of patients during thirteen years as a Sparrow Hospital Emergency Medicine physician, yet he stresses that there are not strict guidelines for when to come to a hospital emergency room. 

"If you are worried about a problem, then we are worried about it too," said Dr. Reinoehl. Unfortunately, many patients do not come in for treatment until they are seriously ill.

Dr. Reinoehl says, while other patients tend to come in with simple problems that could easily be treated at home or could wait until the patient sees his or her physician.

Dr. Reinoehl says, many health problems are easier and more cost-effective to treat if caught earlier. If you are not sure if your condition warrants a visit to the emergency room, Dr. Reinoehl suggests you contact your private physician or call Sparrow Hospital's NurseLine, 1-800-988-3832.

Dr. Reinoehls offers the following list of potentially serious situations which suggest immediate medical attention:

• Shortness of breath
• Chest pain
• Serious cuts
• Orthopedic injuries (breaks, sprains, swelling)
• Pregnancy problems (bleeding or abdominal pain)
• Suicide attempts or psychotic episodes
• Change in status of a chronic health problems (asthma, heart disease)

If possible, you should contact your private physician before you leave for the Emergency Room. Your physician may be able to provide important medical information to the emergency room staff. Dr. Reinoehl cautions that one should not hesitate if he/she think they need immediate attention.

"I would rather see a hundred people that did not need immediate treatment, than to miss one that did."

Q. What is Lyme disease and what are the symptoms?

A. According to Dr. Michael Fairfax, Rheumatologist at Sparrow Hospital, Lyme Disease is transmitted by a deer tick the size of a pinhead, and is contracted most often in the spring and summer months. It is caused by a spirochete, usually Borrelia Burgdorferi which is a microorganism. Lyme Disease discriminates against no one—people of all ages may be affected.

According to Dr. Fairfax, the symptoms and signs of Lyme Disease range from headaches and rashes, to more severe neuromuscular and cardiac manifestations. Within 30 days, an infected person may feel the onset of early symptoms of this disease, characteristically starting as a rash. Without treatment, a person may experience cardiac, neurologic or musculo-skeletal symptoms within two months to several years after being infected with the spirochete. If you have reason to believe you have been infected with Lyme Disease, see your physician.

Q. I spend a lot of time on my feet. Often after working or exercising in a gym, I experience itching, cracking and burning between my toes. How can I prevent athlete's foot?

A. According to Dr. Mitchell Rinkel, Dermatologist on staff at Sparrow Hospital, you can prevent athlete's foot by following these guidelines:

• Wear cotton socks when you exercise.
• Change your socks every day.
• Wear shoes with ventilation holes or porous upper material (not man-made), or sandals.
• Air out your shoes when you are not wearing them.
• Wear sandals, or flip-flops when you take a shower in a locker room.
• Apply Micatin or Lotrimin, an over the counter compound once or twice a week between your toes and predisposed areas.
• Disinfect shower and locker room floors.

The above questions and answers are for general information purposes only. If you have symptoms or health related questions, consult your physician.
Your OPERATION, Your BLOOD

When you discuss surgery with your physician, in addition to scheduling the date, you may want to ask about donating your own blood in advance. Technically known as autologous blood, your own blood can be collected, tested and stored before surgery to be available for blood transfusions.

“We’re seeing more autologous collection because using your own blood is really the safest, surest way to reduce the risk of potential exposures,” said Fran Sklapsky, administrative director of the Sparrow Hospital Laboratory in Lansing, MI. "It’s becoming more common and more people are electing it as a personal preference.”

For a few people, autologous collection may be medically indicated. “When there is the presence of unusual antibodies or multiple antibodies in an individual’s blood, it could make the possibility of finding compatible blood difficult or next to impossible,” said Sklapsky. Antibodies are identified by routine blood group and type testing.

According to Fred Wilson, administrator of the Great Lakes Regional Blood Service for the American Red Cross, the key difference between the general blood supply and autologous or directed donations (for specific donors) is that autologous and directed donations are planned donations.

Directed donations are taken from persons selected by the patient from among family or close friends who have the same or compatible blood type. “The major medical objection to directed donations is that, under pressure to donate, a family member or friend might not be completely truthful about their medical history. This is especially true since donor anonymity has been sacrificed,” said Wilson.

“Our autologous and directed donations are special services that the Red Cross Blood Services provides to patients,” said Wilson. “All of these donations require special paperwork and authorizations.”

Whether you choose to use your own blood for surgery as a personal preference or for medical reasons, your doctor must order autologous collection. Any blood donor – autologous, directed donor, or general donor – must be at least 14 years old and weigh 100 pounds or more.

Prior to the final approval for autologous collection, the physician and technicians evaluate the patient’s overall health, medical history, and any medications the patient is taking. For example a history of blood disorders or cardiovascular disease, and certain “blood thinning” medications would preclude autologous donation. Pregnant women or patients who have an active infection will not be allowed to donate.

Currently about 4 million people require transfusions of 14 million units of Blood and blood components each year. The Red Cross Blood Service, the nation’s largest supplier of blood (most of it donated) says that the current tests, including tests for HIV antibodies, virtually eliminate the chances of receiving contaminated blood.

“We remind our regular, volunteer blood donors that they cannot directly to a patient unless the patient has requested them to do so,” said Wilson.

### ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS:

0. How many units of blood (pints?) are typically needed for surgery, i.e., is there a recommended available supply?

A. We usually leave that decision to discretion of physician who makes the determination depending on the type of surgery. For example, a C-section may require only 2 units of blood, where joint surgery may indicate an available supply of up to 8 units of blood.

0. How frequently would the patient donate before elective surgery?

A. With the physician’s approval and assuming patient can recover adequately, we would draw 1 unit a week and ideally draw the last unit 1 to 2 weeks prior to surgery. If the physician orders, say 6 units, that sounds like a lot of units of blood in a short period of time. There is the problem of outdated blood.

0. How far in advance would autologous collection take place?

A. A unit of blood is good for 42 days — Maximum ideal period. If we need to start drawing before that time and could encounter the problem of outdating we would call "leap frog collection," i.e., we take 1 unit this week, then at the next collection date we give that unit back and then draw 2 units.

0. What factors might determine the frequency of autologous collection?

A. Hematocrit level (ratio of red cells to plasma) recovers adequately; overall health; minimum level of hemoglobin (red cells vs. plasma). This is all monitored by the physician.

0. Are there times when autologous collection would be indicated?

A. Autologous collection is indicated when there is the presence of unusual antibodies or multiple antibodies in an individual’s blood that could make the possibility of finding compatible blood difficult or next to impossible. Antibodies in the blood are identified by routine blood group and type testing done for the hospital — a lot of people walking around with antibodies, but generally can find a compatible blood supply.

0. How long does blood testing take?

A. A minimum of three days before surgery — if donor directed.

0. What other tests are performed on donated blood (other than for HIV antibodies)?

A. Blood group and type, antibody screening; ALT, non specific liver function test; hepatitis C; hepatitis B surface antigen; hepatitis core; HIV, HTLV-1 virus, VDR, (syphilis).

Fran Sklapsky, administrative director of the laboratory, Sparrow Hospital, Lansing.

---

### MEDICAL FOCUS

**STUDY SAYS DRUGS WORK AS WELL AS BALLOON ANGIOPLASTY TO OPEN CLOSED VESSELS AFTER HEART ATTACK**

Clot-dissolving drugs restore blood flow during a heart attack just as well as the more complex balloon angioplasty procedure, according to an article in the New England Journal of Medicine.

“This finding should be of great benefit to patients,” says Dr. Raymond Gibbons, Mayo Clinic cardiologist and principal author of this study. “Drug therapy is available to virtually every hospital across the United States. The balloon procedure is available only at larger medical centers.”

The study assigned 108 patients who had suffered acute heart attacks to one of two therapies. Half received the clot-dissolving drug called tissue plasminogen activator over four hours. They were then observed carefully for the next week. If their chest pain returned, they were treated promptly with medicines or balloon angioplasty.

The other half received balloon angioplasty. This therapy involved threading a balloon-tipped catheter through an artery in the leg and up into the blocked heart vessel. The balloon was then inflated to widen the blocked vessel and restore normal blood flow. This procedure is almost always successful initially, although the vessel may again become blocked over the next six months.

By using a radioactive material and imaging technique, the researchers were able to measure the potential size of the heart attack before treatment and the actual size of the heart attack after treatment. Gibbons and colleagues determined the amount of heart-muscle saved by comparing these two numbers. These measurements showed that both treatments reduced the size of the heart attack by 50 percent. Unfortunately, many patients did not come to the emergency room until they had chest pain for more than two hours. The benefit of either therapy would almost certainly have been greater if the patients had come to the hospital sooner.

"Many cardiologists believe that the balloon procedure would be more effective," Gibbons notes. "We were a bit surprised to find that the drug therapy helped save as much heart muscle as balloon therapy."

The study also showed that the cost of the therapies was about the same. In analyzing costs, researchers measured expenses for hospitalization as well as costs for days taken off of work and change in personal income. When they compared the amount of heart muscle saved with the cost of therapy, they found no substantial difference.

This is one of many Mayo studies examining both the benefits and costs of various treatment options.
Farm Bureau has long believed that sound science is the basis for good policy. To that end, the USDA Soil Conversation Service (SCS) is about to implement an improved equation for estimating soil erosion caused by rainfall and runoff. The old method, known as the Universal Soil Loss Equation, will now be called the Revised Universal Soil Loss Equation (RUSLE). Many farmers using crop residue management, particularly certain types of mulch tillage and no-till, have felt that the old equation did not give them proper credit for the erosion control they were attaining.

While the revised equation doesn't address all the concerns, it represents a major improvement. The revised equation may cause some erosion estimates to go up, while others will go down. For those that go down, the good news is that farmers are accomplishing more erosion control than they were previously credited with.

The equation itself will remain the same (A=R*K*L*S*P). What has changed is that more research has become available to allow some of the factors to be updated to more accurately reflect different conditions across the country. Particularly noteworthy are improvements in:

R=rainfall factor - This factor has been dramatically updated in the western U.S. and revised in the eastern U.S. for flatter areas with high R-factors.
K=soil erodibility factor - A seasonally variable erodibility factor has been developed.
L=slope-length factor and S=slope- gradient factor - New slope length and steepness factors have been developed to account for rill and inter-rill erosion and slopes of varying shape.
C=scouring management factor - New sub-factors for prior land use, crop canopy, surface cover and surface roughness are available.
P=erosion control practice factor - New values have been generated for rangelands, strip-crop rotations, contouring and subsurface drainage.

When available, the SCS field offices will use the new method in making calculations for any "new" conservation compliance, CRP and sodbuster plans. They also will use it when revising any plans that farmers want to change.
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Reducing the Risk of Groundwater Contamination by Improving Fertilizer Storage

If stored safely in a secure location, fertilizers pose little danger to groundwater. Common sense suggests keeping fertilizer dry and out of the way of activities that might rip open a bag or allow rain to enter a bulk container.

In the event of such an accident, an impermeable (waterproof) floor, such as concrete, helps to prevent fertilizer seeping into the ground and leaching to groundwater. A curb built around liquid fertilizer storage areas will prevent contaminants from spreading to other areas.

Secondary containment provides an impermeable floor and walls around the storage area, which will prevent the fertilizer from seeping into the ground. A bulk liquid fertilizer storage tank should leak.

Building a New Storage Facility

While a new facility just for fertilizer storage may be more effective, it may be safer than trying to adapt areas meant for other uses. While a new facility just for fertilizer storage tank should leak.

Secondary containment provides an impermeable floor and walls around the storage area, which will prevent the fertilizer from seeping into the ground.

The building foundation or secondary containment floor should be well drained and located a minimum of two feet below the water table. The finished outside grade should be 3 inches below the floor of the storage area and sloped away from the building to provide surface drainage. The subsoil should have a low permeability.

Provide pallets to keep bags off the floor. Store dry products separate from liquids to prevent wetting from spills.

If you plan to store large bulk tanks, provide a large enough containment area to confine 125 percent of the contents of the largest bulk container, plus the displaced volume of any other storage tanks.

A locked storage area or building should be separate from other activities. The building must also serve as a machine shed or a house for livestock, you may find it difficult to meet all the requirements for safe storage.

Groundwater and nitrates in groundwater:

- * The product label. Read your product labels carefully for specific information on fertilizer health.
- * Nitrate and Groundwater. Freshwater Foundation.

Fertilizer handling and management:

- Fertilizer Practices, Right To Farm, Michigan Agricultural Commission, Lansing, MI.

Fertilizer storage:


What to read about...

Groundwater and nitrates in groundwater:

- * The product label. Read your product labels carefully for specific information on fertilizer health.
- * Nitrate and Groundwater. Freshwater Foundation.

Health effects:

- * The product label. Read your product labels carefully for specific information on fertilizer health.
- * Nitrate and Groundwater. Freshwater Foundation.

Proper disposal of soil contaminated by a fertilizer spill:

- * Department of Natural Resources, Environmental Response Division: Region I – Marquette (906) 282-6561 Region II – Roscommon (517) 275-5151 Region III – Lansing (517) 322-1300

Finding a New Storage Facility

While a new facility just for fertilizer storage may be more effective, it may be safer than trying to adapt areas meant for other uses. While a new facility just for fertilizer storage tank should leak.

Secondary containment provides an impermeable floor and walls around the storage area, which will prevent the fertilizer from seeping into the ground.

The building foundation or secondary containment floor should be well drained and located a minimum of two feet below the water table. The finished outside grade should be 3 inches below the floor of the storage area and sloped away from the building to provide surface drainage. The subsoil should have a low permeability.

Provide pallets to keep bags off the floor. Store dry products separate from liquids to prevent wetting from spills.

If you plan to store large bulk tanks, provide a large enough containment area to confine 125 percent of the contents of the largest bulk container, plus the displaced volume of any other storage tanks.

A locked storage area or building should be separate from other activities. The building must also serve as a machine shed or a house for livestock, you may find it difficult to meet all the requirements for safe storage.

A mixing/loading pad provides operational containment during the transfer of liquid fertilizer to application equipment on nursery tanks. Store piles of dry bulk fertilizer on an impermeable surface under cover or in a building. Treat dry fertilizer impregnated with a pesticide as a pesticide.

Liquid Fertilizer Mixing/Loading Pad

- Contains liquid fertilizer spills and leaks requires an impermeable surface (such as concrete) for mixing and loading. A concrete pad should be large enough to accommodate your equipment and to contain leaks from bulk tanks, wash water and spills from transferring fertilizers to the sprayer.
- Locate the pad adjacent to the storage area. Make sure that water from the pad moves away from the well. At sites where runoff could reach the well, construct a diversion to direct runoff to another area. The pad should be located at least 150 feet from private wells unless special well head protection is provided.
- The size of the pad depends on equipment you use. It should provide space around the packaged equipment for washing and rinsing. The fertilizers and rinse water should have a confined area, such as a sump, for settling before transfer to rinse tank storage tanks.
- Having several separate rinse tank storage tanks allows you to keep rinse water and different fertilizer chemical mixes separate. That way, it can be used for mixing water on subsequent loads.

If you are considering constructing a mixing/loading pad, more detailed information is available from county Extension offices or the Department of Agricultural Engineering at Michigan State University. Call (517) 355-4720.

Even if you don’t have an impermeable mixing and loading pad, you can minimize contamination by following some basic guidelines:

- Avoid mixing and loading fertilizers within 100 feet of a well or water supply. One way to do this is to use a nurse tank to transport water to the mixing and loading site.

Ideally, the mixing site should be moved from year to year within the field of application.

- Avoid mixing and loading on gravel or paved areas. Placing the fertilizer spills to sink quickly through the soil. A clay surface is better than sand.
- Install an anti-backspin device on the well or hydrants. Never put the hose in the sprayer tank. Provide an air gap of 6 inches between the hose and the top of the sprayer tank.
- Always supervise sprayer filling.
- Consider using a closed handling system, in which the fertilizer is directly transferred from the storage container to the applicator equipment, typically through a hose. This minimizes human and environment exposure to the chemical.
- Use rinseate for mixing subsequent loads.
- Once the pad is contaminated with chemicals, runoff must be contained and stored with the rinseate for mixing subsequent loads, or disposed of in an approved manner.
- Only when the pad has been adequately cleaned can runoff be considered uncontaminated and allowed to discharge freely.

Spill Cleanup

For dry spills, promptly sweep up and reuse the fertilizer as it was intended. Dry spills are usually very easy to clean up. Dry impaired fertilizer is considered a pesticide and, if spilled, should be recovered and applied to the target crop as it was intended.

For liquid spills, recover as much of the spill as possible and reuse the fertilizer as it was intended. Liquid spills are usually very easy to clean up. Liquid spills of more than 55 gallons or 200 pounds of fertilizer. Smaller quantities of liquid or dry products should be reported if they could cause damage because of the nature of the specific compound or spill location.

Report uncontaminated fertilizer spills of more than 55 gallons or 200 pounds of fertilizer. Smaller quantities of liquid or dry products should be reported if they could cause damage because of the nature of the specific compound or spill location.

To report, call the 24-hour Pollution Emergency Alerting System (PEAS) of the Michigan Department of Natural Resources: 1-800-292-4700.

Remove the spilled material and contaminated soil no matter what the quantity, and dispose according to DNR recommendations. Know how to handle your particular fertilizers, and whom to call for help.

Contacts and References

Who to call about...

Plans and recommendations for fertilizer mixing and loading pads:

- Your Extension office or Michigan State University, Department of Agricultural Engineering, at (517) 355-4730.
- Fertilizer spills:
  - The 24-hour Pollution Emergency Alerting System (PEAS) – Michigan Department of Natural Resources at 1-800-292-4706.
- Proper disposal of soil contaminated by a fertilizer spill:
  - * Department of Natural Resources, Environmental Response Division: Region I – Marquette (906) 282-6561 Region II – Roscommon (517) 275-5151 Region III – Lansing (517) 322-1300
- What to read about...

Groundwater and nitrates in groundwater:

- * The product label. Read your product labels carefully for specific information on fertilizer health.
- * Nitrate and Groundwater. Freshwater Foundation.

Health effects:

- * The product label. Read your product labels carefully for specific information on fertilizer health.
- * Nitrate and Groundwater. Freshwater Foundation.
## Assessing the Risk of Groundwater Contamination from Fertilizer Storage and Handling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Worksheet</th>
<th>Fertilizer Storage and Handling: Assessing Drinking Water Contamination Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FERTILIZER STORAGE</strong></td>
<td><strong>LOW RISK</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dry Storage</strong></td>
<td>Amount stored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of storage</strong></td>
<td>Covered on impervious surface (such as concrete, asphalt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Liquid storage</strong></td>
<td>Amount stored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of storage</strong></td>
<td>Covered on impervious surface (such as concrete, asphalt)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ADDITIONAL MIXING AND LOADING PRACTICES FOR LIQUID FERTILIZER

- Keep mixing/loading pad clean and dry.
- Use an agg in WIk device.
- Keep mixing/loading pad well drained.
- Do not mix/loading pad with curb keeps. spills contained.
- Keep mixing/loading pad well drained.
- Do not used in rain or 100 feet away.
- Use a mixing/loading pad with curb keeps. spills contained.
- Keep mixing/loading pad well drained.
- Do not used in rain or 100 feet away.

### Water source

- Separate water tank.
- Hydrant away from fert.
- Hydrant user well.
- Directly supplied from well.

### Fertilizer preparation

- Add fertilizer device to fert.
- Add fertilizer device in stack. 
- Add fertilizer device to fert.
- Add fertilizer device to fert.

### Filling operation

- Costumers
- Schedulers or service

### ADDITIONAL MIXING AND LOADING PRACTICES FOR LIQUID FERTILIZER (continued)

- Keep mixing/loading pad clean and dry.
- Use an agg in WIk device.
- Keep mixing/loading pad well drained.
- Do not mix/loading pad with curb keeps. spills contained.
- Keep mixing/loading pad well drained.
- Do not used in rain or 100 feet away.
- Use a mixing/loading pad with curb keeps. spills contained.
- Keep mixing/loading pad well drained.
- Do not used in rain or 100 feet away.

### CLEANUP AND DISPOSAL PRACTICES

- Spary seeded out at least 100 feet away.
- Spary seeded out at least 100 feet away.
- Spary seeded out at least 100 feet away.
- Spary seeded out at least 100 feet away.

### How will this worksheet help me protect my drinking water?

- It will take you step by step through your fertilizer handling, storage and disposal practices.
- It will rank your activities according to how they might affect the groundwater that provides your drinking water supplies.
- It will provide you with easy-to-understand rankings that will help you analyze

### Why should I be concerned?

Fertilizers play a vital role in agriculture. Over the years, they have increased farm productivity dramatically. Commercial fertilizer is, however, a major source of nitrate-polluted ground water.

- Nitrate levels exceeding the public health standard of 10 milligrams per liter (equivalent to 3 ppm) in water have been found in many drinking water wells. The other major components of commercial fertilizer, phosphorus and potassium, are not generally a groundwater contamination concern.

### What to do with these rankings?

Step 1: Begin by determining your overall fertilizer management risk ranking. Total the rankings for the categories you completed and divide by the number of categories you ranked.

This ranking gives you an idea of how your fertilizer management practices as a whole might be affecting your drinking water. It should serve only as a very general guide, not a precise diagnosis. Because it represents an averaging of many individual rankings, it can mask any individual rankings that should be of concern.

Step 2: Look over your rankings for individual activities:

- **Low-risk practices (4s):** ideal; should be your overall objective.
- **Low-to-moderate risk practices (3s):** Provides reasonable groundwater protection.
- **Moderate-to-high risk practices (2s):** Inadequate protection in many cases.
- **High-risk practices (1s):** Inadequate protection; poses a high risk of polluting groundwater.

Regardless of your overall risk ranking, any individual risk of 1 requires immediate attention. Some concerns you can take care of right away; others may be more costly projects requiring planning and prioritizing before you take action.

## Conservation Farming Practices Can Influence Insect Populations

Farmers who are reducing tillage or changing crop rotations to meet conservation compliance requirements could be in store for changes in their insect problems in corn, according to insect specialist in the Corn Belt. Conservation systems don’t necessarily make a big difference in stand and yield. A single most damaging insect in corn crops is the cutworm. Earthworms loosen and aerate the soil, making corn seeds sprout slowly. This increases their vulnerability to early-season soil insects.

Bledsoe points out that high-residue or setaside fields can also make a good breeding ground for insects like cutworms, wireworms, white grubs, billbugs and stalk borers.

### Surface Residue Attracts Cutworm Moths in Spring

Dr. Jon Tollefson of Iowa State University says cutworm moth flight patterns vary each spring from the Gulf of Mexico to breed in weedy fields can also make a good breeding ground for insects like cutworms, wireworms, white grubs, billbugs and stalk borers.

### Wireworms

Farmers facing wireworm infestations have to be very careful, even so-called "no-till" systems, says Berry. "Earthworms are a natural form of tillage," says Dr. Ed Berry, USDA entomologist in Ames, Iowa.

Earwigs loosen and aerate the soil, Berry says. Earwigs come out of the ground via their channels four times faster than fields that don’t have earwigs. Earwigs tunnel a path to the surface and often take advantage of the abundance of channels throughout the soil.

### Why should I be concerned?

Earwigs have a high potential for wireworm infestation, you should expect trouble for the next couple of years and plan your soil insecticide program accordingly, Tollefson recommends.
Young Farmers Optimistic, Better Off, But Not Worry-Free Survey Says

Y

oung farmers and ranchers are more optimistic about farming, and are better off financially than they were five years ago. But their lives are far from worry-free.

Concerns about the availability of financing, profitability, regulations, and taxes weigh heavily on their minds today, according to a survey conducted by the American Farm Bureau Federation.

The survey of 226 young farm and ranch leaders from 35 states was conducted Feb. 13, during AFBF's 1993 Young Farmers and Ranchers Leadership Conference in Dearborn, Mich.

The survey tracked the attitudes and choices of young farmers and ranchers on issues ranging from the environment to off-farm employment.

When asked about their present attitude toward the future of farming, 67 percent said they were more optimistic, while 33 percent said they were less optimistic than they were five years ago. A total of 77 percent said they are financially better off than they were in 1988.

When asked about their three greatest concerns, the young farmers and ranchers said overall profitability was the top concern, receiving 26 percent of the combined ranking. Availability of financing was also a primary concern, with 23 percent of the vote.

Other top issues of concern include: the freedom to farm, in light of government regulations, red tape and urban encroachment (18 percent); the burden of taxes (13 percent); the availability of land and facilities (10 percent); competition from larger farms (5 percent); the willingness of parents to turn over the operation's reins (4 percent); and the availability of adequate support services such as schools, services, and social/cultural activities (1 percent).

Given those concerns, when asked to rank the top three steps they'd like to see government take on behalf of agriculture, young farmers and ranchers said opening international markets was the most important, with 17 percent of the combined ranking. Government reform of health-care was second at 16 percent. On a related topic, 87 percent of the young farmers and ranchers said they were covered by health insurance.

Two additional top recommendations for government action included the strengthening of private property laws and sounder fiscal policies, which each gained 15 percent of the vote.

Other government actions young farmers would like to see include: reducing the burden of Social Security taxes on the self-employed (11 percent); more consideration of economic factors by regulators (9 percent); developing cost-share programs for environmental compliance (7 percent); and more emphasis on rural development programs, and increasing farm program payments, (5 percent each).

Government officials are advised to pay attention to the wishes of young farm and ranch leaders, especially in light of survey results that indicate 91 percent of the respondents voted in the last presidential election, and 43 percent communicated at least once with their elected officials during the previous year.

When asked how they felt about the profession of agriculture, 66 percent of those responding said they chose farming because of its lifestyle values, while 25 percent said their decision to farm was based on lifestyle and business aspects, while just 9 percent said that to them farming was "just a business."

While most choose to farm for lifestyle reasons, even more young farm and ranch couples supplement farm income through off-farm work. Ninety-eight percent of the respondents said they, their spouse or both work off the farm. In 24 percent of the total operations, both spouses work off the farm. Only the wife pursues off-farm employment in 54 percent of the operations, while only the husband brought in off-farm income in 19 percent of the operations.

Despite the need to supplement their farm income, 95 percent of the total respondents said they see themselves as "life-long farmers."

On a similar note, 81 percent of those responding said "yes" they wanted their children to follow in their footsteps as farmers. Only 12 percent said "no," while 7 percent said that decision should be left totally up to their children.

While recognizing the importance of economics and the environment in agriculture, 62 percent of the respondents said they base their voluntary farming practices on both, with an emphasis on economics, and 33 percent said both, with an emphasis on the environment. Four percent said they equally balance economics with environmental considerations, while only 1 percent said they considered only economics or the environment.

The stewardship ethic of young farmers and ranchers is on the increase. Results of the survey indicate that these young farmers have doubled their overall use of stewardship practices in the last five years. The most widely used practices today, in order, include: reduced tillage, regular soil and tissue analysis, field scouting, other types of integrated pest management, and buffer strips for wildlife.

TO RECEIVE ADDITIONAL INFORMATION AND A BROCHURE/APPLICATION, PLEASE FILL OUT THE COUPON BELOW OR CALL DIRECT 1-800-252-2689 EXT. 3236.
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Approximately 274 delegates and additional members of the Michigan Milk Producers Association (MMPA) were in Lansing recently for the cooperative’s 77th annual meeting, to address policy discussion and award programs, delegates heard from General Manager Walt Wosje and MMPA President Elwood Kirkpatrick.

Kirkpatrick told the group that the emphasis on cutting government spending to fund dairy support prices combined with new trading opportunities via North American Free Trade Agreement and GATT could be mixed news for the dairy industry.

"It's becoming apparent the government will not play as important a role as it once did in price supports," Kirkpatrick said. "That means we have both a challenge and an opportunity for developing export market opportunities. It gives the dairy industry the potential to design a program that can assist us in developing export markets and, at the same time, maintain market balance in this country."

Kirkpatrick said the recent Engler proposal to fully fund the Federal Milk Marketing Fund Initiative also represents an opportunity for the dairy industry and Michigan State University to establish a new relationship.

"We need to address the competitive situation from a production per cow standpoint," Kirkpatrick said. "But more importantly, we need to identify the cost of producing milk here in the state of Michigan and how we can reduce that cost so that we can compete with any producing group in the U.S."

According to Kirkpatrick, the shift in production trends to the south and west has continued, adding that California will likely displace Wisconsin in dairy production. Additionally, Michigan’s number one ranking in production has gone to New Mexico which now claims a rolling statewide average of 19,500 pounds.

General Manager Walt Wosje told the group that the number of cows also continues to decline, while average production per cow continues to grow. "In 1950, there was about 22 million dairy cows in the U.S. producing 115 billion pounds of milk," explained Wosje. "In 1992, there were about 10 million cows producing 152 billion pounds."

Wosje attributed the production gains to better genetics and improved management.

He predicted the trend of fewer cows and larger production per farm will continue, resulting in more changes for the cooperative in terms of services provided.

Wosje also discussed a Class III-A pricing category for butter and powder utilization that a number of dairy cooperatives around the country have called for in national hearings.

Under the program, milk sold for butter and powder processing would be priced at the market value of butter and powder as opposed to milk utilized for cheese production. Although the USDA has implemented the Class III-A pricing structure in three of 28 federal orders, it still hasn’t been implemented in Michigan.

"What we saw last year, was that the return on butter and powder was significantly below the M-W, and yet all the plants that made butter and powder had to settle up with the federal order at the M-W price," said Wosje. "In effect, we were paying 75 cents into the federal order pool even though the market return for butter and powder wasn’t there."

Wosje also expressed concern over the proposed dairy futures market, saying that despite future market propagandists’ claims of dairy market stabilization, dairy producers would not benefit as much as the processors and, in fact, could lose peak price opportunities.

In other pricing matters, Wosje outlined a new multiple component pricing system, based on volume, butterfat, and protein, to replace the current single component pricing structure based on butterfat only. According to Wosje, the protein component of pricing will account for nearly 66 percent of the total value of milk, once implemented, and reflect changing consumer tastes and dairy product demands.

The co-op marketed 2.9 billion pounds of milk in 1992, with an average producer pay price of $13.34 cwt. Loss of the state super-pool cost the cooperative nearly $1 million a month in additional premiums paid to the processors, from June to December when the new super-pool was implemented.

Wosje expects that with the new super-pool in place, 1993 will be a better year for MMPA, compared to 1992. Although producer pay prices will not be as high in 1993 as in 1992, Wosje predicted prices would not reach the record lows of 1991.
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Tierney said. "I recognized that there was something in the market that they didn't have—no matter how good the crop insurance. "I always thought producers exaggerated the problem."

"The 1992 crop year offered wheat and feed grains farmers some exceptional pricing opportunities," Tierney said. In February, 1992, futures prices for wheat reached $2.50 per bushel. "I thought this was a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity," Tierney said. "I just couldn't see them doing anything with crop insurance because 'it never pays.'"

Barnaby decided to launch a series of over 25 producer workshops in 1992. "I had assumed that crop insurance will replace the lost bushels at the insured level, then the farmer's crop income will be__the same as the insured level," Tierney said. "I've learned that producers are not going to buy crop insurance because 'it never pays.'"

"The 1992 crop year offered wheat and feed grains farmers some exceptional pricing opportunities," Tierney said. In February, 1992, futures prices for wheat reached $2.50 per bushel. "I thought this was a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity," Tierney said. "I just couldn't see them doing anything with crop insurance because 'it never pays.'"

Tierney never paid much attention to crop insurance. "I always thought producers exaggerated the problem."

Barnaby decided to launch a series of over 25 producer workshops in 1992. "I had assumed that crop insurance will replace the lost bushels at the insured level, then the farmer's crop income will be__the same as the insured level," Tierney said. "I've learned that producers are not going to buy crop insurance because 'it never pays.'"

But Barnaby never changed Tierney's thinking about the tie between pre-harvest pricing decisions and multiple peril crop insurance (MPCI).

Barnaby believed that farmers could use crop insurance to increase their crop income. "The one thing that we can't always see is their thinking," Tierney said. "They may not have the same thinking as producers do."
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There's Only One Crow's

Milford, IL. Nevada, IA. Greenville, OH

Formoreinformation, callone oftheseCrow'sDealersor1-800-331-7201.

Tooyour'93 seedinvestment, useour new single-crosshybridsandyournumbers.

numbersposted big wins in farmers' test plots last year. To get the best return on your '93 seed investment, use our new Yield Results book to compare Crow's single-cross hybrids and your numbers.

It's hot off the press. Call your dealer. Study the results. You may just put some more Crow's in your shed this winter.

Too your numbers.

Crow's YIELD RESULTS

For more information, call one of these Crow's Dealers or 1-800-331-7201.

James D. Crow
Camden, MI
517-254-4512

Andy Sparks
Fremont, MI
616-924-5945

Todd Kubiszak, DSM
Lawrence, MI
616-674-3843

James F. Crew
Quincy, MI
517-639-8362

Richard Bella
Ottawa Lake, MI
313-856-5612

Carl Sparsks
Cassopolis, MI
616-445-3196

Ray Lowman
Gobles, MI
616-629-5079

Richard Zenner
Kingsley, MI
616-263-5339

Art Blight
C Karnang, MI
616-628-5079

Grand Ledge Produce
Grand Ledge, MI
517-671-2743

Wendell Norrer
Lansing, MI
517-651-5409

Delphin Eisenlohr
Shelby, MI
517-681-2318

Mark Morgan
Charlotte, MI
517-543-2498

Steve Baldus
Hartford, MI
517-267-2132

Richard Stark
Lake Odessa, MI
517-674-7394

Les & Orville Sieler
Battle Creek, MI
616-985-4634

Robert Molyneux
Coopersville, MI
616-837-4541

Addison Brooks
Litchfield, MI
517-542-3273

Mark Albright
Battle Creek, MI
616-985-4634

Herbert Harget
Homer, MI
517-569-4017

John Bihlmeyer
Manchester, MI
517-629-7552

Ron Wenger
Battle Creek, MI
517-629-2582

Mabel Harper
Deckerville, MI
313-376-4967

Mark Hilaski
Hepkins, MI
616-793-4541

Paul Smith
Canton, MI
517-676-4413

Donald Isley
Blissfield, MI
517-447-3586

Thomas Riehs
Dandridge, TN
313-526-3825

Mark Harris
Hepkins, MI
616-793-4541

Larry Roberts
Milford, MI
517-741-2318

Ron Hansen
Blissfield, MI
517-447-3586

Roger Theordoris
Eagle, MI
517-626-6653

Don Hassavort
Hudsonville, MI
616-675-0483

Addison Brooks
Litchfield, MI
517-542-3273

Jon Bihlmeyer
Manchester, MI
517-629-7552

Stephen Smith, DSM
Blissfield, MI
517-447-3886

Dana Rehs
Dandridge, TN
313-526-3825

Mark Hilaski
Hepkins, MI
616-793-4541

Paul Smith
Canton, MI
517-676-4413

Stephen Smith, DSM
Blissfield, MI
517-447-3886

Mark Hilaski
Hepkins, MI
616-793-4541

Paul Smith
Canton, MI
517-676-4413

Donald Isley
Blissfield, MI
517-447-3586

Roger Theordors
Eagle, MI
517-626-6653

Don Hassavort
Hudsonville, MI
616-675-0483

Addison Brooks
Litchfield, MI
517-542-3273

Stephen Smith, DSM
Blissfield, MI
517-447-3586

Mark Hilaski
Hepkins, MI
616-793-4541

Paul Smith
Canton, MI
517-676-4413

Remember Michigan's Pseudorabies Deadlines

Effective March 31, all Michigan swine herds must be tested, at owner expense, by July 1 to establish a herd status in regard to pseudorabies (PRV) disease. According to MFB livestock specialist Kevin Kirk, this is so that don't complete this testing will be quarantined and tested by the Michigan Department of Agriculture, at the owner's expense.

"Michigan is currently involved in a 10-year cooperative state, federal and swine industry effort to eradicate pseudorabies from its swine populations," said Kirk. "The success of this program is important to ensure the health of our own swine herds and to maintain our competitiveness in interstate and international markets. For example, Ohio and Wisconsin will not currently accept feeder pigs from Michigan without special provisions, since their state PRV status is ahead of Michigan."

PRV, a viral disease of swine, causes reproductive problems in breeding swine, fever and flu like symptoms in growing swine, death in very young pigs from encephalitis, and poor performance in all ages due to reduced immune systems.

Herd testing is required to enter into an agreement with MDA to eradicate the disease. A herd cleanup plan will be developed defining the steps, procedures and timetable for this cleanup.

In addition, when a herd tests positive for PRV, the testing lab informs the state veterinarian's office and a quarantine is placed on the herd. Previously, the herd was then restricted to moving pigs only to slaughter or to another quarantined facility.

Under the new law, however, the herd may move animals only to slaughter or, under special permit, to licensed, inspected, quarantined facilities.

Quarantines may be released based on negative tests of the entire herd at least 30 days following removal of all infected stock. Alternatively, the herd may be tested by statistical sampling. Two negative samples of a percentage of the breeding and finishing hogs collected at least 90 days apart will qualify for quarantine release and reassignment of herd status.

A herd may also be released from quarantine by undergoing depopulation, cleaning, and disinfection of premises, and regrouping with known PRF-free stock.

According to Kirk, a percentage of swine in a herd must be tested annually according to the following schedule:

- In a herd of 10 or less, all 10 are tested.
- In a herd of 11 to 35, 10 to 20 are tested.
- In a herd of 36 or more, 30 or 30 percent are tested, whichever is less.
- Breeding/farrowing operations are tested according to the number of breeding animals six months of age and older of both sexes. Feedlots are tested according to the number of animals present on the premises for 30 days or more.
- Sampling should be random and representative of all groups. Testing the oldest animals in each group will generally yield the best information.

- All herds are subject regardless of size or type of operation.
- Purchased additions are not part of the herd until 60 days after their introduction into the herd for monitoring purposes.
- Qualified negative pseudorabies free herds and all herds located in Michigan's Upper Peninsula are already in compliance and do not need to change their testing schedule.