

Ex 892 Ex
Cop 3

EXTENSION SERVICE

REVIEW

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE * SEPTEMBER 1972

U. S. DEPT. OF AGRICULTURE
NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIBRARY
RECEIVED

OCT 25 1972

PROCUREMENT SECTION
CURRENT SERIAL RECORDS



43/9

Weather & Crop Service Centennial P•2

The Extension Service Review is for Extension educators—in County, State, and Federal Extension agencies—who work directly or indirectly to help people learn how to use the newest findings in agriculture and home economics research to bring about a more abundant life for themselves and their communities.

The Review offers the Extension worker, in his role of educational leader, professional guideposts, new routes and tools for speedier, more successful endeavor. Through this exchange of methods tried and found successful by Extension agents, the Review serves as a source of ideas and useful information on how to reach people and thus help them utilize more fully their own resources, to farm more efficiently, and to make the home and community a better place to live.

EARL L. BUTZ
Secretary of Agriculture

EDWIN L. KIRBY, Administrator
Extension Service

Prepared in
Information Services
Extension Service, USDA
Washington, D. C. 20250

Director: Walter John
Assistant Director: W. J. Whorton
Editor: Mary Ann Wamsley

The Extension Service Review is published monthly by direction of the Secretary of Agriculture as administrative information required for the proper transaction of the public business. Use of funds for printing this publication approved by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget (July 1, 1968).

The Review is issued free by law to workers engaged in Extension activities. Others may obtain copies from the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C., 20402, at 15 cents per copy or by subscription of \$1 a year, domestic, and \$1.25, foreign.

Reference to commercial products and services is made with the understanding that no discrimination is intended and no endorsement by the Department of Agriculture is implied.

EXTENSION SERVICE

REVIEW

Official monthly publication of Cooperative Extension Service; U. S. Department of Agriculture and State Land-Grant Colleges and Universities cooperating.

CONTENTS	Page
Tests help set air pollution law	3
Demonstrations prove value of good forage	4
Leaders look at land use needs	6
Nutrition 'learn-ins' in Rhode Island	8
Extension leads the way in recycling county's litter	10
Urban 4-H'ers study electricity	12
TV audiences give specialist high ratings	14
People programs	16

Celebrating a centennial

If you're a county agricultural agent, you're probably familiar with the Weather and Crop Service—in most places, county agents are an important part of it. But did you know that the Service is 100 years old this year?

The Service originated in 1872 with the Army Signal Corps, after a pioneer project by the Smithsonian Institution. It switched to the USDA Weather Bureau in 1891, and in 1940 became the joint product of USDA crop experts and Commerce's weather specialists.

Weather and crop condition summaries appear in the national Weekly Weather and Crop Bulletin—compiled from reports supplied by SRS crop reporters, county Extension agents, and weather observers with Commerce's National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

A highlight of the centennial observance will be a special ceremony at the Smithsonian Institution in Washington this month to open an exhibit about the Weather and Crop Service. Awards will be presented to a volunteer weather observer, a volunteer crop reporter, and an Extension worker.

James Robinson, area specialist in Presque Isle, Maine, will receive Extension's award. Although he is the one who will accept the award, however, every Extension worker who cooperates with the Weather and Crop Service should feel equally honored. This is a fine recognition of Extension's efforts to help provide the Nation's farmers, marketers, and consumers current and reliable information on weather's effect on our food and fiber supply.—MAW

by
Franklin B. Flower
Charles M. Holmes
Andrew Bara*

Tests help set air pollution law



Franklin Flower, associate Extension specialist, uses the opacity meter to measure the density of smoke coming from a diesel tractor exhaust.

ences specialist at Rutgers; Charles Holmes, senior county agent in Mercer County; and Andrew Bara, principal engineer for the State's Department of Environmental Protection.

They began by attending a seminar sponsored by the Bureau of Air Pollution Control. There, they learned to use the "opacity meter" approved by the State for measuring the density of smoke from diesel-powered engines. The proposed section, with no exceptions, limited emissions to an opacity of 40 percent, exclusive of water vapor.

A field test, they decided, would be the best way to determine whether diesel farm tractors in good operating condition could comply with the proposal.

A county board of agriculture member arranged for the use of five tractors of four different makes to perform normal plowing at a farm field in Hamilton Township. All five were in good operating condition.

Each pulled its normal gang plow consisting of five to seven bottoms. All five began operation with a cool engine and continued running until the engine had reached normal operating temperatures.

The opacity meter was attached in turn to each of the tractor exhausts, and exhaust densities were noted during the normal operating cycle. Most of the engines produced emission of greater density when operating under

cold conditions than under normal operating temperatures. Once the engines reached operating temperatures, the density ranged from 3 percent to 18 percent opacity.

With a cold engine under load, however, the emission density ranged as high as 40 percent opacity. And puffs of smoke at various times—particularly at start-up, during changing load conditions, and rapid acceleration after idle—ranged from 40 to 80 percent opacity. They were generated during what would be a normal farm tractor operating cycle, and lasted for only a few seconds.

The tests indicated, then, that the modern diesel farm tractor in good operating condition can meet the proposed 40 percent opacity limit during most of its operation. But the occasional puffs of a higher density, also a normal facet of the diesel tractor operation, would not have been allowed under the "no exception" regulation.

So it was recommended to the Bureau of Air Pollution Control that they revise the proposed code to permit emissions of smoke greater than 40 percent opacity from on-the-road mobile sources (which included farm diesel tractors) for brief periods of time.

The final version of the code, as adopted, says, "No person shall cause, suffer, allow, or permit smoke the shade or appearance of which is darker than #2 on the Ringelmann smoke chart or greater than 40 percent opacity, exclusive of water vapor, to be emitted into the outdoor air from the combustion of fuel in any mobile source for a period of more than 10 consecutive seconds."

Through this cooperative effort of New Jersey farmers, the Bureau of Air Pollution Control, and the Cooperative Extension Service, standards were set which meet the requirements of reducing the air pollution in the State, as well as enabling farmers operating diesel-powered tractors to live within these standards when the tractor is maintained in good operating condition. □

New Jersey farmers were concerned when the State air pollution control bureau proposed to tighten its restrictions on engine emissions in a vehicle category which, for the first time, would include diesel-powered farm tractors.

Could their tractors meet the new standards? No one knew, because no such information was available. Even though they, too, were interested in controlling air pollution, the farmers felt they needed some data to help them determine whether this proposal was reasonable.

Their concern prompted the Cooperative Extension Service and the air pollution control bureau to cooperate in tests to determine the practicality of the proposed code. Working together on the project were Franklin Flower, Extension environmental sci-

**Franklin Flower is Rutgers Extension specialist in environmental sciences; Charles Holmes is senior county agent in Mercer County; and Andrew Bara is principal engineer, New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection.*

Demonstrations prove value of good forage



Steers standing belly deep in tall fescue attest to the value of Craig County's pasture improvement.

by
Jack Drummond
Associate Extension Editor
Oklahoma State University

Vernon Haggerton chewed thoughtfully on the stem of tall fescue he had pulled from a 60-acre field where 89 steer calves were grazing contentedly.

"I fed them some grain, but no hay!" he emphasized. "We're allergic to that stuff around here!"

Haggerton is one of four Craig County, Oklahoma, farmers and ranchers cooperating in an educational demonstration program aimed at producing more forage, and thus more beef, on the soils of the county.

"It all got started a year or so ago when our county forage council decided something should be done," said Craig County Extension Director O'Neal Teague.

"We had a brainstorming session and made up our minds to improve our pasture situation."

The council called in help from the agronomy and animal science departments of Oklahoma State University. The university folks, led by Loren Rommann, Extension range, pasture, and forage specialist, worked with

the local committee in developing plans to improve the fertility of the county soils and produce the maximum amount of forage economically possible.

The Tennessee Valley Authority cooperated by underwriting part of the expenses of the demonstrations.

This done, the county forage council selected the cooperators and went into action. Several attacks were planned in attempting to increase the net return for each unit of land.

These were outlined by Gale Thompson, Extension area livestock specialist, Claremore, as:

—seeking more fertile cattle: "We know some are more fertile than others",

—crossbreeding for better livestock, and

—stocking at high enough rates to use the forage produced.

"You can make all kinds of forage, but you have to use it in the right way to profit," Thompson said. "Also, we

wanted to reduce both winter feed costs and hay handling."

Tall fescue grass was selected as one of the major factors in the program, because it is a cool season plant that does well in a relatively high rainfall area like Craig County.

O. L. Epperson drilled in about 25 pounds of the fescue seed per acre on his place last September on both existing Greenfield bermuda pasture and cleared land.

He applied 200 pounds of 10-20-20 fertilizer at planting and 300 pounds of 12-24-24 on every acre this spring. He began grazing 130 head of cattle on 60 acres of the bermuda-fescue mixture on April 15 and they grazed on the green fescue as the bermuda began to green up and produce forage.

Epperson's is a cow-calf operation involving quality Angus cows and Charolais bulls. As he put it, they were doing "exceptionally well" on the pasture in mid-May.

He plans to leave them on the mixture until late September, pull them off to allow the fescue to come back in, then start grazing it again about mid-November.

He has another 20-acre plot of solid fescue on thinner land which he will use for winter grazing at the rate of a cow to every $\frac{3}{4}$ acre "with very little hay supplement."

Coy Stanley, another cooperator, has about 700 acres of mixed pasture, 90 acres of which is on the demonstration program. The 90 acres is a mixture of some bermuda, vetch, elbon rye, and lespedeza, all fertilized according to recommendation.

He carried 60 grown cows on the 90 acres from last August until February of this year after cutting off 3 tons of hay per acre in June.

He now has 66 Holstein steers on the acreage, and the fertility of the soil is shown as the cattle graze belly-deep in grass.

Asked if he felt he could carry an animal per acre, Stanley said he probably could, "but I don't like to push it that hard.

"Pasture like this gives me at least 10 months of grazing, sometimes 12," he said, adding that he usually also gets a cutting of hay.

Those 60 grown cows he wintered last year on the 90 acres were fed hay for only 2 weeks, he said, "and that was when the weather was bad and they couldn't get to the grass."

Lowell Hatcher has two demonstrations involving tall fescue. One is a 50-acre field which he drilled in late last October. He planted 2 bushels of wheat and 15 pounds of fescue per acre and broadcast 100 pounds of 10-20-12 fertilizer. He added 15 pounds of lespedeza seed this spring and 300 pounds of 12-24-24 per acre.

"We didn't get much grazing during the winter because of the late planting," he said. "But we had 40 steers on the 50 acres in May."

He planned to keep the steers on until late summer, then remove them and let the fescue come back for next winter's grazing.

His second demonstration involved native pasture overseeded with wheat. "We got a lot of grazing off that," he said. "The 75 fall calving cows on it would stay about 2 days, then go to

other fescue or native pastures. They had green in front of them almost all the time."

Haggerton, the one who claimed to be allergic to hay, was running 89 yearling steers on a 10-year-old 60-acre fescue field adjoined by some native grass. His last fertilizer application was 75 pounds of actual nitrogen last October.

The yearlings were put on the 60 acres last November at an average of 300 pounds and were estimated to average more than 650 pounds in mid-May when the county council made a tour of the demonstrations.

"That fescue is good," Epperson said. "I had some test out at 19 percent protein when it was green in November and it was still 9 percent when it was brown after our severe weather in January."

"We're getting a good look at what a good fertility program and using a cool season grass like fescue can do for us," Teague said. "Our next step is to learn more about the sort of cattle operations that will fit best with the forage program and more about the stocking rates of what we have.

"The forage production on our demonstrations has been a real eye-catcher. Our job now is to turn that forage into the maximum amount of beef for market."

An open-to-the-public tour of the demonstrations is planned for late fall when the fescue has some growth, Teague said, adding that he expects to see some eyes opened when the visitors see what fescue and fertilizer, combined with good management, can do. □

Leaders look at land use needs

At first glance, Pennsylvania's 28.8 million acres of land would seem to be sufficient to satisfy any future needs. But a closer look reveals that this will not be the case at the present rate of unorderly urban growth. Improved understanding of this situation is essential so that steps can be taken to ensure adequate resources for future generations.

But how do you promote better understanding of a subject that people generally have not yet even recognized as a problem? And with limited time and resources, can you effectively motivate the general public, or should you concentrate on some specific groups?

In southeast Pennsylvania—Berks, Chester, Dauphin, Lancaster, and Lebanon Counties—we chose to begin by directing our educational program to two groups: community leaders and local government officials. The county Extension staffs in these counties cooperated from January 1971 to May 1972 to conduct a program to help these two groups better understand the importance of judicious land use management.

It seems paradoxical that people often are willing to create urban open

space at tremendous cost, while continuing to allow carelessly planned urban growth to expand into rural open space areas. In response to this kind of concern, I presented about 40 lecture-discussion programs to service clubs and civic organizations.

Post-event coverage of these programs through television and newspaper articles increased their effectiveness considerably. Also, two special television programs were presented on "preserving open spaces."

Evidence that improved understanding did occur was noted in increased requests for educational literature, for information on relevant laws and legislative proposals, and for Extension assistance with other problems.

Two countywide forums on preserving agricultural land drew attendance of about 250. Planned for the two primary audiences—community leaders and local government officials—these events were sponsored by the Berks County Cooperative Extension Service and the Berks County Soil Conservation District.

Following these events, a citizens' group was formed in Berks County, dedicated to open space preservation. One of the forum participants emphasized, "We are sitting on a powder keg and don't know it, because the loss of open space land is a sleeping issue. We need more events like this to make the public aware—especially the urban public."

After the forums, seven civic organizations asked for help in preparing resolutions to be submitted to the Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture. Many of these formal resolutions advocated preferential assessment of agricultural land.

The futures of urban centers and their surrounding rural areas are closely linked. To create more awareness of this interdependence, a 20-member local committee (composed of representatives of USDA agencies) planned and conducted a 2-day bus tour of Berks, Chester, and Lancaster Counties in October 1971.

This highly regarded educational event was sponsored by the Pennsylvania Rural Development Committee. It was planned for government officials and the public, and about 50 people participated.

The tour theme was "Agricultural Progress and Urban Development: Values in Conflict." Sites visited included such diverse subjects as:

- a multiple use recreation project,
- the effects of urban pressures on the family farm,
- a new rural concept in family vacationing, and
- the development of an environmental education center.

Considerable use was made of the mass media, particularly a local television station, to publicize the tour and for coverage of the event itself.

An urban resident participating in the tour said, "Everyone loses, including urban people, whenever our comprehensive plans and zoning ordinances fail to place sufficient emphasis on the needs of our rural government." She added, "We should use more methods of this kind to improve communications between rural and urban citizens."



by
Donald A. Harter
*Area Resource Development Agent
Pennsylvania
Cooperative Extension Service*

Are there basic differences between rural and urban planning? Is agricultural zoning an effective tool to halt the indiscriminate use of open space land for urban development? To answer questions of this kind, four planning and zoning seminars, attended by about 125 local government officials and the public, were held during March and October 1971.

The seminars were sponsored by Cooperative Extension, the Dauphin-

Lebanon County Boroughs and Township Supervisors' Associations, and the County Commissioners and City-County Planning Department of Lebanon County. Again, program effectiveness was enhanced by television, newspaper, and radio coverage.

Although several zoning ordinances have been adopted since, we cannot be sure that they were a direct result of the seminars. Participants indicated that the seminars did serve important needs, however. One township super-

visor said, for example, "The seminars were very enlightening. Since we can't stop progress, we will have to make it work to our advantage. They also made me realize that a zoning ordinance is more of a policy instrument than a technical tool."

Here are some things we learned from our experience in southeast Pennsylvania:

—In situations where Extension has not clearly established its expertise, joint sponsorship with organizations having a long-established competence can help to ensure program success.

—The total audience reached can be vastly expanded by innovative use of the mass media for post-event reporting.

—Creating a congenial climate is important, especially when discussing controversial issues. An informal setting for a meeting can be helpful in this regard.

—Direct mail was not found to be effective in persuading urban leaders to attend the 2-day rural development tour. Extensive use of telephone calls and personal contacts probably would be more fruitful, since an activity of this kind requires a generous commitment of time.

—Audience reaction to presentations on preserving open spaces indicates that followup programing is needed on pro and con aspects of preferential assessment of farmland, and on land use compacts. Programs should be planned for both rural and urban groups, with emphasis on civic organizations and service clubs. □



The scene above, in southeast Pennsylvania, illustrates the theme of the rural development tour: agricultural progress and urban development. One site visited on the tour, left, is a vacation area where woodland cabins and recreation facilities have been built with ecology as a dominant concern.

In 1969, during the era of Love-Ins and Sit-Ins, Rhode Island began another kind of "In"—a Nutrition Learn-In.

"Learn-In" actually was just a catchy name tacked on to a program started by a subcommittee of Rhode Island's Food Stamp Nutrition Committee. The committee's objective was "to improve the nutrition of the largest possible number of people of the lower income bracket with no increase in cost to them."

The six members of the health and welfare subcommittee developed a more specific set of objectives:

—to increase the utilization of food stamps in low-income families by educating members of the subcommittee and by educating members of health and welfare agencies, and

—to improve the nutrition of food stamp families by teaching principles of such things as nutrition, food budgeting, and menu planning.

The subcommittee was composed of two Extension home economists, one public utility home economist, one district nurse nutritionist, and one maternal and infant care project

Nutrition 'learn-ins' in Rhode Island



Small-group discussions gave learn-in participants a chance to find out about each others' jobs and to see how they could work together better to serve the families in their community.

by
Betsey Perra
Home Economist
Rhode Island Department of Social
and Rehabilitative Services

nutritionist. In addition, Betsey Perra, Extension home economist working under contract with the welfare department, was chairman of the group.

After much discussion, the members of the subcommittee decided that they could reach more low-income families by working through professionals who already had established networks in low-income communities.

They knew that many people working in this area knew each other by agency name only. In many cases, they did not know what services the other agencies provided.

In an effort to promote cooperation among agencies, the subcommittee planned some "get acquainted" sessions, and the idea for the learn-in was born.

The subcommittee was especially interested in getting people who work directly with low-income families to participate in the learn-ins. However, some directors and supervisors of welfare agencies were included.

Individual letters of invitation were sent to people whose names were received from a number of organizations—the Visiting Nurses' Association, the school departments, various groups associated with the Office of Economic Opportunity, the Technical Action Panel Committee, and the State Department of Social Welfare (now known as the Department of Social and Rehabilitative Services).

The agencies cooperated by recommending names of selected staff as participants or by encouraging all staff members to attend the learn-ins.

The clergy from area churches, Extension staff, and nutrition aides also were to be included. The subcommittee's objective was for all those who might be working with the same families to get to know each other.

The subcommittee then organized the learn-ins with the following goals in mind:

- to promote the use of food stamps,
- to increase the participants' (welfare agency staff members) knowledge of nutrition,
- to help the people from various

agencies get to know each other, and —to help promote better inter-agency cooperation.

To achieve the first objective, promoting the use of food stamps, two speakers were invited to the learn-ins. They were the officer in charge of the Rhode Island branch of USDA's Food and Nutrition Service, and the supervisor of the State food stamp program. Both men already were involved in a publicity campaign for food stamps and welcomed the chance to reach more people.

A film called "Food for Life" was selected for the learn-ins from a list released by the State division on health, education, and information. The film dealt with the "why" of various forms of malnutrition.

When the geographical perimeters for a meeting were chosen, many things were considered. These included Extension areas, town lines, and normal grouping areas.

Because of the small size of the State, most agencies are not limited by geographical boundaries. Town lines are the main boundaries for most of the agencies that have geographical limitations, but the inhabitants gather more by parish boundaries and shopping areas.

The learn-ins needed an ice-breaker to get started, so coffee and home baked cookies were served as a pre-opening.

The speakers were first on the program, followed by the film "Food for Life" and the introduction of the nutrition aides who work in the community where the meeting was held.

Participants were then divided into discussion groups of seven to 12 persons with at least one representative of each organization in each group. Members of the subcommittee were group leaders, and a recorder was chosen in each group.

Each person in the group gave a summary of his job, and then discussion was open to questions or comments. After 15 or 20 minutes, the leader introduced a case study for the group to work on. They were asked what contribution each could make to

help the family. It was pointed out that one person might not be able to provide for all the family's needs and that consultation with someone in another agency would be valuable in some instances.

The Extension aides took part in the discussions and by the end of the program were well aware of their role in the community.

Participants in the learn-in were asked to complete an evaluation of the program. They then returned to one large group for a report by each recorder. The moderator concluded the learn-in by summarizing the high points of the groups.

The moderator was chosen from members of the community where the meeting was held, if possible, so that he or she would know many of the people attending. In a few areas where no one who had a background in nutrition could be found, a member of the subcommittee was the moderator.

Revisions were made in the case study used and the system of evaluation during the series of 10 learn-ins. The case study was modified twice, because the group leaders felt they were getting stale using the same case again and again. The evaluation device was revised because it did not give sufficient information to improve the program.

Where the learn-ins were well attended by social work staff, good rapport has been established and referrals seem to flow quite easily. In one or two areas where the social workers did not attend in large numbers or where the turnover of staff has been great, referrals are very slow and communication is difficult.

The Extension nutrition aides have a good advantage in areas where the learn-ins really worked.

The Food Stamp Committee is pleased with the results of this series, but feels that because of the large turnover of staff a followup of some kind would be beneficial. They are now planning another type of meeting similar to the learn-in. The committee feels that a good beginning was made, but more can be done. □

"Why can't we recycle some of this litter?" said Waseca County, Wisconsin, 4-H'ers after one of their annual spring roadside litter pickups.

These events, publicized by radio, newspaper, and direct mail, have saved an estimated \$5,000 in county highway expense each year. But the young people wanted to go a step further and return some of this solid waste to usefulness.

Late in 1970, the county Extension agent presented information to the County Leaders Federation on glass collection and recycling. When three countywide drives in early 1971 brought in more than 35 tons of glass, the community began talking serious-

ly about setting up a recycling center.

The Extension agent contacted the manager of a recycling center in Minnesota for information. Then he visited with several community groups and called a planning meeting which included representatives from Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, 4-H Clubs, Jaycees, a church youth group, the junior class of a local high school, elementary schools, and the county's activity center for the handicapped.

Their objectives in developing a recycling program were:

—to help youth and adults develop an awareness of the litter problem as one part of environmental understanding,

—to give youth an opportunity to participate in collecting and preparing cans, newspaper, and glass, as well as to learn more about how these materials are used again and again,

—to help people understand that "everything goes someplace" and to get them to think about the consequences of our rapid rate of growth and consumption of resources,

—to foster cooperation among different youth, civic, and church groups in the county on this and other community and educational programs, and

—to demonstrate that recycling is one possible solution to the solid waste problem.

As a result of their efforts, the county opened its recycling center in November 1971, with the county agent as manager of its activities. Each group takes a turn in operating the center, which is open from 9 a.m. until noon every Saturday at the 4-H building at the county fairground.

As manager of the recycling center, the Extension agent helps divide

Extension leads the way in recycling county's litter

by
Roger Wilkowske
Extension Agent
Waseca County, Minnesota



responsibilities among committee members. He contacts buyers of cans, glass, and paper for prices, delivery dates, and preparation instructions.

He also obtains barrels and makes local trucking arrangements, handles the checking account, insurance, and paying the truckers.

Collections to date total 15 tons of cans, 30 tons of newspaper, and 30 tons of glass.

The center receives \$20 per ton for glass, \$6 per ton for newspaper, and \$12.50 per ton for cans. The money remaining after trucking and other expenses will be used for a community environmental improvement project—perhaps a water testing and study project of two lakes bordering the city of Waseca.

It took some work to get the public involved in the recycling project. A news story, with a picture, was submitted to one daily and two weekly newspapers in Waseca County each week for a month before the center opened. The stories told people how to prepare cans, glass, and newspapers for the center. The rule for preparing cans, for example, was "Wash and Squash".

Each Monday for several weeks after the center opened, news articles noting the amount of material collected were sent to local newspapers and radio stations. News media were kept up to date on which organization was in charge each week.

Senior citizens who couldn't bring materials to the center were asked to call the county Extension office so that the organization in charge could pick it up.

Elementary school children have entered the recycling campaign with enthusiasm. Nearly every family is saving cans, and the total collected so far is more than 200,000.

Despite the "wash and squash" instructions, most cans arrived unsmashed, making it difficult to get a sufficient weight of cans on each truckload. So the committee staged a contest to see who could come up with the best idea for an inexpensive hand can smasher.

A senior citizen from Waseca built one for less than \$6 worth of materials and won a \$10 prize for his efforts. Since then, he has built four more of the smashers.

Those working at the center each week separate the glass by color into clear, green, and brown. Metal caps and rings are removed. 4-H'ers help to smash the glass in barrels in preparation for hauling it to outlets in Minnesota. A glass smasher has been developed from an old hammermill.

Paper is loaded onto a local salvage company truck, after which it is baled and hauled to St. Paul. All the cardboard boxes in which people deliver their bottles and cans are flattened and recycled, too.

About 800 elementary school children, from kindergarten through fourth grade, are saving cans and bringing them to school. This activity has been encouraged through newspaper, radio, and television publicity. Each of 29 classrooms, and the staff from two school cafeterias, are keeping a running total of their collections.

Since the recycling center opened, the students have collected more than 200,000 cans—about 85 percent of the center's total. A survey showed that 115 of 125 families with students in these elementary schools were saving cans.

In addition, 4-H'ers are saving cans, glass, and newspapers in their own families and collecting from neighbors in town and in the country. The Waseca Jaycees have begun picking up glass and cans weekly from five bars, restaurants, and bowling alleys.

Besides publicizing the program in the mass media, the Extension agent has encouraged participation by speaking to several groups, illustrating his

talks with slides and overhead transparencies. He has spoken, for example, to:

—several fifth and sixth grade classes,

—the Janesville Rotary Club (who opened a center in their own town a month later),

—adult 4-H leaders at four county project leader training meetings,

—a class at the University of Minnesota Technical College in Waseca,

—a district agricultural Extension conference on 4-H in the 70's,

—an environmental study class of elementary and secondary school teachers, and

—a Minnesota State conference on 4-H in the 70's.

The recycling center has been publicized through regular weekly radio programs and special interviews. A St. Paul educational television station featured two Waseca County Extension agents, three junior 4-H leaders, and an elementary school principal in a half hour program about the recycling center. Seven other stations later carried the same program.

The Extension agent writes a monthly newsletter for representatives of the nine organizations on the recycling center committee to keep them up to date on recycling news and the overall progress of the center. And the committee meets monthly to discuss ways to increase public interest in recycling.

They planned an "Ecology Day" in May, which included such events as slide presentations to elementary school children, a litter pickup at three schools, a downtown coffee hour featuring slides on glass recycling, and an illustrated talk by the director of a natural history museum.

The Waseca County recycling center can point to much success. Public interest has been high, and neighboring counties have requested information on the project. The next step, Extension hopes, is that a community group—such as the county's center for the handicapped—will eventually take over the responsibility for the operation of the center. □

by
Frances Fortenberry
J. W. James
John McVey
Thomas Wilkerson
*Mississippi State University**

Urban 4-H'ers study electricity



They came from rich families, poor families, and medium-income families. They came from black families, white families, and Spanish-speaking families. But they had one thing in common. They were youngsters 9 through 13 in a pilot 4-H electric program for nonrural youth in Jackson County, Mississippi.

They came, nearly 500 of them, and they learned, said Freddy Baylis, associate county agent for 4-H.

The pilot program, financed through a \$1,500 grant from the Westinghouse Electric Corporation, was designed to teach the fundamentals of electric use, with emphasis on safety. More broadly, it was intended as a way to study methods of involving youths and adults in urban areas in Extension youth activities.

The objectives, specifically, were to determine:

—an effective Extension organizational structure for implementing the

The president of the Jackson County Extension Homemakers Council, who volunteered as a teacher in the non-rural 4-H electric program, shows a group of 4-H'ers how to clean an electric can opener.

4-H electric program in nonrural areas,

—effective methods of recruiting and using volunteer leaders and other resource people,

—effective methods of recruiting program participants,

—the most effective method for teaching 4-H electric program subject matter, and

—the adequacy of subject matter materials currently available.

Most of Jackson County's 88,000 population is concentrated around Pascagoula, Moss Point, Ocean Springs, and at the county line near Biloxi. The area has about 5,000 boys and girls in the age group designated as the audience for the pilot program.

After Jackson County was chosen as one of two grant recipients, the program got underway under the leadership of the county 4-H staff—Freddy Baylis, Miss Ellen Fulton, and Mrs. Edith Wright.

Involving community leaders was the first step. The program was explained to power suppliers, civic organizations, school officials, city officials, and other resource people.

Members of the State 4-H staff, the housing and equipment specialist, the agricultural engineering specialist, the district and county Extension staffs, and representatives from the power companies met to develop detailed plans. They set up committees for publicity, leader recruitment, leader training, member enrollment, placement, and awards and recognition, plus an overall steering committee.

At a second meeting, lesson topics were selected. Since separate meetings were to be conducted for boys and girls, two sets of lessons were necessary. Available materials were reviewed to determine what could be used. The State 4-H electric specialists then developed lesson plans for the four 1-hour weekly sessions.

Teachers were given five boys' lessons and six girls' lessons from which to choose. Boys' lessons included, for example, such things as making a trouble light and building an electric motor, while the girls learned about personal care and kitchen appliances, good lighting, and electrical hazards.

The next step—the committee selec-

**Ms. Fortenberry is housing and equipment specialist; Mr. James is 4-H program leader; Mr. McVey is agricultural engineer; and Mr. Wilkerson is information specialist.*

tion process—is one of the most important factors for a successful program. County Extension staff discussed key people in the community who could be considered as potential committee members. The first concern was to find a conscientious person to serve as chairman of the steering committee. Committee members were selected on the basis of their interest in youth and civic affairs.

Committee members included business executives, school principals, a public relations director, home economists, engineers, bank managers, a vocational education director, and a newspaper editor.

The steering committee, which comprised the overall chairman plus the chairmen of all the other committees, met regularly to keep the program running smoothly, offer guidance, and keep the committees working as a unit.

The teacher recruitment committee had perhaps the most difficult task. The original goal was to recruit 30 volunteer instructors and to involve 300 youth in the classes. But because the youth response was so great, it was necessary to find an even larger number of teachers.

They were recruited through PTA's, civic clubs, industry, homemaker clubs, and personal contacts. Like the youngsters, they came from all walks of life. There were about 50 of them—professional people, top executives, homemakers, school teachers, blue collar workers, and Extension aides.

They, like the children, had at least one thing in common—a tremendous enthusiasm for getting the job done, Baylis said.

After teacher recruitment came two leader training meetings. One meeting, planned and carried out by the teacher training committee, consisted of background and technical information about electricity. The second meeting, handled by Extension, consisted of the "how" of teaching electricity to youth and using the lesson plans.

The leaders also got information about recording and reporting attendance, keeping records, testing, and general organizational instructions.

Members of the electric clubs were recruited through a signup program in local schools. The member enrollment committee, which had three school principals as cochairmen, made a presentation about the electric program to all the school PTA's in the area.

The committee sent a letter to the parents through the schools. Attached to the letter was an application form to be returned to the Extension office. About 750 forms were returned, and 500 of these youngsters actually participated—many more than the 300 that had been anticipated in the early planning. About half the enrollees were girls.

The member enrollment committee also arranged for three scout troops to use the electric lessons at a series of their meetings.

The short term 4-H activity was publicized through radio and newspapers, posters, and classroom announcements.

The placement committee, chaired by a power company engineer, found places for the groups to meet. Enough space was acquired through the schools, but many classes chose to meet elsewhere. The girls' classes often met in homes, since their lessons were not as conducive to classroom settings.

When all members had been recruited and places secured, the youngsters were grouped into classes on a neighborhood basis and assigned a teacher and a meeting place. Classes ranged mostly from seven to 15 youngsters, but one had more than 30 members.

A recognition program and exhibit concluded the 4-week course. Each member who attended at least three classes received a diploma. Each teacher and committee member also received a certificate.

Through an evaluation, the Extension staff has reached several conclusions about the pilot program.

The fact that the program operated in more than one urban area was a problem. If committee members all were from one city, for example, they

would be more familiar with the local people.

One month was devoted to recruiting committee members. More planning and preparation should have been involved in this phase, and more time was needed to get better acquainted with key people in the community.

Committee members generally agreed that a more detailed job description would have helped them do a better job. This especially hampered the leader recruitment committee. The effectiveness of this committee could have been improved by: more detailed planning, more time, a larger committee with subcommittees, more group contacts, more frequent meetings, and more information about teacher responsibilities.

The volunteer leaders said that training should have been limited to one meeting.

Recruitment of youth might be more effective if the committee concentrated on a smaller area—one school system at a time. Classroom presentation by committee members would stimulate more interest among the children.

For the most part, lesson plans were adequate. However, some were too long for the allotted time. The teachers said that interest was high enough to merit making the classes longer rather than shortening the lesson plans.

The awards program was one of the strong points. More emphasis could have been given to it from the beginning.

Assessing the overall program, Associate County Agent Baylis said, "Cooperation was great. Civic club leaders, bankers, newspaper editors, management of local radio stations, power company public relations people, home economists, and industry executives all went out of their way to help us with the electric program."

And O. J. Davis, a nuclear power engineer, summed up the feelings of the volunteer teachers. "This was great," he said. "When are you going to have something else like it for us to do?" □

TV audiences give specialist high ratings

by
Vernon Cliff Bice
*Extension Radio-TV Editor
Auburn University*

"I really have learned a lot from the information you present on Mid-Day each week. The one I enjoyed hearing the most was that hot dogs and bologna are nutritional. Now I don't worry so much about giving them to my 2-year-old occasionally."

"My husband always wants to hear each Friday 'What Dorothy will tell us today'. I've been buying and cooking for many years but I still learn something from you each time . . . wish you had your own program every day."

"Always try to listen to you each Friday, as you give so many helpful hints on how to select food and about the best time to buy. The food you show on your program is so tempting. I think your program is very informative. I never miss it if I can help it."

These excerpts were taken from the continuous, heavy flow of mail which Miss Dorothy Overbey, consumer education specialist, Auburn University Cooperative Extension Service, receives as a result of her weekly television program.

They show that she is well respected by central Alabama homemakers. And it's no wonder. Miss Overbey has been a regular Friday guest on Mid-Day, a popular daily program, for the past 9 years.

The show is produced and broadcast by WAPI-TV, Birmingham, one of the State's most powerful stations. The program has consistently rated among that station's most popular shows.

Surveys show that Miss Overbey visits, via television, with about 20,000 women viewers each Friday, giving them up-to-date information on the market angle of selecting and buying food. The station covers an area within a 75-mile radius of Birmingham, including many major population centers.

Feedback from the show in the form of telephone calls, letters, and personal contacts indicates that viewers, rich and poor, educated and uneducated, regularly look to Mid-Day and Miss Overbey for reliable consumer market information.

"Our original intent of the show when we began 9 years ago was to have a group of features," said Everett Holle, the station's program director. "But as we monitored the popularity of the various features, we made quite a few changes. The only guest remaining that we originally began with is Dorothy.

"We rarely preempt Dorothy's time. The President might preempt her," added Holle, "but if she isn't on, you can bet your bottom dollar we will get mail and phone calls saying, 'Okay, what happened to Dorothy?'"



At right, planning an upcoming Mid-Day show are, from left, Mrs. Rosemary Lucas, producer and hostess; Miss Dorothy Overbey, Extension consumer education specialist; and Everett Holle, station program director. Homemakers, like the one above, sometimes recognize Miss Overbey in supermarkets and ask her for first-hand advice.

"If she says this is the week to buy sweet potatoes, then people buy sweet potatoes. Our phone calls testify to that," Holle emphasized. "The way that people admire her, respect her, and pay attention to her shows that she is considered an expert."

Mrs. Rosemary Lucas, producer and hostess of Mid-Day, agrees with Holle's views regarding Miss Overbey's effectiveness.

"She's a great favorite with the audience, and we have received only good comments from her performance. She always gives information that is pertinent and needed, and it appeals to all segments of the audience regardless of their economic status," said Mrs. Lucas.

She added that Miss Overbey always does a fine job of choosing subject matter, is a delightful person to work with, and has a good selection of visuals to show what she is talking about.

"When you do a television show and don't use visual materials, you are losing a great percentage of the involvement of your audience and effectiveness," noted Holle.

Miss Overbey is still enthusiastic about the show after 9 years. "I try to give homemakers the type of information they can use on a day-to-day basis," Miss Overbey said. "And I guess I am doing that, because I get

many requests for all types of information and run into many people in grocery stores who recognize me and want more information.

"I offered a pickle recipe recently and got over 200 requests. This show is the only contact many people have with the Extension Service, and naturally I want their impression to be good," she added.

Miss Overbey listed these goals for her show:

—to give information on the food marketing situation in simple terms that homemakers understand,

—to give homemakers food buying information that will help them stretch their food dollars and meet the essential food needs,

—to try to use some foods each time that will help low-income homemakers feed their families better,

—to give tips on reading and understanding food labels,

—to help homemakers maintain quality of food until they get it home, and

—to help homemakers keep abreast of foods that are good buys and are available locally.

Miss Overbey does not discuss detailed information on cooking or recipes.

She makes the 116-mile trip to Birmingham every other week. While at the station, she presents one program live and tapes another for show-

ing the following week. She figures it takes about 2 days to prepare and present the two programs and that each trip costs Extension about \$38. That's not a bad figure, considering that the program is available to about a third of Alabama's population.

"This Mid-Day show proves that the Extension Service can provide people that have the ability to develop the necessary skills to effectively use television," stressed Holle. "Dorothy is a fine example of a good specialist who is using television to get her information to the masses of people."

Holle added that the close working relationship between Extension and his station dates back 30 or 40 years. But never has that relationship been closer.

WAPI-TV and many other stations in Alabama have given freely of their time and facilities to help Extension serve its clientele. Miss Overbey's resounding success with Mid-Day is proof that Extension can effectively use this medium if we plan, train, and execute correctly. □





People programs

Secretary of Agriculture Earl Butz appeared before the Senate Subcommittee on Migratory Labor recently to testify on "people programs" of the Department. The Secretary traced the history of the Department and its various agencies, including the evolutionary nature of their programs as they endeavored to be responsive to the changing needs of a dynamic society.

He stated, "There are few instances in which the application of research and education has produced such phenomenal results as in agriculture—such abundance for so many." He recognized the importance of this effort to those who earn their living through production of food and fiber, but described the consumers of agricultural and forestry products as equally important beneficiaries of this effort.

In describing the people programs that have evolved as the Department expanded its programs, the Secretary included several Extension programs. Specifically, he mentioned the Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program; 4-H Youth programs; programs for the handicapped, disadvantaged, and minorities; rural development; and the emerging role of the 1890 land-grant colleges. Most of these have been recognized in this space—some more than once.

One of the programs emerging in recent years which was not mentioned in the Secretary's testimony and which has never been recognized here is Extension work on drug use and abuse. As a result, probably few Extension workers realize the total extent of this effort.

Responses by State Extension Services to a recent ES questionnaire show that 48 of the 53 States and territories

with Cooperative Extension programs are conducting on-going efforts in relation to drugs.

These States clearly identified 11 audiences for their programs. However, as one would logically conclude, audiences vary from place to place and no one State is serving all 11 audiences. Also, there is variation as to whether the program is conducted statewide or in selected counties or communities.

Forty-one States are serving three or more audiences. The range, of course, goes from none up to a maximum of eight. As one would expect, 4-H youth was mentioned as the audience most often—34 States. Twenty-eight States are conducting programs for Extension Homemaker Clubs; 20 are providing training for Extension workers; 19 listed other State officials as audiences; 17 listed local leaders as an audience; and 16 listed personnel of local agencies as audiences. In addition, many State Extension Services have developed educational materials and make them available to any groups wishing to pursue programs on drug abuse.

As with all Extension programs, the effort features educational and preventive measures. More specifically, efforts can be summarized by saying the programs give youth and parents information for making personal decisions about health and taking effective community action. Extension also fills an important role as coordinator, particularly among other groups involved in health education.

Descriptions of the variations in programs and projects on drug use and abuse among the States is impossible in this short space. But we believe this total effort is worthy of recognition, as it further shows Extension's response to people's needs and further demonstrates that "Our Concern Is People."—WJW