

# Lancaster Farming

VOL. 25 No. 51

Lancaster Farming, Saturday, October 18, 1980

\$7.50 Per Year



Hanging tobacco crop, with good quality leaf but a bit thin in yield, is examined by John Yocum, left, agronomist and tobacco researcher at Penn State's Southeast Research Lab, Landisville, and Arnold Lueck, agronomist and county extension agent.

## Quality but thin tobacco crop hangs in Lancaster sheds

BY DICK ANGLESTEIN  
LANDISVILLE

Tobacco sheds across Lancaster County, their slats open to the cool, dry October breezes, contain a crop, which may be hanging a bit thin in many locations but whose rich, chestnut brown color denotes good leaf quality.

That's the summary assessment of John Yocum, agronomist and tobacco researcher at Penn State's Southeast Research Lab, and Arnold Lueck, agronomist and county extension agent, from their travels around the county and judging of tobacco entries in local fairs.

"It's a good crop," Yocum said.

"But a lot of the leaf I've seen is thin and some growers may be surprised when they weigh it. I haven't seen the big leaves, particularly in those areas that were hit hard by the extremely dry weather."

While yields will be quite a bit better than last year, when blue mold took its toll, it's expected they generally will be anywhere from 15 to possibly as high as 25 percent below a normal year.

But yields likely will vary considerably across the county, depending on where the beneficial thunderstorms fell during the growing season. While it was quite dry around places like Creswell and southern sections, summer showers nourished the crop in areas such as Denver and Ephrata and produced some monstrous plants.

The tobacco yield variations will follow the

corn crop yield pattern recorded in various parts of the county.

Ideal curing conditions which prevailed since the tobacco was hung in the sheds is responsible for the general good quality of the leaf.

"We've seen some of the best color we've had in awhile," according to Lueck.

"While the quality is definitely up, our overall quantities will be down from normal. Also, we should have a minimum of curing problems."

Lueck had strong words of praise for the efforts of growers in tackling the blue mold problem this year.

"We did a lot better than we first expected as far as the disease was concerned," he explained.

"Most growers did an excellent job of spraying in the seedbeds and the only time we had some real problems was when pulling and transplanting in-

ferred with regular spraying in the beds."

County growers used all of the Ridomil that was available this past season for their fields.

In the continuing chemical control of blue mold, the manufacturer of Ridomil is striving to obtain label approval for its use on

(Turn to Page A36)

## Horst takes trophies at Lebanon Holstein Banquet

MT. ZION — Lebanon County's Kirby Horst ended his years with the county's Junior Holstein Club in a winning way at Monday evening's Annual Lebanon County Holstein Club Banquet.

Twenty-one-year-old Horst captured four first place trophies and six second place plaques in youth competition for best cows in

milk and fat production during the past year.

Horst's three year old Holstein took the top honors in her division for both milk and fat. She made 21,216 pounds milk and 720 pounds fat.

His four year old was at the head of her class with 21,901 pounds of milk. Her fat production at 772 pounds ranked her in second place

## Lancaster Farmers' Assn. approves deed restrictions

BY CURT HARLER  
INTERCOURSE — A policy to allow counties or townships to initiate and fund farmland preservation programs such as ag preserve areas, and to use deed restrictions, was approved Tuesday night at the annual meeting of the Lancaster County Farmers' Association.

The policy, with several strings attached to assure local control and allow a 25 year ask-out interval, was one of several approved.

The preserve program would need the support and approval of each township in which a preserve area is to be designated, with full input from township supervisors and their planning commissioners, farmers said.

Among other provisions are a requirement that all owners of farmland be notified of hearings on the matter.

To avoid suppression of property values within a preserve and to prevent intermingling of residential and other development in a preserve area, the resolution allows a township to buy, at market price, a property for which a change of use is anticipated.

The passage of the resolution has to be seen as a victory for Amos Funk, the

Millersville farmer who has pushed for such a program for years.

Funk noted the 25-year provision and township control mechanism as the two compromises which allowed passage of the resolution.

The resolution, if approved on the state level by Pennsylvania Farmers' Association, may ease passage of HB 1963 by allowing legislators who ordinarily follow PFA policy to support such a bill.

HB 1963 basically would make legal the provisions called for by LFA. Then municipalities seeking to save farmland, like Ephrata Township, could continue with their ag preserve program.

Since the preserve program is not mandatory, any township whose voters are against the idea would not have to participate.

In other action, LFA recommended the seller of any animal sold by weight at auction be furnished with a duplicate of the weight slip furnished to the buyer.

They asked PFA to oppose designation of streams, rivers, lakes and wilderness areas for wild and scenic uses. This stems from the proposed Wild and Scenic River designation for the Octoraro.

Lancaster farmers recommended 50 percent of the property tax be replaced by a higher income tax and

(Turn to Page A34)

### In this Issue

SECTION A: Editorials, 10; Bradford-Sullivan farmers, 17; York lambs, 18; Lebanon farm-city exchange, 30; Manheim sale, 32; Good old hybrids, 38.

SECTION B: Eisenhower farm, 2; Meat, poultry outlook, 8; York DHIA, 9; Chester DHIA, 11; MCMF York meeting, 12.

SECTION C: Homestead notes, 2; Home on the range, 6; Joyce Bupp, 8; Ida's 10th year, 10; Dealing with stress, 16; Lancaster DHIA, 25; Sheila's shorts, 34.

SECTION D: Apple art, 2; KILE horses, 4; Farm talk, 10; 1980 milk picture, 11; NEDCO annual meeting, 13; 291-bushel corn, 20.

### Meeting Monday evening

## Manor Twp. to discuss ag district plan

BY SHEILA MILLER

LANCASTER — The Manor Township, Lancaster County, Board of Supervisors will meet Monday evening at 7:30 p.m. at the township building, 26 Millersville Road, to accept or reject an agricultural district plan.

The proposed ordinance and map for an agricultural district in the township were

presented to the supervisors Tuesday evening by the township's planning commission.

According to John Barley, a dairyman and member of the planning commission for Manor Township, the commission hopes the supervisors will accept the proposal as presented.

"Ninety percent of the time the supervisors accept

the Planning Commission's recommendations without any changes," he stated. However he admitted there may be some discussions on the proposed boundaries of the ag district as delineated on the map.

"The proposed ordinance, I feel, is acceptable pretty much as is," Barley said Friday.

Included in the ag district plan for Manor Township are its 9600 acres of prime farmland.

The Lancaster County Comprehensive Plan and the Soil Survey for the township were used as guidelines for preparing the map.

Barley said the county's sample ordinance was used as a guide but that Manor Township made some modifications to the original.

"We felt the county plan was too restrictive — it allows for zero development.

"In our plan, we are calling for a three percent development restriction. In other words, if a farmer needs to build a home for a family member of himself,

he can develop up to three percent of his total acres.

"Instead of being limited to building on an acre lot, our ordinance allows for home construction on 20,000 square feet.

"This makes development in the future, if the need arises, a simple thing. Farmers are more comfortable with that type of ordinance."

Barley emphasized that the Planning Commission encourages any development on farms be done on less desirable land.

He pointed out the three percent allowance can be transferred between properties.

"If a farmer owns two 100 acre properties, the total allowable for development would be six acres."

If one farm had six acres of woodland or some other type of less desirable land, the farmer could then transfer three acres for development from one 100 acre farm to the other,

(Turn to Page A12)

(Turn to Page A30)