USDA – Forest Service Termiticide Report for 2013

Thomas Shelton, Donald Fye and Michael Ulyshen Contributors

n the United States. termiticides are considered for federal registration by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) based, in part, on the results of fiveyear, small-plot field efficacy tests performed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service (USDA-FS). This work is done by the Insects, Diseases and Invasive Plants (IDIP) Research Work Unit (RWU; SRS-4552) on four national field sites in Arizona. Florida.



Mississippi and South Carolina. The termite portion of the IDIP RWU was initiated by Thomas E. Snyder during the late 1930s. Dr. Snyder was honored posthumously with induction into the *Pest Management Professional* Hall of Fame this past year (*PMP*, Oct. 2013). For more than 75 years, the USDA-FS has evaluated termiticides in its ongoing termiticide testing program. Currently it's managing



Figure 1. Number of candidate termiticides installed at USDA-FS test sites.

five continuing agreements with product manufacturers in 2013. termites The number of products

installed on USDA-FS field sites since 1985 is illustrated in **Fig. 1.** The number of new products installed during the past few years has diminished. For example, in 2013, one candidate product was installed on two field sites. This reduction will be seen in the termiticide market during the next few years as fewer new products will be available to compete with older products. This situation was discussed previously in the 2011 Termiticide Report (*PMP*, Feb. 2012). Five field testing agreements were still active in 2013, representing four candidate products.

Test Methods

Two test protocols are designated for efficacy evaluations of soil-applied termiticides: the ground board and concrete slab field tests are specified by EPA's Product Performance Test Guideline – OPPTS 810.3600. At each of the four national locations, each test type is replicated 10 times for each termiticide concentration tested.

Continued on page 44

THE LITTLE SQUARE THAT WILL HAVE A BIG IMPACT

Introducing EndZone[™] Insecticide Sticker from FMC

EndZone[™] insecticide sticker is an innovative filth fly service offering that's discreet, affordable and easy to use. Approved for both residential and commercial accounts, EndZone delivers knockdown in one minute^{*} and provides residual action that lasts up to seven months indoors and four months outdoors.^{**} Visit **www.fmcprosolutions.com** or contact your FMC Market Specialist to learn how EndZone can help you grow and distinguish your services while increasing your profitability.



*Proven to knockdown house flies in one minute. **When protected from contamination by dirt, dust, filth, moisture and rain. Always read and follow label directions. FMC and EndZone are trademarks of FMC Corporation. ©2014 FMC Corporation. All rights reserved.

USDA – Forest Service Termiticide Report

Continued from page 42

For the ground board test, a 6-inch-square pine board is centered on 17-inch-square plot of exposed, termiticide-treated soil (**Fig. 2**). The board is held in place with a brick.

In the concrete slab test, the treated plot area is also 17 inches square. Treated soil is covered by a polyethylene vapor barrier before a 21-inch-square concrete slab is poured around a 4-inch diameter PVC pipe placed at the center (**Fig. 3**). After the concrete sets, the vapor barrier is cut out and removed from the bottom of the pipe and a 3.5-by-2.5-by-1.5-inch rectangular pine block is placed on the treated soil at the bottom of the pipe. Finally, a PVC cap is placed on the pipe to prevent weathering of the treated soil (**Fig. 4**).

Termiticides are applied to the soil at an equivalent preconstruction volume of 1 gallon per 10 square feet in both test types. Data are collected annually about the extent of damage done by termites to each block and board, as well as the presence or absence of live termites infesting test blocks or boards.



Figure 2. A newly treated ground board plot



Figure 3. A study in Florida after treatment, but before concrete pouring



Figure 4. A completed concrete slab plot

Damage data are collected using the Gulfport scale: 0 = no damage, 1 = nibbles-to-surface etching, 2 =light damage with penetration, 3 = moderate damage, 4 = heavy damage, and 5 = board or block destroyed.

Performance Standards

For the purposes of termiticide registration, there are two standards for efficacy. The first standard is EPA's Test Guideline (OPPTS 810.3600) used in the federal registration of candidate products. The other standard used is the state of Florida Termiticide Efficacy Rule (5e-2.0311, FAC). These standards apply to different termiticide uses. The Florida rule applies to preventive applications for new construction, whereas the federal guideline applies to directions for pre- and postconstruction applications of the product.

For federal registration of a candidate termiticide, the product should prevent termites from penetrating treated soil in all test plots for at least five years using the concrete slab test method at the lowest label rate that will be registered. For this reason, the data in the EPA sections of Tables 1 and 2 of this report are given in years of 100-percent control.

Success for a candidate termiticide under the Florida rule is defined differently than success under the federal guideline. The Florida rule considers only data collected in Southeastern states. Under this rule, success for a candidate termiticide occurs when it prevents damage more severe than ASTM 9 (equivalent to a Gulfport rating of 1) to greater than 90 percent of all test blocks (or boards) for five years in one or more of the Southeastern sites. A minimum of 10 concrete slab plots is required. All test plots are evaluated annually, and each year is considered independently for the 90-percent threshold. Previous or cumulative infestations of plots aren't considered. *Continued on page 48*







GENTROL[®] A WORD TO THE WISE.

Experienced pest control professionals know that for complete cockroach control you need Gentrol^{*} IGR in the protocol. Gentrol^{*} IGR is an insect growth regulator (IGR) that prevents nymphs and larvae from developing into breeding adults. The active ingredient, (S)-hydroprene, translocates from treated areas to locations that are typically difficult to treat. Use Gentrol^{*} IGR in a tank mix with Zenprox^{*} EC or as a spot treatment with Zenprox^{*} Aerosol to help ensure the end of infestations. In addition to cockroaches, Gentrol^{*} IGR also controls bed bugs, fruit flies, drain flies and stored product pests.

Always read and follow label directions. Gentrol, Zenprox and Zoëcon with design are registered trademarks of Wellmark International. ©2013 Wellmark International.

To learn more about Gentrol[®] and Zenprox[®] products, visit **zoecon.com** or call **800.248.7763**.





NEW CONSTRUCTION MEANS **NEW CUSTOMERS** FOR TERMITE RENEWAL & GP





EXPONENTIALGROWTH STARTS WITH BORA-CARE®



BORA-CARE®

Grow your business with Bora-Care new construction termite treatments – selling the termite renewals and general pest contracts will grow your business exponentially.

Bora-Care is a borate-based termiticide, insecticide and fungicide applied directly to wood, concrete and foundation penetrations. Bora-Care creates a barrier, eliminating wood as a food source. nisuscorp.com/boracare



MOLD-CARE®

Kills mold and deters future mold growth. Kills and controls decay fungi, carpenter ants and other pests. nisuscorp.com/moldcare





BORA-FOAM®

First termite resistant expanded polystyrene insulation designed for basements and enclosed crawl spaces. R-11 insulation. nisuscorp.com/borafoam



JECTA®

Ready-to-use borate termiticide, insecticide and fungicide injectable gel used to reach places where other products cannot be applied effectively. nisuscorp.com/jecta





800.264.0870 • www.nisuscorp.com

Bora-Care, Mold-Care, Bora-Foam, Jecta and Nisus Corporation are registered trademarks of Nisus Corporation. ©2014 Nisus Corporation #PMP0314

USDA – Forest Service Termiticide Report

Continued from page 44

| Table 1. Numb sites applying th Control = percent | per of years rep ne EPA guidelir ntage of all uni | ellent termi ne and Florid treated plot | ticides rem da Efficacy s attacked | nained effec Rule.† Fracti throughout | tive in con ons of yea the life of | crete-slab (rs occurred the study. | CS) and gro when prod | und-board ucts were i | (GB) tests o nstalled out | n four field of cycle. |
|--|---|---|--|---|--|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|
| | | Arizona | | Florida | | Mississippi | | South Carolina | | FL |
| % A.I. | Test | EPA | FL | EPA | FL | EPA | FL | EPA | FL | SE States |
| Bifenthrin - | - Biflex TC | c (study | establis | shed 198 | 6 and c | losed 20 |)11) | | | |
| 0.031 | CS | 0 | 9 | 4 | 11 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 4 | 4 |
| 0.062 ⁺⁺ | CS | 16 | 16 | 22 | 22 | 7 | 7 | 10 | 16 | 10 |
| 0.125 ⁺⁺ | CS | 10 | 15 | 9 | 25 | 2 | 7 | 24 | 25 | 9 |
| 0.25 | CS | 25 | 25 | 25 | 25 | 16 | 17 | 25 | 25 | 25 |
| 0.5 | CS | 6 | 23 | 25 | 25 | 18 | 24 | 25 | 25 | 25 |
| 0.031 | GB | 6 | 7 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 4 |
| 0.5 | GB | 10 | 11 | 14 | 21 | 12 | 15 | 8 | 11 | 14 |
| Control | CS | 52 | % | 68 | 1% | 5 | 1% | 59% | | - |
| Control | GB | 68% | | 86% | | 74% | | 84% | | - |
| Cypermeth | rin (study | establis | shed 19 | 82 and c | losed 20 | 004) | | | | |
| 0.125 | CS | 1 | 4 | 0.5 | 1.5 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 0.25 ⁺⁺ | CS | 4 | 4 | 10.5 | 12.5 | 3 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 0.5** | CS | 4 | 5 | 4.5 | 9.5 | 7 | 14 | 12 | 12 | 11.5 |
| 1.0 | CS | 8 | 10 | 7.5 | 21.5 | 6 | 15 | 12 | 16 | 15 |
| 1.0 | GB | 3 | 6 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 5 |
| Control | CS | 62 | % | 66% | | 50% | | 60% | | _ |
| Control | GB | 73% | | 75% | | 85% | | 88% | | - |
| Permethrin | - Dragne | t (study | establi | shed 197 | 8 and c | losed 20 | 004) | | | |
| 0.25 | CS | 8 | 10 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 1 |
| 0.5** | CS | 13 | 19 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 4.5 | 4.5 | 4.5 |
| 1.0 ⁺⁺ | CS | 15 | 15 | 15 | 25 | 5 | 8 | 10.5 | 11.5 | 10.5 |
| 1.0 ⁺⁺ | GB | 9 | 11 | 6 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 0.5 | 3.5 | 3 |
| Control | CS | 50 | % | 55 | % | 60 | % | 53 | % | - |
| Control | GB | 43% | | 78% | | 86% | | 84% | | - |
| Permethrin | i – Torpedo | o (study | establis | shed 198 | 0 and c | losed 20 | 011). Con | trols same as | cypermethrir | 1 |
| 0.25 | CS | 9 | 9 | 3 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 1.5 |
| 0.5 ⁺⁺ | CS | 11 | 13 | 6 | 9 | 3 | 5 | 1.5 | 4.5 | 5 |
| 1.0 ⁺⁺ | CS | 19 | 31 | 25 | 27 | 3 | 7 | 6.5 | 7.5 | 7 |
| 0.5 ⁺⁺ | GB | 4 | 4 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| 1.0 ⁺⁺ | GB | 8 | 9 | 5 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 1.5 | 1.5 | 1.5 |

⁺ **EPA**: years with no penetration through treated soil in any plot.

FL: years with no annual damage more severe than ASTM 9 to blocks or boards on 90 percent or more of the plots per site. Each annual evaluation stands alone; they're not cumulative. FL SE States: years with no annual damage more severe than ASTM 9 to blocks or boards on 90 percent or more of the plots throughout the Southeastern sites.

Damage ratings are annual, not cumulative.

⁺⁺ Registered label rates.

Latest Test Results

Tables 1 and 2 provide the results for repellent and nonrepellent termiticide evaluations collected through 2013. Similar to last year (*PMP*, Feb. 2013), Altriset (Chlorantraniliprole) is the only product for which new data can be reported. For Altriset, no efficacy losses were noted for any rate (including the registered application rate of 0.05 percent A.I.) compared with the 2012 report (*PMP*, Feb. 2013) for the concrete slab test plots. However, for the ground board plots, there was a loss of efficacy under the Florida rule standard for the 0.25 percent A.I. rate, having passed that standard for eight years. All Altriset plots will continue to be read annually. The federal efficacy guideline delineates a valuable standard for evaluating termiticide performance. Guidelines are open to interpretation and aren't required to be taken literally, whereas rules require compliance. EPA's primary mission is to protect human health and the environment, so registration of new termiticides is based more on the product's toxicological and environmental impact than on efficacy. Therefore, EPA sometimes registers products that don't strictly adhere to its guideline. While less stringent than the federal guideline, the Florida rule is followed by regulators in Florida.

Continued on page 50







THE TEMPRID[®] DIFFERENCE

When callbacks and cancellations are reduced, things are less complicated.

29

www.TempridDifference.com



EXPERIENCE THE DIFFERENCE.

- A difference of value: a broad-spectrum insecticide that reduces callbacks by over 50%; saving you time and money
- A difference of confidence: provides proven control you can count on
- A difference of flexibility: a go-to product for any pest issue, tough or occasional
- A difference of convenience: a single perimeter control solution
- A difference of satisfaction: happy technicians lead to happy customers

*Bayer PMP callback studies, 2007-2009.

Bayer CropScience LP, Environmental Science Division, 2 TW Alexander Drive, Research Triangle Park, NC 27709. 1-800-331-2867. www.BackedbyBayer.com. Bayer, the Bayer Cross, and Temprid are registered trademarks of Bayer. Not all products are registered in all states. Always read and follow label instructions carefully. ©2014 Bayer CropScience LP.

USDA – Forest Service Termiticide Report Continued from page 48

Table 2. Number of years nonrepellent termiticides remained effective in concrete-slab (CS) and ground-board (GB) tests on four field sites applying the EPA guideline and Florida Efficacy Rule.[†] Fractions of years occurred when products were installed out of cycle. Control = percentage of all untreated plots attacked throughout the life of the study.

| | | Arizona | | Florida | | Mississippi | | South | | FI |
|--|---|-------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-----------|
| % A.I. | Test | EPA | FL | EPA | FL | EPA | FL | EPA | FL | SE States |
| Imidacloprid – Premise 75 WSP (study established 1992 and closed 2007) | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0.025 | 2) | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 |
| 0.025 | CS CS | 15 | 15 | 6 | 12 | 2 | 7 | 10 | 10 | 6 |
| 0.1** | (S | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 15 | 8 |
| 0.15 | CS | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 15 | 5 |
| 0.2 | CS | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 |
| 0.25 | CS | 15 | 15 | 12 | 15 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 9 | 8 |
| 0.3 | CS | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 11 | 14 |
| 0.4 | CS | 15 | 15 | 12 | 15 | 5 | 9 | 5 | 14 | 15 |
| 0.1** | GB | 3 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 0.2 | GB | 8 | 14 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 0.3 | GB | 5 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| 0.4 | GB | 5 | 7 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 5 | 2 |
| Control | CS | 33 | 3% | 7 | 7% | 7 | 5% | 36% | | - |
| Control | GB | 40 | 0% | 9 | 5% | 96 | 5% | 70% | | - |
| Fipronil – T | lermidor 80 |) WG (st | udy esta | ablished | d 1994 ai | nd close | d 2010) | | | |
| Only five treated GB p impossible to evaluat | olots were attacked d e treatment effects. | luring the life o For additional | of the study, but information, ref | because of the fer to the 2006 | e low attacks at Termiticide Rej | t untreated cont port (<i>PC</i> , Februa | trol plots and m ary 2007, page (| ultiple product 66). | s in the test sit | e, it was |
| Control | CS | 14% | | 18% | | 2% | | 3% | | - |
| Control | GB | 9% | | 8% | | 16% | | 119 | 6 | - |
| Fipronil – T | Cermidor SO | C (study | establi | shed 19 | 99 and c | losed 20 |)11) | | | |
| 0.06 ⁺⁺ | CS | 12 | 12 | 11.5 | 11.5 | 8 | 12 | 8 | 8 | 11.5+ |
| 0.125 ⁺⁺ | CS | 12 | 12 | 11.5 | 11.5 | 8 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 11.5+ |
| 0.25 | CS | 12 | 12 | 11.5 | 11.5 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 11.5+ |
| 0.06 ⁺⁺ | GB | 10 | 12 | 9.5 | 11.5 | 9 | 10 | 5 | 11 | 10.5+ |
| 0.125 ⁺⁺ | GB | 12 | 12 | 11.5 | 11.5 | 8 | 11 | 10 | 10 | 11.5+ |
| 0.25 | GB | 0 | 9 | 2.5 | 11.5 | 2 | 2 | 12 | 12 | 11.5+ |
| Control | CS | 1% | | 67% | | 85% | | 50% | | - |
| Control | GB | 50% | | 97% | | 86% | | 88% | | - |
| Chlorfenap | oyr – Phant | om (stu | dy estab | lished | 1996 and | l closed | 2011) | | | |
| 0.125 ⁺⁺ | CS | 15 | 15 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 7 | 1 |
| 0.25 ⁺⁺ | CS | 15 | 15 | 11 | 11 | 2 | 5 | 5 | 15 | 6 |
| 0.5 | CS | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 4 | 4 | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| 0.75 | CS | 15 | 15 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 5 | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| 1.0 | CS | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 5 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 7 |
| 2.0 | CS | 15 | 15 | 15 | 15 | 1 | 9 | 15 | 15 | 15 |
| 0.25" | GB | 9 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 8 | 6 |
| 0.5 | GB | 5 | 10 | 4 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 12 | 15 | 5 |
| 0.75 | GB | 15 | 15 | 4 | / | 5 | 12 | 11 | 15 | 8 |
| 1.0 | GB | 8 | 15 | 9 15 | 15 | 17 | 11 | | 14 | 12 |
| Z.U Control | GB | 0 | 11 | L) | I) (0/ | 12 | 12 | ð | 14 | IZ |
| Control | GR | 5/ | 970 10/2 | Q. | 070 70/2 | 99% | | 95% | | - |
| Chlorantraniliprole – Altriset (study established 2004) | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0.025 | T | | ······································ | 1 | | , | F | | 0 | - |
| 0.025 | | 3 F | 5 | | / | 2 | 5 | 9 | 9 | / |
| 0.05'' | |) ר | 0 | <u>ک</u> | 9 | 9 | У 0 | 4 | 4 | 9 |
| 0.1 | C C | <u></u> Λ | 7 0 | 9 0 | 9 | 9 | لا 0 | 2 0 | 9 0 | 9 |
| 0.25 | GR | 7 | 2 5 | ρ | 9 1 | 7 | 2) | 2 1 | זי ר | 1 |
| 0.05 ⁺⁺ | GR | 2 | , , | 0 | 7 | 2 | <u>د</u> ۵ | 1 | 2 | 2 |
| 0.05 | GR | <u>د</u> | 2 | 1 | 6 | Δ | т 6 | 2 | <u>د</u> ل | <u>د</u> |
| 0.25 | GR | 2 | 4 | 2 | 9 | 2 | 8 | 4 | ہ 8 | 8 |
| Control | (7) | <u> </u> | т % | - 6 | 9% | 2 89 | 3% | 51 | 1% | - |
| Control | GB | 1: | 3% | 8 | 4% | 8 | 7% | 88 | 3% | - |
| | | | | | | . 0 | | . 00 | | 1 |

⁺ **EPA:** years with no penetration through treated soil in any plot.

FL: years with no annual damage more severe than ASTM 9 to blocks or boards on 90 percent or more of the plots per site. Each annual evaluation stands alone. They're not cumulative. FL SE States: years with no annual damage more severe than ASTM 9 to blocks or boards on 90 percent or more of the plots throughout the Southeastern sites.

Damage ratings are annual, not cumulative.

⁺⁺ Registered label rates.

Continued on page 52

Pyrethroid Resistant Killing Power Perfected

QUICKLY KILLS PYRETHROID RESISTANT BED BUGS AND THEIR EGGS

> WILL NOT STAIN WATER-SAFE FABRICS AND SURFACES

> > EDLAM

FOR USE ON MATTRESSES, WOOD FURNITURE, CARPET AND MORE

DUAL MODE OF ACTION ATTACKS TWO TARGET SITES

Bedlam[®] Plus features a dual mode of action that kills the toughest pyrethroid-resistant bed bugs fast. Featuring the perfect combination of quick kill and residual control, Bedlam Plus is proven to keep killing pyrethroid-resistant bed bugs and their eggs for 2 weeks after treatment^{*}



Kills Pyrethroid Resistant Bed Bugs and their

*On wood and ceramic surfaces

www.MGKpro.com



USDA – Forest Service Termiticide Report

Continued from page 50

FIFRA Scientific Advisory Panel

In March 2013, a three-day meeting of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act Scientific Advisory Panel (FIFRA SAP) was conducted. Five FIFRA SAP members and nine Food Quality Protection Act Science Review Board members were present. Details of the panel's recommendations are beyond the scope



of this article, but this information is at *www. regulations.gov* by searching for docket EPA-HQ-OPP-2012-0574, where recommendations and comments by the public are available.

Conclusions

The USDA-FS Termiticide Testing Program has been evaluating termiticide performance since the 1930s. The program has provided baseline performance data for all termiticides currently registered in the U.S. Through this report and individual product reports, registered termiticide performance data has been provided to pesticide manufacturers, regulators, the pest management industry and the American public for decades. As new products are tested, the USDA-FS will continue to provide updated information. **PMP**

Thomas Shelton and Michael Ulyshen are entomologists. Donald Fye is a biologist with the USDA-FS' Wood Products Insect Research Team in Starkville, Miss.

ROLLINS SHARED THE SAME VALUES AS OUR OWNERS

When the news broke that the Sameth family was selling the business to Rollins, there was a wide range of emotions among the Western employees. Once everybody heard what Rollins stood for and what the business goals were, our teams settled down, and the fear of the unknown quickly dissipated. Western Pest Services continues to grow and prosper as part of Rollins, and being part of the Rollins team has expanded opportunities for many of our people. The Sameth family's decision to sell to Rollins was the best decision for our people and our customers.

- Tom Walters, President, Western Pest Services

JOIN OUR DISTINGUISHED TEAM OF ROLLINS BRANDS TODAY.

Kemp Anderson | 407-616-9766 | handerson@rollins.com All inquiries are kept strictly confidential.

