

# Termiticide Report 2005

## Also in Technologies

66 Termite World

68 Ask the Expert

70 Treatment Countdown

## Termiticide testing in full swing; USDA-FS's Mississippi site hit hard by Hurricane Katrina.

By Terry Wagner, Joe Mulrooney, Thomas Shelton and Chris Peterson • Contributors

**T**he USDA-FS wrote and administered 44 termiticide testing agreements with industry; Hurricane Katrina hit hard the oldest U.S. Forest Service test site; and the Termiticide Standards Committee of the Association of Structural Pest Control Regulatory Officials proposed a revision of the EPA's Product Performance Test Guideline, OPPTS 810.3600.

Five termiticides were evaluated in the laboratory, and 26 termiticides and five impregnated barriers were evaluated in the field. Four new termiticides were installed at sites in Florida (February), Arizona (April), Mississippi (June) and South Carolina (September).

One termiticide was installed at three sites (Arizona, Florida and Mississippi) and another at two sites (Arizona and Florida). These partial installations allowed registrants to get products in the ground early without having to wait for the next installation cycle beginning in February. Two additional generic termiticides were installed in Starkville, Miss., to satisfy Florida registration requirements. Overall, the USDA-FS

### **The USDA-FS wrote and administered 44 termiticide testing agreements with the industry in 2005.**

wrote and administered 44 agreements with industry as part of its ongoing testing program.

#### **HIT BY HURRICANE**

Hurricane Katrina slammed into the Mississippi gulf coast in August 2005, causing severe damage throughout the region. The Harrison Experimental Forest did not escape

damage despite its location 20 miles inland. The forest contains the oldest Forest Service test site, dating back to the late 1930s. The storm damaged an estimated 30 to 70 percent of the trees depending on location, and damage was scattered throughout the test site. Some individual test plots were destroyed by fallen and uprooted trees (see photographs on page 61). A full inventory of losses and general clean-up of the site are scheduled for late winter/early spring.

The hope is that storm-related losses were spread more or less evenly over all tests and the newer tests involving unregistered candidate termiticides were spared the greatest

*continued on next page*

### **Termiticide Efficacy Standards Debate Continues**

The standards used to evaluate termiticide performance have been a topic of considerable discussion in recent years. Because this topic has a direct impact on the registration of new compounds, the 2003 Termiticide Report provided an overview of the debate in *Pest Control's* February 2004 issue.

The debate continued during 2005 when the Termiticide Standards Committee

*continued on page 62*

# Termiticide Report from previous page

**Table 1** Number of years that termiticides remained effective in concrete slab (CS) and ground board (GB) tests at 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 control plots attacked over the life of the study.

% A.I.	Test	Arizona		Florida		Mississippi		South Carolina		FL SE States
		EPA	FL	EPA	FL	EPA	FL	EPA	FL	
<b>Bifenthrin – Biflex TC (est. 1986)</b>										
0.031	CS	0	9	4	11	2	5	2	4	4
0.062††	CS	16	16	19	19	7	7	10	16	10
0.125††	CS	10	15	9	19	2	7	19	19	9
0.25	CS	19	19	19	19	16	17	19	19	19
0.5	CS	6	19	19	19	18	19	19	19	19
0.031	GB	6	7	4	5	2	2	3	4	4
0.5	GB	10	11	14	19	12	15	8	11	14
Control	CS	53%		77%		58%		64%		-
Control	GB	66%		86%		79%		89%		-
<b>Cypermethrin (est. 1982 – 2004)</b>										
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	63%		67%		56%		65%		-
Control	GB	75%		76%		87%		90%		-
<b>Permethrin – Dagnet (est. 1978 – 2004)</b>										
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%		-
<b>Permethrin – Torpedo (est. 1980 – 2004. Controls same as cypermethrin)</b>										
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	24	24	24	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 soil penetration through treated soil in any plot.  
 FL: years with no damage worse than ASTM 9 to test blocks in 90 percent or more of the plots per site.  
 FL SE States: years with no damage worse than ASTM 9 to test blocks in 90 percent or more of the plots for all southeastern sites.  
 †† Registered rates.

*continued on page 58*

# Termiticide Report from page 56

**Table 2** Number of years that termiticides remained effective in concrete slab (CS) and ground board (GB) tests at 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 control plots attacked over the life of the study.

% A.I.	Test	Arizona		Florida		Mississippi		South Carolina		FL SE States
		EPA	FL	EPA	FL	EPA	FL	EPA	FL	
<b>Imidacloprid – Premise 75 WSP (est. 1992)</b>										
0.025	CS	13	13	13	13	1	1	3	4	2
0.05††	CS	13	13	6	12	2	2	10	10	6
0.1††	CS	13	13	13	13	2	4	5	13	8
0.15	CS	13	13	13	13	3	4	5	13	5
0.2	CS	13	13	13	13	2	5	5	5	5
0.25	CS	13	13	12	13	2	2	8	9	8
0.3	CS	13	13	13	13	5	5	5	11	13
0.4	CS	13	13	12	13	5	9	5	13	13
0.1††	GB	3	7	2	2	1	1	2	2	2
0.2	GB	8	13	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%		78%		79%		41%		-
Control	GB	40%		96%		98%		75%		-
<b>Fipronil – Termidor 80 WG (est. 1994)</b>										
0.0625††	CS	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11
0.125††	CS	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11
0.25	CS & GB	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11
0.5	CS & GB	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11
1.0	CS & GB	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11	11
Control	CS	14%		22%		3%		4%		-
Control	GB	9%		6%		13%		11%		-
<b>Fipronil – Termidor SC (est. 1999)</b>										
0.06††	CS	6	6	5.5	5.5	6	6	6	6	5.5+
0.125††	CS	6	6	5.5	5.5	6	6	6	6	5.5+
0.25	CS	6	6	5.5	5.5	6	6	6	6	5.5+
0.06††	GB	6	6	5.5	5.5	6	6	5	6	5.5+
0.125††	GB	6	6	5.5	5.5	6	6	6	6	5.5+
0.25	GB	0	6	2.5	4.5	2	2	6	6	5.5+
Control	CS	1%		47%		72%		61%		-
Control	GB	40%		96%		81%		89%		-
<b>Chlorfenapyr – Phantom (est. 1996)</b>										
0.125††	CS	9	9	1	7	1	1	6	7	1
0.25††	CS	9	9	9	9	2	5	5	9	6
0.5	CS	9	9	9	9	4	4	9	9	9
0.75	CS	9	9	1	1	5	5	9	9	9
1.0	CS	9	9	9	9	5	7	9	9	7
2.0	CS	9	9	9	9	1	9	8	9	9
0.25††	GB	9	9	0	0	2	6	5	9	6
0.5	GB	5	9	1	8	4	4	9	9	5
0.75	GB	9	9	4	7	5	9	9	9	8
1.0	GB	8	9	9	9	5	9	9	9	9
2.0	GB	6	8	9	9	9	9	8	9	9
Control	CS	23%		50%		92%		52%		-
Control	GB	43%		86%		98%		99%		-

† EPA: years with no soil penetration through treated soil in any plot.  
 FL: years with no damage worse than ASTM 9 to test blocks in 90 percent or more of the plots per site.  
 FL SE States: years with no damage worse than ASTM 9 to test blocks in 90 percent or more of the plots for all southeastern sites.  
 †† Registered rates.

continued on page 60

# Termiticide Report from page 58

impact. Critical to the registration process are concrete slab plots containing termiticide concentrations targeted for registration.

## TEST SITE EXPANSION

Elsewhere, work continued on expanding the U.S. Forest Service's test site located on the Calhoun Experimental Forest near Union, S.C. An area adjacent to the existing site has been chosen for the expansion, and archaeological and wildlife assessments are being made.

## TEST METHODS

The USDA-FS uses two standard field methods to test soil-applied liquid termiticides — ground boards and concrete slabs. These methods

are specified in EPA's Product Performance Test Guideline, OPPTS 810.3600.

The ground board test consists of a pine board centered in a 17-by-17-inch plot of exposed treated soil, replicated 10 times at each test site.

***The U.S. Forest Service collects data annually on the amount of damage to the wooden blocks and the presence of termites and mud tubes in the attacked plots.***

The concrete slab test consists of a 17-by-17-inch plot of treated soil covered by a 21-by-21-inch concrete slab. A covered four-inch pipe extends through the center of the slab and contains a pine block placed on the treated soil.

Both tests apply termiticides to the soil at an equivalent pre-construction volume of 1 gallon per 10 square feet. The U.S. Forest Service collects data annually on the amount of damage to the wooden blocks and the presence of termites and mud tubes in the attacked plots.

Damage is read using the Gulfport scale, where 0 = no damage, 1 = nibbles to surface etching, 2 = light damage with penetration, 3 =

*continued on page 63*



*The USDA-FS's test site in Mississippi was hit hard by Hurricane Katrina last August. The Harrison Experimental Forest, located 20 miles inland, contains the oldest USDA-FS test site and dates from the late 1930s. The storm damaged an estimated 30 to 70 percent of the trees, depending on location.*

# Termiticide Report from page 61

## Efficacy Standards continued from page 55

(TSC) of the Association of Structural Pest Control Regulatory Officials (ASPCRO) proposed a revision of EPA's Product Performance Test Guideline, OPPTS 810.3600. The TSC is comprised of four state regulators, a member from National Pest Management Association (NPMA), and a member from the organization representing termiticide manufacturers, Responsible Industry for a Sound Environment (RISE).

The TSC-proposed revision of the federal guideline differs from the existing guideline in several significant ways.

First, the primary criterion used to evaluate product performance in small-scale field tests was changed from soil penetration to wood damage. Under the existing guideline, termites must penetrate through the treated soil for an individual plot (e.g., concrete slab) to "fail." Under the TSC proposed guideline, termites must cause damage to the wooden test block worse than ASTM 9 (e.g., nibbles to 3-percent loss) for a plot to fail.

Second, the percentage of failed plots constituting a product failure at a given concentration was changed. For example, under the existing guideline, no plots can fail at any site for at least five years; whereas under the proposed guideline, up to 10 percent of the plots can fail without constituting a product failure. Thus, the proposed revision is very similar to the Florida Termiticide Efficacy Rule — with one significant difference: Once a plot fails under the proposed guideline, it is considered a failure thereafter (in subsequent years). Under the Florida rule, all plots are evaluated each year regardless of their prior status.

The proposed guideline also eliminates all references to "toxic barriers." Soil penetration is the logical criterion for evaluating termiticides that repel and/or kill termites quickly and, in so doing, form an effective toxic barrier under and around structures. Termiticides that are relatively slow acting and non-repellent may not act as barriers, and thus the soil penetration criterion has been replaced with damage. The use of a damage criterion recognizes that termites may penetrate through the treated zone and ultimately get into the structure.

The proposed guideline also includes building tests (under Experimental Use Permits) as a supplement to small-scale field tests.

If adopted, the TSC proposed guideline would influence the registration of termiticides by changing product performance durations (e.g., the number of years the product is considered successful). Like the existing standards, termiticides under the proposed guideline must be judged successful for at least five years. The number of years a product would remain successful under the proposed guideline is generally equal to or greater than the existing guideline and equal to or less than the Florida rule. Thus, the proposed guideline is less demanding than the existing guideline but more demanding than the Florida rule.

Results comparing the existing EPA guideline (Table 2), the TSC proposed guideline, and the Florida rule (Table 2) for imidacloprid under concrete slabs are: 2 vs. 4 vs. 6 years of success at 0.05 percent AI, 2 vs. 5 vs. 8 years of success at 0.1 percent, 3 vs. 4 vs. 5 years at 0.15 percent, 2 vs. 5 vs. 5 years at 0.2 percent, 2 vs. 4 vs. 8 years at 0.25 percent, 5 vs. 9 vs. 13 years at 0.3 percent, and 5 vs. 8 vs. 13 years at 0.4 percent.

The same comparisons for chlorfenapyr are: 1 versus 1 versus 1 year at 0.125 percent AI, 2 vs. 5 vs. 6 years at 0.25 percent, 4 vs. 9 vs. 9 years at 0.5 percent, 1 vs. 5 vs. 9 years at 0.75 percent, 5 vs. 7 vs. 7 years at 1 percent, and 1 vs. 9 vs. 9 years at 2 percent.