

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PEST CONTROL REGULATORY OFFICIALS (NAPCRO)

HISTORICAL RECORD

1974

PRESIDENT:

VICE-PRESIDENT:

SECRETARY:

TREASURER:

LOCATION OF ANNUAL MEETING:

Memphis, TN

DATE:

9/09/74 to 9/12/74

MOTIONS OF EXECUTIVE BOARD MEETING:

**That NAPCRO change its name from National Association of Pest Control Regulatory Officials to Association of Structural Pest Control Regulatory Officials. (passed unanimously)

**Election of Officers

**State Reports

BUSINESS MEETING:

**Insect Survey-Chester Gordon

***"Are You Prepared?"-NPCA, Richard Eldridge

**Better Business Bureau-Glen Myers

**FHA-Kenneth Haley

**Legal Aspects of Pest Control-Bob Laws

***"Our Industry, General Pest Control"-Myron Smith

***"Our Industry, Wood Destroying Pests"-Albert Snyder

**Views & Comments-Thomas Garland, state senator from Tennessee

RESOLUTIONS:

NONE IN HISTORICAL RECORD

MISC: Meeting was directed by Jimmy R. White, Tennessee Department of Agriculture. States in attendance were Arkansas, California, Florida, Kansas, Louisiana, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, Tennessee and Texas.

** File contains an FHA Wood Infestation Report dated 1973.

The Fifteenth Annual Conference of the Association of Structural Pest Control Regulatory Officials (ASPCRO) met at the Rodeway Inn, Memphis Tennessee on September 9, 10, 11, and 12, 1974. The conference was attended by eleven states. All aspects of the meeting were notably well arranged and highly beneficial and a real tribute to the host state of Tennessee.

Program of the
Fifteenth Annual Meeting
National Association of Pest Control Regulatory Officials
September 9-12, 1974
Monday, 9 September

Registration

Tuesday Morning, 10 September

Welcome to Tennessee & Memphis - Don S. Jamieson and Howard L. Bruer and
The Honorable Gil F. Thornton

Today - Paul Levingston, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Insect Survey Program - Chester Gordon, Survey Entomologist, Tennessee Department
of Agriculture.

"Are You Prepared?" - Richard Eldredge, Executive Director, National Pest Control
Association.

Better Business Bureaus - Glen Myers, Director, Better Business Bureau of Memphis.

Federal Housing Administration - Kenneth Haley, FHA Office, U.S. Department of
Housing and Urban Development, Memphis.

Executive Session

Wednesday Morning, 11 September

The Tennessee Pest Control Operators Act of 1972 - Legal Aspects of Pest Control
Enforcement - Bob Laws, Staff Attorney, Tennessee Dept. of Agriculture

Welcome to Memphis - Hon. Wyatt Chandler, Mayor of the City of Memphis

"Our Industry - General Pest Control," - Myron W. Smith, Hill-Smith Termite Company

"Our Industry - Wood-Destroying Pests," - Albert E. (Bud) Snyder, Terminix
International, Memphis, Tennessee

Views and Comments - Hon. Thomas J. Garland, State Senator, Tennessee and Owner-
Operator of Chapman Exterminating Company

Tour of Joseph Schlitz Brewery, Tour of Memphis by bus and a Visit to Terminix
International headquarters.

Thursday Morning, 12 September

Executive Session - Reports from the States: North Carolina, Rudy Howell;
Mississippi, Robert McCarty; California, Ed. C. Sizemore; Arkansas, Gerald
King; Michigan, Robert L. Mesecher; Missouri, E. C. Houser; Kansas, Clarence
Guldner, Jr.; Tennessee, Claude E. Jones; Florida, F. R. Du Chanois.

Meeting Adjourned.

1 November 1974

MEMORANDUM:

TO: Association of Structural Pest Control Regulatory Officials (ASPCRO)
FROM: F. R. Du Chanois, Secretary-Treasurer (Florida)
SUBJ: Minutes and Notes of 15th Annual Conference in Memphis, Tennessee.

The Fifteenth Annual Conference of the Association of Structural Pest Control Regulatory Officials (ASPCRO), formerly National Association of Pest Control Regulatory Officials, met at the Rodeway Inn, 2949 Airways Blvd., Memphis, Tennessee on 9-12 September 1974. The conference was attended by eleven states, represented by fifteen officials and 22 speakers and guests. All aspects of the meeting were notably well arranged, organized and highly beneficial in terms of information imparted and exchanged, program excellence and objectives accomplished. Educational and business sessions, informal discussions and social events complemented each other, were edifying and enjoyable, and a real tribute to the host State of Tennessee and its warm-hearted, hospitable officials and citizens. The meeting sessions were capably presided over by Mr. Jimmy R. White, Assistant Director, Division of Plant Industries, Tennessee Department of Agriculture. Program and meeting arrangements were in charge of Mr. Claude E. Jones, Pest Control Administrator also of the Division of Plant Industries, Dept. of Agriculture of our host state . . . who, with his local committee, did a beautiful job. Copies of the Program, "It's a New Day", and rosters of members and guests attending are appended hereto.

Minutes and Notes of the Fifteenth Annual Meeting*

ASSOCIATION OF STRUCTURAL PEST CONTROL REGULATORY OFFICIALS

Memphis, Tennessee

9-12 September 1974

Monday, 9 September

REGISTRATION

Tuesday Morning, 10 September

Coffee and donuts in the hospitality suite. Orientation.

OFFICIAL WELCOME TO TENNESSEE AND MEMPHIS

Mr. Don S. Jamieson, Jamieson Pest Control Co., Inc., Memphis.

Mr. Howard L. Bruer, Director, Division of Plant Industries, Tennessee Dept. of Agriculture.

Honorable Gil F. Thornton, Commissioner, Tennessee Dept. of Agriculture welcomed the members on behalf of the Honorable Winfield Dunn, Governor of the State of Tennessee, and on behalf of the Dept. of Agriculture. The members recognize and sincerely appreciate Commissioner Thornton's taking time from his busy schedule to be with us, to welcome us so cordially and to set the proper tone of the meeting.

*Minutes and Notes are intended for the information and use of ASPCRO members only, and to reflect as accurately and faithfully as possible information presented or opinions expressed by individual members and speakers, and are not necessarily those of the Association. It is believed to be accurate, and neither the Association nor its Secretary assumes any responsibility for errors of commission or omission as they are, if any, unintentional. Corrections will gladly be made in the next issue upon request.

"TODAY", Mr. Paul Levingston, U. S. Environmental Protection Agency (for Mr. James H. White).

Mr. Levingston commented on amended FIFRA provisions of 1972: Use of pesticides in accordance with the label; pesticides classified as general-use and restricted-use; certification of applicator's (ten categories); state agency plans for implementing FIFRA and also including certification of commercial and private applicators are due by 21 October 1975; stop sales of pesticides; and disposal of unwanted and excess (surplus) pesticides and pesticide containers.

Section 4 Regulations on Certification of Applicators of Restricted Use Pesticides have been approved and will shortly appear in the Federal Register. EPA intends to promulgate final regulations on Sections 3, 4 and 5, which are the heart of the Act, by October 1974. State plan regulations should be promulgated by January 1975. EPA will furnish technical assistance to the states as needed in formulating state plans. They are trying to design procedural plans for certification.

Mr. Levingston touched on proposed "core manuals" -- basic training manuals for commercial and private applicators. EPA is funding USDA with \$9 million for training through state Agricultural Extension Service offices. He acknowledged (in answer to a question from the floor) that a law suit may be filed in at least one state challenging EPA's authority (jurisdiction) over private applicators.

Mr. Jimmy White (Tenn.) commented that it all boils down to restricted-use pesticides.

Mr. Sizemore (Calif.) remarked that 22 per cent of the pesticides used in this country are used in California.

The speaker noted that it wouldn't be surprising if it became necessary in about a year to come back and revise the applicator regulations.

Mr. Carleton (La.) expressed the fear of disruption of state programs unless EPA investigated and took into consideration existing and long-standing state laws and regulations (with special reference to structural pest control).

Mr. Doug Gaydon (EPA, Region 4, Southeastern U.S.) commented that "grandfathers" under state laws have never been required to demonstrate competence and this is being questioned by the EPA.

Considerable discussion ensued re the "demonstration and research pest control" category. The speaker informed us that Dr. John Osmun, who headed EPA's Operations Division until recently, had returned to his teaching/administrative duties at Purdue University. Dr. (Col.) Fred W. Whittemore, Jr. is the new Director, Operations Division, Office of Pesticides Programs. Mr. Levingston was hopeful that a tentative list of restricted-use pesticides would be issued as suggested by Mr. Jimmy White (Tenn.) and others present. Mr. Levingston's office telephone numbers at USEPA in Washington, D.C. are: (202)755-8053 and personal line (202)755-8051. FIFRA Section 4 Regulations, Certification of Pesticide Applicators, Fed. Regis. 9 Oct. 1974, were distributed.

INSECT SURVEY PROGRAM, Mr. Chester Gordon, Survey Entomologist, Tennessee Department of Agriculture.

"As American agriculture goes, so goes America", Mr. Gordon reminded. The USDA entered into insect survey work in 1912. The speaker noted that events of recent years brought forth unwarranted attacks on pesticides from a relatively few misuses. The farmer and the PCO must now contend with the Fair Labor and Standards Act, Occupational Health and Safety Act and Environmental Pesticide Control Act.

Insect survey methods and techniques are dependent upon many associated workers. The Cooperative Tennessee Insect Survey recorded in 1972 and 1973 respectively, 11 and 15 new (introduced into U.S.) insect pests. Eventually they will be able to determine reasonably accurately the economic loss to Tennessee agriculture due to insect pests; when pest (will) occur; the economic threshold data; and identify major economic pests. The subterranean termite is the major economic loss pest in Tennessee. Aphids and flea beetles have replaced the tobacco hornworm and budworm as the major pests of tobacco. Thrips are attacking corn for the first time. The speaker opined that the increase in wood-destroying pests and other foreign (introduced) pests was due to fewer USDA Quarantine Inspectors. Recently, a bostrichid from South Africa (in sandalwood), and a drywood termite from Mexico and South America were not intercepted and were introduced into Memphis. Plant quarantine inspection is the first line of defense and the Insect Survey the second line, and latter is showing up deficiencies in the former and pointing up the apparent need for funds.

Economic insect programs are essential if we are to provide the necessary food, fiber and shelter. Insect Survey answers the where, what and how many (insect pests) before control methods are applied. Mr. Gordon stated they do not know of an established drywood termite infestation in Tennessee at the present time, and was aware of only one structural infestation in the state since 1952. House dust mites have become recognized as more of a problem. A new problem with microscopic "tar pills" (or droplets), which encapsulate minute quantities of sulfuric acid and which occur in certain types of building insulation, has been encountered. These cause skin irritation to homeowners and PCO's. The operators are seeing more bedbugs and human body and head lice. (Ed. note: Could this be another side effect of the unavailability of DDT?)

Tuesday noon, 10 September

DELICIOUS STEAK LUNCHEON with all the trimmings (and Havana cigars) through the courtesy of ORKIN EXTERMINATING COMPANY. Mr. Pete Jones, District-State Manager of Nashville, and Messrs Earl Geiger, Vice President, and Robert (Bob) M. Russell, Vice President, Training and Standards, both of Atlanta, were ASPCRO's hosts. The members go on record expressing their sincere appreciation to their hosts.

Tuesday afternoon, 10 September

"ARE YOU PREPARED?" Mr. Richard Eldredge, Executive Director, National Pest Control Association.

Mr. Eldredge aroused the interest of the members with a "pop quiz" -- a series of stimulating, indeed provoking, questions such as:

- Have you read Public Law 92-516 (FEPCA)?
- Have you read drafts of proposed regulations under this law?
- Does your state have training programs?
- Does your state have a lead agency?
- Have you commented on regulation drafts?
- Are you currently licensing (certifying) by means of exams?
- Will your lead agency be ready to present a plan (to EPA) for compliance?
- Has your lead agency been adequately funded?
- How will it be funded?
- Where are the rest of your NAPCRO members?
- Is your (NAPCRO) organization organized (to meet today's challenges)?

Does the voice of NAPCRO count at the Federal level?

Do you have a list of (training and instruction) references you can recommend to your industry?

Is the pest control board (or agency) in your state assured of survival or will it be snapped up by EPA or the lead agency?

The speaker continued that representative organizations have not commented (to EPA) for the most part. Now there is a snarl and snare of unanswered questions. Where has EPA gotten authority to do some of the things they are doing or trying to do? Do you have any way of measuring now whether your (state) plan will comply with EPA standards? Mr. Eldredge played the devil's advocate, as it were, to stimulate thought, discussion and constructive action. He proposed we take a positive attitude toward these matters, and submitted that we are where we are because we were not ready. He observed that we are faced with a bureaucratic mess, and cautioned that if industry and (state) regulatory people do not cooperate (with each other), EPA will make certification mandatory at all levels - even beyond the supervisory level. He believes we can obviate further regulation by voluntary cooperation, through providing leadership and training. (There are 30,000 employed in the pest control industry in the United States).

NPCA's National Training Program will provide a vehicle for training in structural pest control at any level, according to Mr. Eldredge. NPCA has gone to EPA and petitioned that the Association be named the national accrediting agency for the pest control industry. They cannot become the accrediting agency unless the program is also offered to non-members. This is not intended to supplant state certification and training.

The following training aids were exhibited: Serviceman's Training Program for service technicians (number of manuals shown in parentheses) - cockroaches (5), termites (4), rodent control (8), insecticides (6), equipment (5), and training the trainer (coming, 3).

Preparing for Applicator Certification, A Guide to Study for Owners, Managers and Supervisors in the Structural Pest Control Industry (3 volumes) - (1) General and Household Pest Control; (2) Termites and other Wood-Destroying Organisms; and (3) Fumigation. Prices for these volumes are: (1) \$5.00 members, \$15.00 non-members; (2) and (3) \$4.00 members, \$12.00 non-members.

Also displayed were a Learner's Manual and an Administrator's Manual.

BETTER BUSINESS BUREAUS, Mr. Glen Myers, Director, Better Business Bureau of Memphis.

Mr. Myers defined "consumerism" as the communication gap between customer and business man (dealer). He admonishes BBB members and all industry to try to resolve every legitimate customer gripe. You (the customer) are your own best protection. Consumer confidence in business has dropped dramatically in the last five years. They set up a program of "Constructive Consumerism", the objective of which is to eradicate every legitimate customer complaint, and to eliminate the malpractitioner, the cheats. More laws is not the answer the speaker pled. Some refinement of existing laws and increased, vigorous prosecution are indicated. They try to provide the information and let the customer use his/her own best judgment.

Of the telcals they receive, one of nine are complaints and of these 50 per cent are valid. The speaker said that the pest control industry is not a major source of complaints. People in general are more demanding and unreasonable than ever before.

They (BBB's) try to expose and ferret out schemers, malpractitioners and cheats. Many so-called "vocational schools" are nothing more than "rip offs". (Mr. Myers injected some welcome humor in his presentation. For example, a prospective young lady customer on a rather large sale asked the salesman what he meant by a discount. When the salesman explained that a discount was something you take off for cash, the lady asked, "Honey, would these earrings be in the way?)"

They favor consumer arbitration. Some pest control operators, the speaker said, are frankly indifferent to customer complaints. Their (BBB) policy is to get both parties together and settle the matter fairly. Their office experienced a problem last year involving misrepresentation of non-existing infestations. A few bring their own termites although he had thought this went out with black bloomers. We were told that their study shows that 51.4 per cent of public complaints were going to BBB's. He predicted that 1975 will be a rough year as to activist groups. Mr. Myers plainly spoke from considerable knowledge and experience of his subject.

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION, Mr. Kenneth Haley, FHA Office, U. S. Dept. of Housing and Urban Development, Memphis.

The speaker discussed FHA Form No. 2053, Wood Infestation Report. A copy is attached to this report. This is now the standard form used by all FHA offices, and is required on all existing properties insured that are over one year old. The original and copies with live signatures go to the lending agency, and that agency in turn sends original to FHA. Mr. Carlton (La.) suggested that the words "visible evidence of" be inserted in Item 1. before the word "active", and the word "visible" be added in Item 2. before the word "evidence" on FHA Form No. 2053. Mr. Haley suggested that any matter concerning revision of the form be taken up with the Technical Standards Division, FHA, Washington, D.C.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

ASPCRO member states represented were: Arkansas, California, Florida, Kansas, Louisiana, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, Tennessee and Texas. The session was called to order at 4:35 P.M., Mr. White (Tenn.) presiding.

(1) Moved by Mr. Carlton (La.), seconded by Mr. King (Ark.) that we formalize the existing NAPCRO organization, elect officers, and change the name from National Association of Pest Control Regulatory Officials (NAPCRO) to the more representative and identifying name of Association of Structural Pest Control Regulatory Officials (ASPCRO).

The motion carried unanimously.

(2) Mr. Carleton (La.) then nominated Mr. Chapman (Tex.) as Chairman. Seconded by Du Chanois (Fla.).

There being no further nominations, Mr. Chapman was elected unanimously.

(3) Mr. Carty (Miss.) moved that the offices of Chairman, Vice Chairman and Secretary-Treasurer (be established) and serve for two (2) year terms. Seconded by Mr. Elder (N.C.).

The motion carried unanimously.

(4) Mr. Carleton (La.) nominated Mr. McCarty (Miss.) as Vice Chairman. Seconded by Mr. Guldner (Kans.).

There being no further nominations, Mr. McCarty was elected unanimously.

(5) Mr. Carlton (La.) then nominated Mr. Du Chanois as Secretary-Treasurer. Seconded by Clarence Guldner (Kans.) There being no further nominations, Mr. Du Chanois was elected unanimously.

(Ed. note: If unanimity means anything, the formal organization got off the ground without any trouble).

(6) Mr. Chapman, the newly elected Chairman, graciously offered to have the 1975 meeting in Texas, subject to confirmation, and the location and dates to be announced.

(7) The officers were delegated the responsibility for drafting the constitution and by-laws to be mailed to all member states. (The Secretary mailed the Chairman lists of latest available addresses of known member states following the meeting.)

There being no further business, the executive session adjourned at 6:15 P.M.

HOSPITALITY SUITE courtesy, continental breakfasts and coffee breaks courtesy of Tennessee Pest Control Association, West Tennessee Pest Control Association and the Pest Control Operators of Memphis, Tennessee. The members go on record as expressing their sincere appreciation.

Wednesday morning, 11 September

Coffee and donuts in the hospitality suite.

THE TENNESSEE PEST CONTROL OPERATORS ACT OF 1972 - LEGAL ASPECTS OF PEST CONTROL ENFORCEMENT, Mr. Bob Laws, Staff Attorney, Tennessee Dept. of Agriculture.

Mr. Laws very capably outlined the provisions of the Tennessee Pest Control Operators Act. The Act was passed in 1972 and replaced the old pest control act. The speaker said that when you have someone with a personal interest as well as the welfare of his constituents at heart, you have less of a problem with legislation. (He had reference to Mr. Tom Garland, a Tennessee pest control owner-operator and State Senator).

The law provides for a business charter, qualified operator's licenses (qualified operators of the first class and of the second class), operators are required to submit a list of all employees, main or principal office is supervised by a qualified operator of the first class, branch office may be supervised by qualified operator of the second class, seven-man pest control board composed of the assistant commissioner of agriculture, the director of entomology, a member of the staff of a university of the state, two licensed pest control operators, and two Tennessee citizens at large not associated with the industry, and provides for an advisory board.

The most important function of the pest control board is certification and promulgation of regulations. There is now a prohibition on oral exams (which used to be given). A corporate surety (fidelity) bond must accompany application for Charter (\$5,000 to \$25,000 depending on the gross volume of business). Liability insurance is

required - protects persons and property. The Act requires registration cards and a person can hold only one registration card and be employed by only one company at a time; provides for reports from the company, a fee of \$1 to \$3 must accompany each contract reported; there is a grace period of 120 days to obtain another qualified operator; can suspend license indefinitely or for a time certain; automatic revocation upon loss of qualified operator; all fees and taxes due on last day of the month in which due, and if not paid, they can collect by and under a special statutory provision.

The speaker alluded figuratively to the EPA as a big hairy monster sitting out there that may descend upon you. But he takes the position that they (Tenn.) have enabling provisions in the Act to come under FIFRA. In answer to a question, Mr. Laws said that violation of regulations would have the same effect as violation of the law itself.

WELCOME TO MEMPHIS, Hon. Wyatt Chandler, Mayor of the City of Memphis.

Due to prior schedule commitments, His Honor, Mayor Chandler welcomed ASPCRO at this point in the program. The Mayor more than made up for the unavoidable timing with a very interesting, brief, historical account of the City of Memphis, and a genuine, heart-warming welcome. The members recognize with appreciation Mayor Chandler's contribution to the program.

"OUR INDUSTRY - GENERAL PEST CONTROL", Mr. Myron W. Smith, Hill-Smith Termite Control Company, Memphis, Tennessee.

Mr. Smith recounted how after W W II, DDT and chlordane were referred to as shot-gun pest control - a panacea. Everything in sight was sprayed. As a result of this one-shot approach, PCO's lost the art of pest control. The same applied to Compound 1080. Operators became sloppy. Training became an accidental activity. The untrained "serviceman" went out with a can of DDT and some rat bait. The customer bought "service" and was very unhappy unless the serviceman sprayed everything in sight. The serviceman didn't know what he was using. Men were sent out on routes with two or possibly three materials. Then along came insect resistance to DDT and chlordane. During this period they almost exterminated the human bedbug. They are back now and are hardy rascals.

Because of these bad practices, laws were passed. Exams did not measure a man's ability to do the job. There was too little (or too late) checking by regulatory authorities on work being done. The speaker viewed EPA as doing the industry "a great big favor in the long run". The emphasis has changed. Then, servicemen were floating itinerants with the "baseboard syndrome"--spray everything including the dog lying in the corner. Training came onto the scene, and restricted and specific use pesticides. Using pesticides in accordance with the label came about because the label means what it says. Service costs - and charges - have increased. The industry must reckon more with call-backs because of the short-lived materials.

The industry has to deal with (and eliminate) misidentification of pests, e.g. cluster fly and housefly are look-alikes. The former is a parasite of earthworms. They are having some of the same accidents - dogs, pets and children. The industry is not out of the woods on this yet but is making progress. Big industry outfits are performing their own pest control because PCO's didn't perform. Good manufacturing practices resulted in zero tolerances - no cockroaches, etc. - called for specialized pest control and subcontracting work for a specific job or problem.

Mr. Smith opined we would be seeing more and more pest control without pesticides. We are seeing sophisticated pest control, stepped up rodent control with baiting etc. out away from the plant or building, and more rodent stoppage. We are beginning to see "integrated pest control". There are new problems, e.g. book lice in packing houses and other plants; pests in palletized shipments. There is no ULV application label for malathion. The PCO needs more knowledge and more expertise than formerly. His company runs across 52 recurring pest species in its area of operation. They are emphasizing "integrated pest control", e.g. a little steel wool in the right place or catch-all traps in place of (or along with) rodenticides. Positive pressure such as produced at air doors within a building whereby, when the door is opened, just enough pressure moves out of the building to deter or exclude pests. Everything (incoming) stops 100 feet from some modern plants until quality control is satisfied everything is OK before accepting or using any of the material.

The speaker was called in on a problem where fragrance odors from food processing plants attracted honeybees. They solved the problem by neutralizing the odors coming from the plant until the bees couldn't sense it outside the plant. In other cases, they have placed repellent lights on buildings and attractant black lights away from the building to control night-flying insects. Human body and public lice are being spread from dress (apparel) shops. They have been able to control scorpions and snakes by eliminating their food supply rather than the animals themselves. His firm performed fumigation in Memphis for control of drywood termites which came in with a shipment of hand-carved figurines from South America. They have dealt with filter fly infestations by killing off the adult flies out away from the sewage treatment plant. They are giving more frequent service - semi-monthly, weekly or even more often. According to Mr. Smith, the average pay for good, well-trained servicemen is in the range of \$10,000-\$12,000. These jobs will and do attract college graduates. Summing up, Mr. Smith, said that the industry has new responsibilities, and the public, industry and government expect the PCO to accept this responsibility.

"OUR INDUSTRY - WOOD-DESTROYING PESTS", Mr. Albert E. (Bud) Snyder, Terminix International, Memphis, Tennessee.

Mr. Snyder outlined his company's up-dated training program, with special reference to wood-destroying pest control training. They are selling what their people know how to do. If people have specialized knowledge they are in demand. The pest control serviceman is out there by himself and must make decisions and hence must be well trained. Pest control is a good small business opportunity. According to the speaker, the industry is concerned and scared. The PCO sees rising operating costs and greater regulation. He feels the federal bureaucracy has some folks who do not know the business they are regulating.

He has felt that not enough attention has been given training. On-the-job training is essential and has no substitute. A training manual itself does not communicate its contents especially if it sits on the shelf. Lectures and riding with the serviceman do not necessarily accomplish training. Servicemen must have on-the-job skills. Mr. Snyder explained their in-house training program and displayed their training manual, which he described as just a tool. The Pest Control Service Manual is carried by the serviceman on his route. This is an on-the-job reference manual and includes sample labels. Mr. Snyder also mentioned their training film strips and tape cassettes designed to overcome the wrong way of doing the job or misuse of pesticides, and to show the right way. He also commented on their "remote control training" using old, tried and proven training methods. Their company has instituted a six-weeks serviceman's training program for new employees. This includes three different tests and an evaluation sheet. This is the plan of action that gives feed-back and utilizes other tools available. They

want to be able to document that a man has been trained and also give a man confidence, self-assurance, and feeling of security through acquisition of specialized knowledge and skills.

The speaker noted that they were not adverse to change but want to see change that is workable. They wish to communicate their views to the regulatory agencies. Their position is that certification should stop at the managerial or supervisory level, and they would not like to see it go further. The serviceman is out by himself and do not think he should be required to have on-the-job (certified) supervision. Mr. Snyder praised the industry's good overall safety record. He expressed the views that regulations should be based on actual facts, and that they opposed re-examination following certification as they were not convinced it is necessary. He also took the position that a person should be certified (examined) based on practical considerations, and not piecemeal certification. He spoke in favor of reciprocity among the states, and encouraged regulatory officials to work toward this goal. He concluded by saying that we (the industry) have an opportunity now to become professional and yet do so in a practical, workable manner.

VIEWS AND COMMENTS by Hon. Thomas J. Garland, State Senator, Tennessee Senate Minority Leader, and owner-operator of Chapman Exterminating Company, Greenville, Tennessee.

Senator Garland added his welcome to the Great State of Tennessee. The Senator reviewed and expressed pride in the great strides in progress and changes that have taken place in the educational and penal systems of the state in recent years. Tennessee can boast of kindergarten and vocational systems in all 95 counties, and vocational training programs in all regional prisons. This was accomplished with the help of federal fundings until they were cut off. The state is now developing regional retardation centers. The Senator spoke highly of state Dept. of Agriculture personnel, and singled out Mr. Myron Smith of the pest control industry in Tennessee as a highly respected citizen, operator and long-time member of the pest control board.

Wednesday Noon, 11 September

Adjourn to buses for trip to Joseph Schlitz Brewery for tour of plant and delicious lunch followed by bus tour of Memphis, including visit to Terminix International headquarters, all through the courtesy of Terminix International, Memphis. Messrs Bud Snyder and Charlie Hromada, executives of the company, were ASPCRO's hosts. The members go on record expressing their sincere appreciation to their hosts.

Thursday Morning, 12 September

Coffee and donuts in the hospitality suite.

EXECUTIVE SESSION - REPORTS FROM THE STATES

North Carolina - (Mr. Rudy Howell): The North Carolina pest control law was amended in 1973. It gives the board authority to certify operators to comply with FIFRA amended. Have had a pest control law since 1955. Categories of pest control are fumigation, control of wood-destroying organisms and household pests. A Pesticide Act (pesticide applicators law) was recently passed, which covers any person applying restricted pesticides including registration of dealers and applicators, use and application. They have encountered problems of fumigation for powder-post beetles without any visible evidence

of infestation and some litigation is pending. For 1973-74, there were 326 licensed operators and over 1,000 registered employees.

The two year A.S. degree course in Pest Control at North Carolina State University, Raleigh, was discontinued in 1973 because of lack of industry support, and apparent industry resentment of additional competition. Discussion on employee contracts ensued. Mr. Bruer (Tenn.) commented that restricted employee covenants are being upheld in the Tennessee courts.

Mississippi - (Mr. Robert McCarty): They initiated a good educational program to upgrade the industry and to aid in enforcement work (through better trained technicians). They conducted four or five 20-week courses. Opposition developed within the industry itself to the point that the courses were discontinued. The industry sent a delegation to the Commissioner of Agriculture opposing continuation of the course. This was apparently motivated by an anti-competition attitude. Owner-operators seemingly don't want their employees to know more than they do.

Mississippi has three laws pertaining to pesticide applicators: The structural pest control law, an aerial applicator's law, and an aerial applicator's law covering use and application of phenoxy-type herbicides. They anticipate passage of a pesticide applicator's law to cover those persons not taken in by existing laws. The regulations were changed with industry support to require a high school education and four years experience within the previous six years. They have had problems with respect to performance of unnecessary work, e.g. fumigation for non-existing powder-post beetles, and "moisture control" jobs. Their office wrote letters to all operators cautioning them on doing moisture (and fungus) control. The matter is now under investigation. They will have no "grandfather clause" problem under FIFRA regulations because there was no such clause in the law and everyone took the exam(s).

California - (Mr. Ed C. Sizemore): Their biggest problem is surplus money in the reserve fund. The California Pest Control Operator's Association has promoted industry education for many years originally through industry suppliers' funding. The educational program became too big for the Association so they sold it (certain phases?) and turned it over to the University of California Polytechnic Institute, Pomona. This program is conducted by the University any place for a group of 15 or more students.

Under their law (regulations) there is a 100 per cent penalty for not renewing a license within a 90-day grace period following expiration, after which the company is out of business. Any citizen can obtain a copy of any inspection report from his office for a \$2.00 fee. The realtor must have a copy of the "Report of Work Completed and Not Completed" (from the operator) in the hands of the buyer before closing. A proposed change in the law would require that the realtor must furnish buyer or potential buyer with a copy of this report before closing. Last year they revoked seven licenses, and suspended 27 (1973). They have never had a problem with the reporting or performing of unnecessary work, but just the opposite - due to their system of requiring the filing of inspection reports available to the general public.

Arkansas - (Mr. Gerald King): They are attempting to increase fees to support administration of the program. In 1973 they issued 190 licenses, gave 80 new exams (50 per cent passing), received 22,800 termite job reports, made 5,200 routine inspections, 360 request inspections, and found 525 substandard treatments upon initial inspection. They collected \$72,000 in fees and expended \$78,000 administering the program.

They charge \$15 reinspection fee, but doubt that this acts as a deterrent to sub-standard work. Arkansas will comply with FIFRA when the requirements are made known. They would have no problem with the "grandfather clause" ruling because everyone has taken the exam.

Michigan - (Mr. Robert L. Mesecher): Their pesticide law, first passed in 1959, was amended in 1971 to include structural pest control operators. They have a permit system for selling or applying restricted-use pesticides. This does not presently apply to agricultural uses. It is proposed that farmers will be able to purchase and use restricted pesticides, when the law is modified to comply with FIFRA. They require liability insurance and surety bonding. They promulgate a list of restricted-use pesticides. There are now ten categories of pest control.

Missouri - (Mr. E. C. Houser): Represents the Bureau of Pesticide Control, Plant Industry Division, Missouri Dept. of Agriculture. The Missouri Pesticide Act of 1974 was enacted in March 1974, and becomes effective 21 October 1976. The program is new and resulted from the 1972 amendment of FIFRA. He is in process of sitting up the program to comply with the federal law.

Kansas - (Mr. Clarence Guldner, Jr.): Represents the Division of Entomology, Kansas Dept. of Agriculture. The Kansas Legislature recently passed the "Pesticide Use Act", which is administered by the Noxious Weed Division of the Department of Agriculture. The Division of Entomology administers the Kansas Pest Control Act. The only class of pesticide applicators which does not come under the latter act is that of aerial applicators; and the only class which does not come under the former (Pesticide Use Act) is that of structural pest control operators. Hence there is some overlapping jurisdiction. It is proposed that in the future to divide responsibility along structural pest control (urban) and agricultural (rural) lines. Some licensed operators did come in under the "grandfather clause".

Tennessee - (Mr. Claude E. Jones): In 1973 they licensed 212 firms in one or more of 13 categories, issued 960 solicitors licenses and 350 operators licenses. They collected \$121,000 in revenue. Termite contracts reported were 38,000. They require bonding (\$5,000 to \$25,000 depending on gross volume) and liability insurance, the amount also based on gross operating volume. Two written exams are required -- the first comprehensive and the second specific as to category.

They have been successful in getting arrest warrants signed by homeowners charging offenders with taking money under false pretenses. Two violators were convicted and served time in a state prison.

Florida - (F. R. Du Chanois): Since our last meeting the Florida Pest Control Act governing commercial pest control operators in the state was amended slightly on 7-1-74 to provide for staggering annual renewal of business licenses and ID cards on an anniversary date set for each licensee by the Division of Health (which enforces the law in Florida); requiring firms to notify of termination of ID card holders and to destroy ID cards; and consolidating all fees collected in a Pest Control Trust Fund. The last amendment in effect eliminates all general revenue fund deposits and makes all funds available for carrying out the provisions of the law. Fee receipts for FY 1972-73 were ca. \$80,218.

Division of Health Pest Control Regulations were extensively overhauled and the revision was adopted and became effective 5-2-74. A significant change resulting from this was elimination of the requirement for fumigation guards. This is now left up to the discretion of the certified fumigator.

Florida has licensed 854 firms and renewed 1,208 pest control operator's certificates as of 12-2-74. Identification cards issued for 1973-74 set a new record of 8,300. Due to the late hour and in the interest of time, the Florida report was cut short. We are keeping attuned to developments in implementing FIFRA amended.

- - - - -

Mr. McCarty (Miss.) thanked the Tennessee Dept. of Agriculture and its personnel, and all those individuals and companies in the pest control industry who in any way contributed to making the 1974 meeting such an outstanding success both functionally and socially. The names of all pest control associations and firms who sponsored the luncheons and hospitality suite were announced and recognized with applause.

Mr. White (Tenn.) recommended that the first ASPCRO committee to be formed should be a membership committee. Mr. McCarty replied that the point was well taken and would be taken under advisement.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 12:08 P.M., 12 September 1974, A.D.

- - - - -

List of the Regulatory Officials attending the annual meeting
of the National Association of Pest Control Officers* in Memphis, Tenn.

10-12 September 1974

Mr. Rudy E. Howell
Chief, Structural Pest Officer
Pest Control Division
North Carolina Department of Agriculture
P. O. Box 27647
Raleigh, North, Carolina 27611

Mr. Alfred S. Elder
Director, Pest Control Division
North Carolina Department of Agriculture
P. O. Box 27647
Raleigh, North Carolina 27611

Mr. Keith L. Jarvis
Assistant Attorney General
State of North Carolina Justice Building
Raleigh, North Carolina 27602

Mr. Charlie Chapman
Director, Pest Control Board
313 E. Anderson Lane
Chevy Chase III
Austin, Texas 78752

Mr. Richard Carlton
Bureau of Entomology & Plant Industry
P. O. Box 44153
Capitol Station
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804

Mr. H. L. Bruer, Director
Division of Plant Industries
Tennessee Department of Agriculture
P. O. Box 40627, Melrose Station
Nashville, Tennessee 37204

Mr. Jimmy R. White, Assistant Director
Division of Plant Industries
Tennessee Department of Agriculture
P. O. Box 40627, Melrose Station
Nashville, Tennessee 37204

Mr. Claude E. Jones
Pest Control Administrator
Division of Plant Industries
Tennessee Department of Agriculture
P. O. Box 40627, Melrose Station
Nashville, Tennessee 37204

Mr. E. C. Houser, Supervisor
Bureau of Pesticide Control
Plant Industries Division
Missouri Department of Agriculture
Box 630
Jefferson City, Missouri 65101

Mr. F. R. DuChanois
Bureau of Entomology, Division
of Health, P. O. Box 210
Jacksonville, Florida 32201

Mr. Robert L. Mesecher
Plant Industry Division
Michigan Department of Agriculture
Lewis Cass Building
Lansing, Michigan 48913

Mr. Robert McCarty
Division of Plant Industry
P. O. Box 5207
Mississippi State, Mississippi 39762

Mr. Gerald King, Head
Arkansas State Plant Board
P. O. Box 1069
Little Rock, Arkansas 72203

Mr. E. C. Sizemore, Registrar
California Structural Pest Control
Board
1707 11th Street
Sacramento, California 95814

Mr. Clarence Guldner, Jr.
Kansas State Board of Agriculture
Route #2, Box 93
Clay Center, Kansas 67432

* Now Association of Structural Pest Control Regulatory Officials(ASPCRO)

NAME AND ADDRESSES OF TERMITE COMPANIES WHO CONTRIBUTED
TO THE ASPCRO* MEETING, Memphis, Tennessee, 10-12 Sept. 1974

Mr. Gail R. Burnett
AAA Termite Control
Suites 9-11
3106 South Perkins
Memphis, Tennessee 38118

Mr. Alford Foster, Sr.
All-American Exterminators, Inc.
2616 Old Lebanon Road
Nashville, Tennessee 37214

Mr. S. L. Tubbs
Atomic Pest Control, Inc.
2307 Ball Road
Memphis, Tennessee 38114

Mr. Delbert Wilson
Ace Termite & Pest Control
736 Adkisson Lane
Nashville, Tennessee 37205

Mr. Houston Chandler
Atlas Chemical Company
132 Neil Street
Memphis, Tennessee 38112

Mr. M. W. Smith
Hill-Smith Termite Control Co., Inc.
P. O. Box 22068
Memphis, Tennessee 38122

Messrs. R. O. & Don S. Jamison
Jamison Pest Control Company, Inc.
3638 Summer Avenue
Memphis, Tennessee 38122

Mr. Leo Carrier
Leo's Exterminating Company
P. O. Box 3110
Bristol, Tennessee 37620

Mr. Thomas E. Parks
Mid South Exterminating Company, Inc.
5854 Summer Avenue
Memphis, Tennessee 38128

Mr. Paul D. Spillman
Spillman Pest Control
2999 Park Avenue
Memphis, Tennessee 38114

Mr. Earl F. Geiger
Mr. Robert M. Russell
Orkin Exterminating Co., Inc.
P. O. Box 647
Atlanta, GA 30305

Mr. Pete Jones
Orkin Exterminating Co., Inc.
2603 - 12th Avenue, S.
Nashville, TN 37204

Mr. Charles J. Hromada
Mr. Albert E. Snyder
Mr. Vern Walter
Terminix International, Inc.
P. O. Box 17167
Memphis, TN 38117

WOOD INFESTATION REPORT

Company Name _____ Date _____
 Address _____ Property Address _____
 Phone Number _____
 Lic. No. (if any) _____ FHA Case Number _____

This is to certify that a qualified inspector employed by this Company has carefully inspected and sounded all accessible areas of the property located at the above address for termites or other wood destroying insects with the following findings:

- | | Check One | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | YES | NO |
| 1. There is active infestation of: (A) Termites | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (B) Other wood destroying insects | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. There is evidence of a previous infestation of: (A) Termites | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| (B) Other wood destroying insects | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. There is evidence of conditions conducive to infestation (earth-wood contact, faulty grades, insufficient ventilation, etc.) If yes, describe on reverse side of form | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. There is evidence of damage to structural items (columns, girders, sills, joists, plates, headers, stairs, porch supports, rafters, etc.) If yes, describe on reverse side of form | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. There is evidence of damage to other construction (exterior porch floors and steps, door and window sills, jambs, siding, subflooring, etc.) If yes, describe on reverse side of form | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 6. The premises have been treated by the undersigned by the application of _____ on _____ (Date) and a one (1) year guarantee issued against reinfestation by subterranean termites. This guarantee is transferable to any subsequent owner of this property during the life of this guarantee | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 7. This Company has made inspections of these premises previously | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 8. This Company has treated these premises previously | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

I hereby certify that neither I nor the company for whom I am acting have had, presently have or contemplate having any interest in the property involved. I do further certify that neither I nor the company for whom I am acting is associated in any way with any party to this transaction.

Inspector _____ Date _____

Authorized Agent _____ Date _____

Original to HUD/FHA

Copy To: Buyer
 Seller
 Mortgagee

REMARKS

USE THIS SPACE TO AMPLIFY STATEMENTS NUMBER 3, 4 AND 5. THIS SPACE CAN BE USED TO CLARIFY ANY STATEMENT MADE. INCLUDE ITEM NUMBER WITH EACH EXPLANATION.

[illegible]