

**ASPCRO Bed Bug Committee
2015 Annual Committee Report
August 23, 2015**

Committee Members: Tim Drake, Clemson University; Dave Scott, Office of the Indiana State Chemist; Steve Sims, Kentucky Department of Agriculture; Julie Spagnoli, JM Specialty Consulting, LLC; Norman Goldenberg, Terminix International; Jim Warneke, Fulton Marine International; Jonathon Berger, BASF; Kim Kelley-Tunis, Rollins Corporation; Jim Fredericks, National Pest Management Association; Tom Wright, Pest Pro Academy; and Liza Fleeson, Virginia Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services (Chair).

The Bed Bug Committee (Committee) met on April 20, 2015 in conjunction with the 2015 Mid-year Meeting in Detroit, Michigan. After the welcome and introductions, the meeting began with a review of the Annual Meeting Report to the Board of Directors as well as a review of meeting agenda. No additional items or modifications to the annual report or agenda were made.

Issues/Concerns/Focus Areas:

The Committee discussed and continues to monitor the status of following specific items:

- I. ***EPA’s “Draft Product Performance Test Guidelines OCSPP 810.3900: Laboratory Testing Methods for Bed Bug Pesticide Products”.*** On March 6-7, 2012, EPA convened a FIFRA Scientific Advisory Panel (SAP) to receive expert opinions and recommendations on the design and scientific soundness of its guideline which describes approaches to efficacy testing procedures, test methods, data reporting and evaluation of testing results for Section 3 bed bug pesticide product registration. ASPCRO provided written and oral comments to the SAP. The Committee agreed to continue to monitor the process and progress of the test guidelines. Revisions are expected to be completed in May and will include a revised guideline and response to comments from the public and SAP. The publication date is unknown given there will be an internal review process. There will also be a 30 day comment period once published. EPA’s Registration Division has the lead. ***Current Status: Poised for internal review by Office of Chemical Safety and Pollution Prevention (OCSPP). Anticipated publication in 2015.***

- II. ***EPA’s “Product Performance Data Needs for Pesticide Products Claiming Efficacy against Invertebrate Pests of Significant Public Health or Economic Importance”.*** As part of a joint effort with the Termiticide Standards Committee (TSC), the Committee provided input into the nominations to the SAP as well as written and oral comments to the FIFRA SAP which was held March 19-21, 2013. The Committee agreed to continue to monitor the process and progress of this effort along with or in conjunction with the TSC. The rule was put on hold and has now been activated again. EPA’s Field and External Affairs Division - Policy and Regulatory Services Branch has the lead. ***Current Status: Work group is in process of responding to comments and working on next steps in the rule making process.***

- III. ***25b Products***
 - A. ***Status of OECA’s Compliance Assistance Effort*** - The Committee discussed the current status of EPA’s Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance’s (OECA) compliance assistance effort. The Committee had previously agreed to work with EPA to address those products which are exempt from registration under Section 25, Paragraph B of FIFRA and described in 40 CFR (Code of Federal Regulations), Section 152.25 - Exemptions for pesticides of a character not requiring FIFRA regulation, Subpart f, specifically, how best to address those products that do not meet the conditions for exemption and require federal registration. AAPCO, through Full SFIREG and its Working Committees, worked with EPA on this effort which had resulted in a template compliance assistance letter which was made

available to EPA Regions March 2015. **Current Status: Unknown if this is being used/implemented in Regions or by States or if it has been effective.**

- B. Product Efficacy** - The Committee had previously agreed to work with EPA to address the issues Member States continue to experience with 25b products including reports of lack of efficacy of these products and/or efficacy data; false or misleading statements or claims to protect human or public health; and misuse. The Committee had previously commented on the proposed 25(b) rule in which EPA proposed to more clearly describe the active and inert ingredients permitted in products eligible for the exemption from regulation for minimum risk pesticides and to modify the label requirements in the exemption to require the use of specific common chemical names in lists of ingredients on minimum risk pesticide product labels, and to require producer contact information on the label. **Current Status: On June 24, 2015, EPA Administrator has forwarded the draft final rule to the Secretaries of the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) and of Health and Human Services (HHS). The draft regulatory document is not available to the public until after it has been signed and made available by EPA.**

- IV. **Model Regulations** - The Committee received a request from a member state to develop model regulations for canine scent detection; heat treatment; ozone treatment; and cold treatment including efficacy data. The Board requested that SLAs be polled to determine the need for model regulations and the priority order of activities for the Committee. Based upon the results of the poll, there was a need for model regulations for the aforementioned non-pesticidal treatment option. A recommendation was made to the Board, and the Board approved, drafting model regulations for the following (priority order): heat treatment; canine scent detection; ozone treatment and cold treatment.

Consensus Items

1. There is need to re-focus/clarify the discussion. It is not that “25b” products are the issue, in other words, being exempt from federal registration, it is the lack of efficacy; no efficacy; claims that are not true (i.e.: kills on contact vs. residual activity).
2. There continues to be interest in an open forum/25b bulletin board where SLAs could share information regarding efficacy/registration issues (joint AAPCO/ASPCRO). E-Commerce continues to be a challenge in the sale of these types of products.
3. Education is still the key and there is a need for all stakeholders to be able to recognize legitimate sources of information related to bed bugs and their management.
 - a. News releases/PSAs for use by SLAs to address misinformation or provide good sources of information.
 - b. List of resources available from SLAs and outreach is needed.
 - c. Need to reach out and coordinate efforts with a variety of organizations for example, cities, departments of health, landlord/tenant organizations.

ACTIVITIES MOVING FORWARD

The Committee will focus on the discussion points above continuing work as appropriate.

Respectfully submitted,



Liza J. Fleeson
Chair - Bed Bug Committee