


CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES  
OFFICE OF TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT

# Biologically Based Technologies for Pest Control




SCIENTIFIC PUBLISHERS (INDIA), JODHPUR

# **Biologically Based Technologies for Pest Control**

---

Congress of the United States Office of Technology Assessment

---



*Foreword by*  
**Roger C. Herdman**



**SCIENTIFIC PUBLISHERS (INDIA)**

P.O. BOX 91

JODHPUR

*First reprint in India, 1998*

by

Scientific Publishers (India)

5-A, New Pali Road, P.B. No. 91

JODHPUR - 342 001

FAX : 0291-613480 & 649093

First Reprint in India, 1998

ISBN : 81-7233-189-4

Originally published by U.S. Government Printing Office  
Washington, DC, USA, 1995

First Indian Edition Printed in India at  
Efficient Offset Printers, New Delhi

# Foreword

**T**he way the nation manages pests is changing because of efforts to reduce the reliance on conventional pesticides. Driving this change is strong public opinion coupled with action by Congress and by federal and state agencies. At the same time, pest control needs are rising. Many important pests are now resistant to formerly effective chemical controls. And new pests continue to enter the country or spread to new locations where they threaten agriculture, native ecosystems, or human health.


The farmers, foresters, ranchers, and others who seek to prevent excessive pest damage are increasingly aware of the shortcomings of conventional pest control approaches. Their need for more pest control options is acute. Current hopes are that integrated pest management (IPM)—which uses alternative tools as well as pesticides—will provide the key to meeting this need while reducing the reliance on conventional pesticides. This assessment examines an array of the biologically based tools that underpin effective IPM.

The report covers technologies ranging from enhanced biological control of pests by their natural predators and parasites to commercial formulations of microbial pesticides. Today, such approaches have joined the mainstream. Biologically based technologies have penetrated most major applications of pest control and are the methods of choice for such widespread pests as the gypsy moth. They could be used more widely to help solve the nation's pressing need for pest control tools. What happens next will depend largely on federal policies and programs.

The federal government's role here is extensive through its involvement in research, technology transfer, plant protection, land management, and pesticide regulation. Annual expenditures for research and implementation of biologically based technologies for pest control exceed \$200 million. But the system does not work as well as it might. A better match between national priorities and the portfolio of federally supported research would improve delivery of new pest control tools into the field. An improved regulatory system would streamline the regulatory process while more closely evaluating the occasional high risks. Finally, the relative roles of the private and public sectors warrant rethinking, because the private sector on its own will go only so far in supplying new biologically based tools.

*Biologically Based Technologies for Pest Control* was requested by three congressional committees: the House Committee on Agriculture; the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee; and the House Committee on Natural Resources, Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests, and Public Lands.

We gratefully acknowledge the contributions of the Advisory Panel, authors of commissioned papers, workshop participants, and the many additional people who reviewed material for the report or provided valuable guidance. Their generous, timely, and in-depth assistance made this study possible. As with all OTA studies, the content of this report is the sole responsibility of OTA.



ROGER C. HERDMAN  
Director

# Advisory Panel

**Katherine Reichelderfer  
Smith, *Panel Chair***

Director, Policy Studies  
Program  
Henry A. Wallace Institute for  
Alternative Agriculture  
Greenbelt, MD

**Paul A. Backman**

Professor and Director  
Biological Control Institute  
Department of Plant Pathology  
Auburn University  
Auburn, AL

**Ring T. Cardé**

Professor  
Department of Entomology  
University of Massachusetts  
Amherst, MA

**Willard A. Dickerson**

Plant Pest Administrator  
North Carolina Department of  
Agriculture  
Raleigh, NC

**Roger C. Funk**

Vice President of Human and  
Technical Resources  
The Davey Tree Expert  
Company  
Kent, OH

**Harry J. Griffiths**

Chairman  
Entomological Services Inc.  
Corona, CA

**Judith A. Hansen**

Superintendent  
Cape May County Mosquito  
Extermination Commission  
Cape May, NJ

**Dennis L. Isaacson**

Program Director  
Noxious Weed Control Section  
Oregon Department of  
Agriculture  
Salem, OR

**Deborah B. Jensen**

Vice President, Conservation  
Science and Stewardship  
The Nature Conservancy  
Arlington, VA

**Tobi L. Jones**

Special Assistant to the  
Director  
Department of Pesticide  
Regulation  
California Environmental  
Protection Agency  
Sacramento, CA

**Peter M. Karelva**

Professor  
Department of Zoology  
University of Washington  
Seattle, WA

**Allen E. Knutson**

Associate Professor and  
Extension Entomologist  
Texas Agricultural Extension  
Service  
Texas A&M University  
College Station, TX

**James B. Kramer**

Family Farmer  
Hugoton, KS

**David W. Miller**

Vice President for Research  
and Development  
EcoScience Corporation  
Northborough, MA

**Timothy L. Nance**

Crop Consultant  
Gro Technics Consulting  
Naples, FL

**David O. TeBeest**

Professor  
Department of Plant Pathology  
University of Arkansas  
Fayetteville, AR

**Jeffrey K. Waage**  
Director  
International Institute of  
Biological Control  
Ascot, Berks, UK

**Michael E. Wetzstein**  
Professor  
Department of Agricultural and  
Applied Economics  
University of Georgia  
Athens, GA

**David M. Whitacre**  
Vice President, Development  
Sandoz Agro, Inc.  
Des Plaines, IL

## **EXECUTIVE BRANCH LIAISONS**

**Gary H. Johnston**  
National Park Service  
U.S. Department of the Interior  
Washington, DC

**James Krysan<sup>1</sup>**  
Agricultural Research Service  
U.S. Department of  
Agriculture  
Washington, DC

**Anne E. Lindsay**  
Office of Pesticide Programs  
U.S. Environmental Protection  
Agency  
Washington, DC

**Thomas C. Roberts<sup>2</sup>**  
Bureau of Land Management  
U.S. Department of the Interior  
Washington, DC

**Sally J. Rockey**  
Cooperative State Research,  
Education, and Extension  
Service  
U.S. Department of  
Agriculture  
Washington, DC

**Judith St. John<sup>3</sup>**  
Agricultural Research Service  
U.S. Department of  
Agriculture  
Washington, DC

**William S. Wallace**  
Animal and Plant Health  
Inspection Service  
U.S. Department of  
Agriculture  
Washington, DC

**Lewis H. Waters<sup>4</sup>**  
Bureau of Land Management  
U.S. Department of the Interior  
Washington, DC

---

<sup>1</sup> Until February 1995.

<sup>2</sup> From April 1995.

<sup>3</sup> From June 1995.

<sup>4</sup> Until March 1995.

# Project Staff

**Clyde Behney**  
Assistant Director

**Walter E. Parham<sup>1</sup>**  
Program Director  
Food and Renewable Resources

**Robert Niblock<sup>2</sup>**  
Program Director  
Environment Program

**Elizabeth A. Chornesky**  
Project Director and Senior  
Analyst

**Cynthia M. Palmer<sup>3</sup>**  
Analyst

**John Longbrake**  
Research Analyst

**Christine Taverna<sup>4</sup>**  
Research Assistant

## CONTRACTORS AND OTHER CONTRIBUTORS

**John M. Houghton**  
Contractor & Workshop  
Organizer

**Priscilla S. Taylor**  
Editor

**Gary Jahn<sup>5</sup>**  
Analyst

**William Westermeyer<sup>6</sup>**  
Senior Analyst

## ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF

**N. Ellis Lewis<sup>1</sup>**  
Office Administrator

**Kathleen Beil<sup>2</sup>**  
Office Administrator

**Nellie M. Hammond**  
Administrative Secretary

**Kimberly Holmlund<sup>2</sup>**  
Administrative Secretary

**Sharon Knarvik<sup>2</sup>**  
Administrative Secretary

**Babette Polzer<sup>4</sup>**  
Contractor

**Carolyn M. Swann<sup>1</sup>**  
PC Specialist

---

<sup>1</sup> Through February 1994.

<sup>2</sup> From March 1994.

<sup>3</sup> From January 1995.

<sup>4</sup> From May 1995.

<sup>5</sup> April through July 1994.

<sup>6</sup> February through May 1995.

# Contents

- 1 Summary 1**
  - Context and Scope 1
  - Current Use and Future Potential of BBTs 2
  - Issues and Options 3
  - Rethinking Public and Private Sector Responsibilities 6
- 2 The Context 9**
  - An Introduction to Pest Management 10
  - Forces Shaping the Future of U.S. Pest Management 16
  - Responses by Congress and the Executive Branch 23
  - Defining the Terms of OTA's Assessment 25
- 3 The Technologies 31**
  - Evaluating the Technologies 31
  - Current Use of BBTs in the U.S. 40
  - Obstacles to Expanded Use of BBTs 58
  - Improving the Odds of Future Success 62
  - Appendix 3-A: Internet Sites for Information on  
Biologically Based Pest Control 64
- 4 Risks and Regulations 69**
  - Risks from BBTs 69
  - Addressing the Risks 83
  - Regulating the Risks from BBTs: Issues and Options 102
- 5 From Research to Implementation 109**
  - Overview 109
  - Educating Users 131
  - From Research to Implementation: Issues and  
Options 137
- 6 Commercial Considerations 145**
  - Structure of the BBT Industry 146
  - View from the Conventional Pesticide Industry 155
  - Issues and Options 160



**Appendix A: List of Boxes, Figures, and  
Tables 167**

**Appendix B: List of Acronyms 169**

**Appendix C: Background Reports, Workshops,  
and Workshop Participants 171**

**Appendix D: Reviewers 175**

**References 181**