

Update

NPMA LIBRARY UPDATE

MAY/JUNE
2005

Insert this update into the NPMA Pest Management Library, which can be purchased from the Resource Center. Phone: 703-352-6762 fax: 703-352-3031

It's WDI Season ...

What You Need to Know About Wood Destroying Insects

In the heat of the WDI season, it is always good to review policies, current events in WDI, and answer any questions about treatments and inspections. This Library Update will serve as a collection of information and answers to common questions which should be used for training and as references.

States that DO NOT use the NPMA-33

There are a few states that historically have used their state forms, primarily due to unique state regulations and dismay at the old HUD reporting form, the HUD 92053, which was initially replaced by the NPCA-1, and subsequently, this year, the NPMA-33.

These states, by regulation or statute, have their own unique state form for reporting evidence of wood destroying insects for real estate inspections. The states that have their own unique forms that should be used alone and to the exclusion of all others include the states of: Alabama, Arizona, California, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, Nevada, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina and Texas.

Keep an eye on state regulations, however, as some of these states are considering withdrawing their state forms and adopting the NPMA-33. No

Wood Destroying Insect Inspection Report		Notes: Please read important consumer information on page 2.	
Section I. General Information		Company & Business Lic. No.	Date of Inspection
Inspection Company, Address & Phone		Address of Property Inspected	
Inspector's Name, Signature & Certification, Registration, or Lic. #		Structure(s) Inspected	
Section II. Inspection Findings This report is indicative of the condition of the above identified structure(s) on the date of inspection and is not to be construed as a guarantee or warranty against latent, concealed, or future infestations or defects. Based on a careful visual inspection of the readily accessible areas of the structure(s) inspected:			
<input type="checkbox"/> A. No visible evidence of wood destroying insects was observed. <input type="checkbox"/> B. Visible evidence of wood destroying insects was observed as follows: <input type="checkbox"/> 1. Live insects (description and location): _____ <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Dead insects, insect parts, feces, shelter tubes, exit holes, or staining (description and location): _____ <input type="checkbox"/> 3. Visible damage from wood destroying insects was noted as follows (description and location): _____			
NOTE: This is not a structural damage report. If box B above is checked, it should be understood that some degree of damage, including hidden damage, may be present. If any questions arise regarding damage indicated by this report, it is recommended that the buyer or any interested parties contact a qualified structural professional to determine the extent of damage and the need for repairs. Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> It appears that the structure(s) or a portion thereof may have been previously treated. Visible evidence of possible previous treatment: _____			
The inspecting company can give no assurance with regard to work done by other companies. The company that performed the treatment should be contacted for information on treatment and any warranty or any other agreement which may be in place.			
Section III. Recommendations			
<input type="checkbox"/> No treatment recommended. (Explain if Box B in Section II is checked) <input type="checkbox"/> Recommend treatment for the control of: _____			
Section IV. Obstructions and Inaccessible Areas		This inspector may write out obstructions or see the following optional list:	
The following areas of the structure(s) inspected were obstructed or inaccessible:		<input type="checkbox"/> Basement <input type="checkbox"/> Crawlspace <input type="checkbox"/> Main level <input type="checkbox"/> Attic <input type="checkbox"/> Garage <input type="checkbox"/> Entry <input type="checkbox"/> Porch <input type="checkbox"/> Addition <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Roofing <input type="checkbox"/> Siding <input type="checkbox"/> Front yard covering <input type="checkbox"/> Fire mantel <input type="checkbox"/> Insulation <input type="checkbox"/> Floor joists <input type="checkbox"/> Ceiling or ceiling <input type="checkbox"/> Structural <input type="checkbox"/> Appliances <input type="checkbox"/> No access or entry <input type="checkbox"/> Limited access <input type="checkbox"/> No access between	
		<input type="checkbox"/> Dry wall joints <input type="checkbox"/> Ceiling insulation <input type="checkbox"/> Ceiling water <input type="checkbox"/> Sink supports <input type="checkbox"/> Fire or wiring <input type="checkbox"/> Wet wall covers <input type="checkbox"/> Wood joist <input type="checkbox"/> Siding <input type="checkbox"/> Appliances <input type="checkbox"/> Window, door frame <input type="checkbox"/> No access or entry <input type="checkbox"/> Limited access <input type="checkbox"/> No access between	
Section V. Additional Comments and Attachments (these are an integral part of the report)			
Attachments: _____			
Signature of Seller(s) or Owner(s) if refinancing. Seller acknowledges that all information regarding W.D.I., infestation, damage, repair, and treatment history has been disclosed to the buyer.		Signature of Buyer. The undersigned hereby acknowledges receipt of a copy of both page 1 and page 2 of this report and understands the information reported.	
X		X	

NPMA-33

other state is authorized to adopt their own forms to the exclusion of the NPMA-33 as HUD had "grandfathered" a provision to accept forms in place as of adoption of the NPMA-33. Any new state forms will have to use the NPMA-33 for HUD transactions, even if they adopt a state form.

Be aware that some states, such as Washington, have an optional state form which may be used with the NPMA-33. As

always, diagrams, further information sheets, or other forms may be used with the NPMA-33 and attached to the NPMA-33 but may not disclaim any information noted on the NPMA-33.

Suggested Guidelines for the NPMA-33 Updated

There were several minor wording changes added to the Suggested Guidelines for Completing the NPMA-33 as of mid-April. For the latest version, go to www.npmapestworld.org and click on the Suggested Guidelines link. The next printing of the forms will include the latest Suggested Guidelines.

Also, note that the Suggested Guidelines are designed to be guidance and advice. The guidelines are neither rules nor regulations and do not have the force of law. NPMA suggests that field personnel do not refer to the NPMA-33 and guidelines as “new laws” or “new regulations” regarding how to fill out the form. Always keep up to date on state regulations and laws regarding

WDI inspections. Note that the guidelines were named as such to show that they are guidance documents only and that state requirements, local practices, and company policies should be taken into consideration when reporting WDI information.

Termites in Mulch and Wood Debris

Several years ago, NPMA issued a Library Update on termites in mulch. One of the most common questions that NPMA technical staff members receive during nearly every session presented on proper inspection reporting is how to report termites in mulch.

Plainly stated, termites in mulch can lead to infestation. In the past, it was believed that termites in the mulch would almost certainly lead to infestation when the termites found a break in the “barrier.” As many of the newer soil termiticides do not act as a “barrier” and the break in a barrier is less important, the discussion about termites in mulch becomes even more important.

If termites are found in mulch, any reporting should comply with state regulations. Lacking any regulatory requirements in states using the NPMA-33, termites in mulch may be reported and described in the “Comments” section; however, termites in mulch alone should not constitute an implied infestation in Section II. Termites found in mulch do not necessarily suggest a situation where termites are infesting the structure and should not be reported as such. Remember,



findings are for areas in, within, or on the structure. This does not prohibit an inspector from making some sort of corrective recommendation; however, the inspector should not imply that the house is infested.

Termites in wood debris outside of the foundation or attached areas should be treated in the same manner. Infested wood debris away from the building with no other evidence of infestation, while perhaps suggesting that there is a chance of future infestation, is not part of the structure and should not result in any suggestion that the structure is infested based upon these observations. It can be reported in the "Comments" section if the company prefers.

Infested wood debris in a crawlspace, basement, or in any part of the structure, should be reported in Section II as Visible Evidence. Recommendations should be made accordingly.

International Residential Code Changes

As reported via ePestworld to members in March, NPMA worked to get the International Residential Code modified to allow any EPA registered product for new construction termite prevention. Currently, only liquid soil treatments are allowed, and other methods are accepted only by a code Evaluation Report, which is basically a variance.

After working with the American Forest and Paper Association, National Association of Home Builders, the Insulating Concrete Forms Association, the Association of Structural Pest Control Regulatory Officials, and RISE, the University of Georgia, and manufacturers, the NPMA proposal passed the Building and Energy hearing which is a very large step. The entire IRC Council will vote in September on the proposal, and if approved, the language will become effective in 2006. Many members have asked for copies of the approved language. The approved text

follows on the next page (strikethroughs are deletions and underlined areas are additions).

Termite Prevention Working Group

The Termite Prevention Working Group is an ad hoc group of organizations and individuals interested in improving the IRC's provisions addressing termite protection. The group is composed of:

- **National Pest Management Association**, represented by Greg Baumann
- **American Forest and Paper Association**, represented by Dennis Pitts
- **National Association of Home Builders**, represented by Jeff Inks
- **Association of Structural Pest Control Regulatory Officials**, represented by George Saxton
- **Responsible Industry for a Sound Environment**, represented by Frank Gasperini
- **University of Georgia Department of Entomology**, represented by Dr. Brian Forschler.

Approved Text:

Section R320: Protection Against Subterranean Termites

R320.1 Subterranean termite control methods. In areas subject to damage from termites as indicated by Table R301.2(1), methods of protection shall be one of the following methods or a combination of these methods:

1. by Chemical soil termiticide treatment as provided in Section R320.2;
2. Termite baiting systems installed and maintained according to the label.
3. Pressure preservatively treated wood in accordance with the AWPA standards listed in Section R319.1;
4. Naturally durable termite-resistant wood as provided in Section R320.3
5. or Physical barriers as provided in Section R320.4 (such as metal or plastic termite shields);
or a combination of these methods.

R320.1.1 Quality mark. No revision

R320.1.2 Field treatment. Field cut ends, notches, and drilled holes of pressure preservatively treated wood shall be retreated in the field in accordance with AWPA M4.

R320.2 Chemical soil termiticide treatment. Chemical termiticide treatment shall include soil treatment and/or field applied wood treatment. The concentration, rate of application, and treatment method of treatment of the chemical termiticide shall be consistent in strict accordance with and never less than the termiticide label.

R320.3 Pressure preservatively treated and Naturally resistant wood. Heartwood of redwood and eastern red cedar shall be considered termite resistant. Pressure preservatively treated wood and naturally termite-resistant wood shall not be used as a physical barrier unless a barrier can be inspected for any termite shelter tubes around the inside and outside edges and joints of a barrier.

R320.3.1 Field treatment. Field cut ends, notches, and drilled holes of pressure preservatively treated wood shall be retreated in the field in accordance with AWPA M4.

R320.4 Barriers. Approved physical barriers, such as metal or plastic sheeting or collars specifically designed for termite prevention, shall be installed in a manner to prevent termites from entering the structure. Shields placed on top of an exterior foundation wall are permitted to be used only if in combination with another method of protection.

R320.4 R320.5 Foam plastic protection. No additional revisions.

Revise footnote "c" of Table R301.2(1) to read as follows:

c. The jurisdiction shall fill in this part of the table with "very eavy," "moderate to heavy," "slight to moderate," or "none to slight" in accordance with Figure R301.2(6) to indicate the need for protection depending on whether there has been a history of local subterranean termite damage.