



ENVIRONMENTAL  
HEALTH  
PERSPECTIVES

ehponline.org

Effectiveness of an Integrated Pest Management  
Intervention in Controlling Cockroaches,  
Mice and Allergens in New York City Public Housing

Daniel Kass, Wendy McKelvey, Elizabeth Carlton,  
Marta Hernandez, Ginger Chew, Sean  
Nagle, Robin Garfinkel, Brian Clarke, Julius Tiven,  
Christian Espino, and David Evans

doi: 10.1289/ehp.0800149 (available at <http://dx.doi.org/>)  
Online 15 April 2009



**NIEHS**  
National Institute of  
Environmental Health Sciences

National Institutes of Health  
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

**Effectiveness of an Integrated Pest Management Intervention in Controlling Cockroaches,  
Mice and Allergens in New York City Public Housing**

Daniel Kass<sup>1</sup>, Wendy McKelvey<sup>1</sup>, Elizabeth Carlton<sup>2</sup>, Marta Hernandez<sup>1</sup>, Ginger Chew<sup>2</sup>, Sean Nagle<sup>2</sup>, Robin Garfinkel<sup>2</sup>, Brian Clarke<sup>3</sup>, Julius Tiven<sup>3</sup>, Christian Espino<sup>2</sup>, David Evans<sup>2</sup>

1. New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, New York, NY
2. Columbia Center for Children's Environmental Health, Columbia University Mailman School of Public Health, New York, NY
3. New York City Housing Authority, New York, NY

Address correspondence to:

Daniel E. Kass

NYC Department of Health and Mental Hygiene

Bureau of Environmental Surveillance and Policy

22 Cortlandt St., 12<sup>th</sup> Floor, CN-34E.

New York, NY 10007

Phone: 212-788-1219

Fax: 212-442-2642

Email: [dkass@health.nyc.gov](mailto:dkass@health.nyc.gov)

**Acknowledgements:** We are grateful for the outstanding efforts of Frank Francisco in recruiting participants and collecting study data, and to Pamela Diaz, Toy Mordiglia, Christopher Murphy, and Manuel Ortiz for their help with data collection. Thanks especially to the Residents' Associations and the residents of New York City Public Housing who generously opened their homes to us. The authors declare they have no competing financial interests.

**Funding:** This study was funded, in part, by contributions to the Columbia Center for Children's Environmental Health by the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (grants 5 P30 ES09089, P01 ES009600, 5 R01 ES008977, 5 R01 ES11158, 5 R01 ES012468, 5 R01 ES10165), the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (grants R827027, 82860901, RD-832141), Irving General Clinical Research Center, Bauman Family Foundation, Gladys & Roland Harriman Foundation, New York Community Trust, Educational Foundation of America, The New York Times Company Foundation, Rockefeller Financial Services, Horace W. Goldsmith Foundation, Beldon Fund, The John Merck Fund, and the September 11<sup>th</sup> Fund of the United Way and New York Community Trust. Dr. Chew also received funding as a National Institutes of Health (NIH) National Center on Minority Health and Health Disparities Fellow. The project was also supported by the New York City Council, and by substantial in-kind contributions from the New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene, and New York City Housing Authority.

**Short Running Head:** Effectiveness of IPM in NYC Public Housing.

**Key Words:** allergen, asthma, cockroach, integrated pest management, mouse, New York City, pesticide, public housing

**Article Descriptor:** Built Environment

**Abbreviations:**

Bla g 2: *Blattella germanica* 2

CI: confidence interval

DOHMH: Department of Health and Mental Hygiene

g: gram

IPM: Integrated pest management

µg : microgram

MUP: Mouse urinary protein

NYC: New York City

NYCHA: New York City Housing Authority

RA: Resident Association

**OUTLINE:**

Abstract

Introduction

Methods

    Study design

    Sampling and recruitment

    Data collection

    Intervention

    Measures

        Cockroach and mouse populations

        Allergens

        Apartment conditions and pesticide use

    Data analysis

Results

    Baseline conditions

    Impact on pests

    Impact on allergens

    Impact on pesticide use

    Impact on satisfaction with building services

Discussion

References

Tables 1-6

Figure Legend

Figure

## ABSTRACT

**Background:** Cockroaches and mice are common in urban homes, and are sources of allergens capable of triggering asthma symptoms. Traditional pest control involves the use of scheduled applications of pesticides by professionals, and pesticide use by residents. In contrast, integrated pest management (IPM) involves sanitation, building maintenance and limited use of least toxic pesticides.

**Objectives:** We implemented and evaluated IPM, compared to traditional practice, for its impact on pests, allergens, pesticide use and resident satisfaction in a large urban public housing authority.

**Methods:** We assigned IPM or control status to 13 buildings in five housing developments, and evaluated conditions at baseline, three and six months in 280 apartments in Brooklyn and Manhattan, New York City. We measured cockroaches and mice populations, collected cockroach and mouse urinary protein allergens in dust, and interviewed residents. All statistical models controlled for baseline levels of pests or allergens.

**Results:** Compared to controls, apartments receiving IPM had significantly lower counts of cockroaches at three months, and greater success in reducing or sustaining low counts of cockroaches at three and six months. IPM was associated with lower cockroach allergen levels in kitchens at three months, and in beds and kitchens at six months. Pesticide use was reduced in IPM relative to control, apartments. Residents of IPM apartments also rated building services more positively.

**Conclusions:** In contrast to previous IPM studies which involved extensive cleaning, repeat visits and often extensive resident education, we show that an easily replicable single IPM visit

was more effective than the regular application of pesticides alone in managing pests and their consequences.

## INTRODUCTION

Cockroaches and rodents are present in the homes of many urban residents in the United States. Besides causing annoyance and stress, they are sources of allergens that can trigger asthma symptoms in sensitized individuals, and may increase the risk of allergic sensitization.(Chew et al. 2008; Gruchalla et al. 2005; Huss et al. 2001; Matsui et al. 2004; Morgan et al. 2004; Nelson 2000; Phipatanakul et al. 2000; Rosenstreich et al. 1997)

The professional control of residential pests has traditionally depended on personnel licensed by states to apply pesticides. Pesticides applied in urban homes include insecticides and rodenticides, and their chemical formulation frequently involves active and inactive ingredients that are acute toxicants, known or suspected carcinogens (California EPA 2005) or developmental or reproductive toxicants (U.S.EPA 2004). Their application may result in human exposure via inhalation, ingestion or skin absorption from initial applications and their residual presence.

Pest control that depends on chemical-only approaches is limited by its failure to address conditions that sustain pest populations -- the ability of pests to move within and between residences, the presence of food and water sources typically found in kitchens and bathrooms, and the ability of pests to find and create shelter. Integrated Pest Management (IPM) is an approach that primarily involves improving sanitary and structural conditions to deny pests food, water, harborage and movement, and includes the judicious use of pesticides following an evaluation of need and the hazard to human occupants.

Several studies have evaluated the use of interventions in which residents were given equipment and taught how to use IPM principles to control cockroaches and allergens in their homes, either alone (Klennert et al. 2005; Krieger et al. 2005; McConnell et al. 2005), or in

combination with professional pest control using low toxicity pesticides (Brenner et al. 2003; Condon et al. 2007; Morgan et al. 2004; Peters et al. 2007) . These studies suggest that education about IPM, either alone or combined with commercial cleaning, successfully reduced either cockroach counts (Brenner et al. 2003; McConnell et al. 2005) or cockroach allergen levels (Klennert et al. 2005; McConnell et al. 2005; Morgan et al. 2004). Another study compared IPM that included repeated visits with the use of insect growth regulator devices to treatment with spray pesticide alone in public housing, using a commercial service for both treatments (Miller and Meek 2004). The results suggested that IPM was superior to the traditional intervention in reducing cockroach populations. Two features of these studies limit their instructiveness for significant institutional replication and expansion. First, these studies have typically recruited from, and analyzed impact of IPM on individual rental apartments without building level interventions. Second, these studies, some of which involved goals beyond just pest control, have involved repeated visits by pest control professionals, cleaning services, or educators. The current study, in contrast, involves a single visit by pest control professionals with the intervention at the building level.

The New York City Housing Authority (NYCHA) is the largest public housing owner in North America with more than 405,000 low-income residents. The successful implementation of IPM in an institution of this size was thought to offer many potential benefits; pesticide use reduction, improved pest management and reduced pest and allergen burdens in housing populated by largely Black and Hispanic families with disproportionately high prevalence of asthma (Stevenson et al. 2000). Following a successful pilot program in public housing (Kass and Outwater 2003), the New York City Department of Health and Mental Hygiene (DOHMH) and NYCHA developed an IPM intervention designed to be simple, low-cost and relatively

easily scaled if successful. It involved a single visit to homes by a specially constituted team of NYCHA pest control personnel during which IPM services were conducted in kitchens and bathrooms. This intervention was compared to NYCHA's conventional pest control, involving the offer of calendar-based application of spray pesticides in non-intervention apartments, for its impact on populations of cockroaches and mice and levels of cockroach and mouse allergen.

## **METHODS**

**Study Design.** NYCHA owns and manages 178,000 apartments in 343 developments within NYC, each of which has one or more residential buildings. We conducted an intervention study in 13 buildings or building groups owned within five developments. A convenience sample of housing developments was selected that met three criteria: location in a neighborhood with a rate of asthma hospitalization higher than the citywide average; good structural condition of buildings with no major capital renovations planned for several years; and the presence of an active Residents' Association. The selected developments were located in Bushwick, Brooklyn, and East Harlem, Manhattan.

Within housing developments, we assigned buildings to IPM intervention or control status. IPM status was assigned to whole buildings to facilitate efficient service delivery and out of a belief that pests may be more successfully controlled in a given apartment if simultaneously addressed in neighboring apartments. The building sample included seven high-rises (5 general population, 2 senior citizen only) and 6 three-story attached townhouses (general population). Eight of these buildings were assigned to the IPM intervention and five to control; one of the two senior buildings was assigned intervention and one control status. Control buildings were selected so as to be as physically distant as possible from intervention buildings within the developments.

Before beginning the intervention, program representatives met with Resident Associations (RA) to discuss the study and solicit input. RA members served as liaisons between residents and the IPM and evaluation teams, answering residents' questions about the program and providing informal feedback to the teams. The study protocol was approved by the Institutional Review Boards of Columbia University Medical Center and DOHMH, and all participants provided written, informed consent prior to the study.

**Sampling and recruitment.** We randomly selected 50% of the apartments in each studied building to participate in the study, totaling 516 apartments. . Residents of selected apartments were recruited through RA meetings, staffed tables in building foyers, phone calls and door-to-door canvassing. In an attempt to reach working residents, phone calls were made during the day and in the evening, and evaluation visits were scheduled Mondays through Saturdays. We enrolled and completed baseline evaluations in 323 apartments (63%). Residents in 137 apartments (27%) refused to participate, 25 (5%) were never home, 10 (< 2%) were not capable of providing informed consent, 10 (< 2%) were erroneously given the IPM intervention before the baseline visit could be conducted, and the remaining 11 (< 2%) were excluded because of vacancy status or other reasons.

**Data collection.** Baseline evaluations were conducted by an evaluation team in East Harlem between August and November 2002 and in Bushwick between October 2003 and May 2004. Trained research workers fluent in English and Spanish from CCCEH and DOHMH conducted home visits in which they interviewed heads of households in their language of choice, and collected vacuumed dust samples in the kitchen and bedroom. A translator was provided by NYCHA for several Chinese speaking residents. The research workers also placed cockroach and rodent monitoring devices, which were recovered from the home one week later.

Follow-up evaluations for all baseline measures were conducted 3 and 6 months after the date of the IPM visit for intervention apartments, and 3 and 6 months following the baseline evaluation visit for control apartments.

**Intervention.** All apartments in intervention buildings received IPM whether or not they were selected for participation in the study. NYCHA recruited, hired and trained nine public housing residents to become pest control technicians in a dedicated unit to carry out IPM in intervention buildings. The staff operated in teams of three, each overseen by a NYCHA supervisor trained in IPM. The teams scheduled appointments with residents, and completed IPM in a single visit that averaged 2-3 hours (8-12 person-hours). The teams employed mechanical and steam cleaning using soap (Simple Green®) on kitchen cabinets, stoves, refrigerators, floors and countertops, and bathroom floors and fixtures; they used latex caulk to seal cracks and crevices, gaps within kitchen cabinets and between the cabinets and wall, gaps and cracks in baseboards, plumbing joints, and other potential ports of entry for pests; and they applied boric acid and cockroach baits (gels or containerized solids containing fipronil or hydramethylnon) to kill remaining cockroaches. The supervisor instructed apartment residents to store open food in sealed containers, cover garbage containers with a tight-fitting lid, and dispose of garbage frequently. Residents were provided with a covered garbage container, food storage containers and cleaning supplies, including sponges, soap, powdered cleanser, and a non-hydrocarbon based degreasing solution. Residents in intervention apartments were asked not to use Tempo® (a wettable insecticidal powder commonly available, but illegal for consumer sale in New York City), cockroach chalk or aerosol/spray pesticides. No repeat IPM visits were scheduled, but residents could file complaints per usual practice if they continued to have

problems with pests. Only solid or gel baits were applied on those visits in the fewer than ten cases where follow-up occurred.

The control buildings received usual care from NYCHA's state-licensed pesticide applicators. Usual care consisted of the offer of conventional, calendar-based extermination visits every three to six months, about two thirds of which resulted in a kitchen baseboard application of spray insecticides containing pyrethroids and the synergist, piperonyl butoxide.

**Measures.** *Cockroach and Mouse Populations.* Pest populations were estimated through objective monitoring and sightings reported by residents during the interview. Cockroach populations were monitored by placing 5 pheromone glue traps in the kitchen for one week at baseline (prior to IPM intervention), and three and six months later (Chew et al. 2006). It was not always possible to collect all 5 traps after 7 days, so adjustments were made accordingly (at least 4 traps were collected from 95% of apartments at each round of monitoring; traps were left out between 6 and 8 days in 83% of apartments). Data are reported for the total number of kitchen cockroaches trapped in a week, adjusted for numbers of traps and numbers of days present. We also created dichotomous outcome variables to measure success, defined as having maintained zero pests at follow up, having reduced the baseline cockroach count by 25% and 50% at three and six-month intervals. We monitored mouse populations using non-toxic, non-rodenticidal bait blocks as previously described (Chew et al. 2006). The presence of mice was analyzed as a dichotomous variable that was considered positive if at least one gram of bait was consumed from any of the bait blocks placed in the apartment.

During the interview, we asked residents how many cockroaches they had seen, on average, each day over the previous three months, and assigned responses to one of six categories ranging from zero to  $\geq 20$  per day. We also asked how often they had seen mice, on

average, over the same period, with responses assigned to six categories ranging from never to  $\geq 5$  times each day. We assigned midpoints to the categories to be able to analyze the variable as a count. In addition, we created dichotomous variables to measure pest control success. For subjective roach and mice sightings, success was defined as having maintained zero pests at follow-up or having dropped a specified number of categorical responses. We examined the use of 1, 2, and 3 drops in sighting categories.

*Allergens.* Separate settled dust specimens were collected from the bedrooms (vacuumed from the surface of beds in the upper bed near the pillows) and directly from the kitchen floor at baseline, three month and six month intervals as previously described (Chew et al. 2006). Briefly, the sampling equipment included a Mitest dust collector (Indoor Biotechnologies, Charlottesville, VA) attached to a canister vacuum (Eureka Mighty Mite), Bloomington IL) used for three minutes during each sample. Samples were frozen at  $-20^{\circ}\text{C}$  for 24 hours immediately after collection. Dust samples were extracted and assayed for mouse urinary protein (MUP) and cockroach (Bla g 2) allergens by ELISA. The MUP agents were obtained from Green Laboratories, Inc. (Lenoir, NC) and the Bla g 2 reagents were obtained from Indoor Biotechnologies (Charlottesville, VA).

*Apartment conditions and pesticide use.* During the interview, we asked about other factors that could affect pest populations including personal pesticide use, the number of adults and children living in the apartment, open food, and clutter, and building maintenance practices.

To assess personal pesticide use, we asked residents whether they had used any of eight different products in the past three months, including illegal pesticides (Tempo® and Chinese chalk), spray (aerosolized) pesticides, baits, and boric acid. A dichotomous variable for low-toxicity pesticide use was created by evaluating the use of baits, gels or boric acid. A

dichotomous variable for higher toxicity pesticide use was created by evaluating the use of any illegal or aerosol pesticides. Residents were also asked to rate the quality of building services in their building on a 4-point scale from poor to excellent with respect to control of cockroaches and mice.

**Data analysis.** Because the IPM intervention was conducted at the building level and cockroach and mice presence and allergen levels were quantified in a sample of apartments from each building, we used multilevel modeling to account for the resulting correlation among apartments in the same building. SAS statistical software version 9.1 (SAS Institute, Inc., Cary, NC) was used for all analyses. All references to statistical significance are based on an alpha of 0.05.

We modeled outcomes in apartments at 3 and 6 months following baseline, separately. Allergen levels were modeled with linear regression after being log-transformed, using the SAS PROC MIXED procedure. Cockroach counts (unstandardized) were modeled using PROC GLIMMIX, specifying a poisson distribution, and including trap-days (number of traps placed multiplied by days left out) as an apartment-level predictor. We modeled the category midpoints that were assigned to the subjective cockroach and mouse sightings as count data using poisson regression as well. We modeled success outcomes and presence of mice with logistic regression, using PROC GLIMMIX, specifying a binomial distribution. Random building intercepts were included in all models, and these intercepts were modeled as a function of IPM status and senior building status. We controlled for baseline levels of pests or allergens and senior building status. We were only able to control for time of the year that apartments were recruited into the study using a dichotomous variable representing the heating season (October 1 through May 31), because the data could not support a finer measure of season.

## RESULTS

Follow-up data were collected from 262 (81%) apartments at 3 months and from 256 (79%) apartments at 6 months. Retention at three months was the same in intervention and control groups (81%). Retention at six months was slightly lower in intervention apartments compared to control (77% and 82%, respectively). Of the 67 participants lost to follow up at 6 months, 63% (42) refused to continue participation, 21% (14) had moved and 16% (11) could not be contacted for other reasons. Overall, 280 apartments provided follow up data at 3 or 6 months (87%). We found no significant differences between retained apartments and those lost to follow up for number of residents or the presence of clutter or open food. Retained apartments were more likely to have had exterminator services within the past 6 months, to have used both safe and unsafe pesticide products, more likely to have had cockroach infestation, less likely to have mice, and more likely to have children under 7. However, statistical models adjusted for baseline pest or allergen levels, and for senior building status.

**Baseline Conditions.** Table 1 provides baseline descriptions of the 280 apartments for which we had either three or six month follow-up data (baseline data for all 323 apartments enrolled in the study have been previously reported) (Chew et al. 2006). Almost one third of apartments were in senior citizen housing. About half of apartments housed one resident, while almost 20% housed four or more. Apartments ranged in size from studios to five-bedroom units. Senior apartments were smaller, typically studios or one-bedrooms. Children under seven were present in 15% of apartments.

Table 2 describes pests and pesticide use at baseline for the 280 respondents who provided follow up data. Cockroaches were highly prevalent; 76% of apartments had evidence of

cockroaches from traps, while 94% were reported by residents to have had cockroaches within three months prior to baseline. A sizeable proportion of apartments had extensive infestations; more than 100 weekly cockroaches were trapped in the kitchens of 35% of apartments, and 27% of all apartments reported seeing at least 20 cockroaches each day. There were fewer cockroaches trapped in bedrooms and bathrooms relative to the kitchen, so we used kitchen counts as our outcome variable in subsequent analyses of IPM effectiveness. A large percentage of apartments (89%) reported use of at least one lower toxicity pesticide product, while 64% reported use of at least one higher toxicity product at baseline.

Objective evidence of mice was detected at baseline in 20% of apartments with follow-up data, and in contrast to cockroaches, mice were evident throughout the apartment. Baits were positive for mice in 7% of kitchens, 11% of living rooms, 5% of bathrooms and 7% of bedrooms. Mouse sightings in the last three months were reported by residents in 47% of apartments at baseline, and 16% of apartments reported seeing mice at least daily. There was imperfect correlation between objective and subjective mouse sighting data. Baits were positive for mice in 8% of apartments where residents reported seeing no mice in the past three months, and only 24% of apartments where residents reported seeing mice every day.

**Impact on Pests.** Table 3 describes the impact of the intervention on cockroach populations. The number of cockroaches trapped in the kitchens of IPM apartments was estimated to be 0.57 times that of control apartments at 3 months (95% CI: 0.33, 1.00) and 0.86 that of control apartments at 6 months (95% CI: 0.56, 1.33). Using data based on subjective sightings by residents over the past 3 months, counts of cockroaches in IPM apartment kitchens were 0.44 times that of controls after 3 months of follow-up (95% CI: 0.30, 0.64) and 0.55 that of control at 6 months follow-up (95% CI: 0.29, 1.05). Adjusting for recruitment time of year as

a dichotomous variable had virtually no impact on model results, so it was dropped from analyses.

The odds of successfully reducing trapped cockroach counts by 25% and 50% in IPM apartments after 3 months follow-up were 3.1 (95% CI: 1.2, 7.8) and 2.7 (95% CI: 1.0, 7.8) times the odds in control apartments, respectively (Table 4). The odds of success in IPM apartments after 6 months were also higher than in control apartments. Using drops in pre-defined categories of subjective cockroach sightings as measures of success, the odds of a one category reduction (corresponding to a reduction in daily sightings of one to 10 cockroaches daily, depending on the initial category) in IPM apartments was 3.6 times the odds of success in control apartments (95% CI: 1.8, 7.5), while the odds of a two category drop (corresponding to a drop of 2 to 20 or more per day) were 3.1 times the odds in control apartments (95% CI: 1.6, 5.8).

There was little evidence of success in reducing the presence of mice as measured by bait consumption. Mouse sightings were fewer in IPM compared to control apartments at 3 and 6 months followup, , but these differences were not statistically significant (Table 4).

**Impact on Allergens.** Table 5 presents the ratio of IPM to control group allergen levels per gram of dust. IPM was associated with lower cockroach allergen levels at the 6-month follow-up visits in beds and kitchens . For example, the level of Bla g 2 in beds of IPM apartments at the 6-month follow-up visit was 0.4 times the level found in control apartments (95% CI = 0.2-0.8). The IPM apartments also had significantly lower levels of Bla g 2 at the 3-month follow-up visit in the kitchen , but not in the beds. When Bla g 2 was modeled as the absolute amount of allergen per unit area, the IPM group was found to be significantly lower in both the kitchen and bedroom 6 months after the intervention (data not shown). Many of the mouse allergen concentrations for all three time points in beds and kitchens were below the limit

of detection (0.5 µg/g), and IPM was not significantly associated with lower levels of mouse allergen at 3-months or 6 months after treatment in either the kitchen or bedroom whether modeled as MUP per unit area or per gram of dust.

Figure 1A illustrates 10<sup>th</sup>, 25<sup>th</sup>, median, 75<sup>th</sup> and 90<sup>th</sup> percentile levels of Bla g 2 measured in kitchens and Figure 1B, in bedrooms, on a log scale for the subset of apartments that provided data at all three time points. Kitchen cockroach allergen declined in the IPM group (n=126) at 3 months and were sustained at 6 months, while the control apartments (n=85) showed no apparent change. Bedroom median levels of cockroach allergen declined in IPM apartments at both 3 and 6 months, but rose in control apartments (n=45) over the same time periods.

**Impact on Pesticide Use.** NYCHA pest control staff used no spray pesticides in IPM apartments, in contrast to control apartments. Table 6 summarizes the impact of IPM versus traditional practice on residents' own use of pesticide products. At baseline, 18% of IPM apartments reported using either Tempo® or chalk to control cockroaches, compared to 8% in control apartments. At six months follow up, only 2% of IPM apartments reported using Tempo® or chalk (a 10-fold drop), while use dropped to 5% (half of previous levels) in control apartments at six month follow up. Use of aerosol pesticides such as sprays, bombs or foggers dropped in the IPM group from 63% at baseline to 37% after six months of follow-up. In control apartments, use of aerosol pesticides barely changed -- from 53% at baseline to 59% at six month follow up. Both IPM and control apartments showed substantial reductions in clutter and open food, with little difference between groups. None of these differences were statistically significant.

**Impact on Satisfaction with Building Services.** Residents of IPM apartments reported more positive feelings about the quality of NYCHA's building services at follow up than those in control apartments. (Table 6). In addition, the proportion of residents rating control of cockroaches by the building maintenance staff as poor declined more in IPM apartments than in control apartments, while both groups of apartments showed a reduction in the proportion rating mice control as poor. None of these differences were statistically significant.

## **DISCUSSION**

This study sought to determine whether an easily replicable professionally implemented IPM approach to the eradication and control of residential indoor pests would out-perform traditional practices. The search for alternatives to the dependence on higher toxicity insecticides in residential settings is driven by several factors. The recent epidemic of severe and uncontrolled asthma in urban environments has brought increased knowledge and attention to the problem of indoor allergens from household pests, particularly cockroaches and mice. As awareness grows about the association between indoor pest allergens and asthma symptoms and severity, there is widespread concern in the public health and environmental community that pesticide use will rise. In New York City, more than 1,000 accidental exposures to pesticides are reported to the regional Poison Control Center annually, with the vast majority occurring to children in the home (Kass et al. 2005). Though the active ingredients in the baits used in the IPM apartments are mammalian toxicants, by virtue of their solid or gel form, low vapor pressure, placement away from the reach of residents or pets, and the very small quantities used, they pose no significant threat of exposure to residents

The intervention in this study compared the impact of IPM with a traditional pest control approach. The findings show that a single IPM visit was more effective than the regular application of pesticides alone in controlling cockroaches, reducing cockroach allergen levels, reducing resident use of more harmful pesticides by residents, and improving resident satisfaction with building maintenance. IPM was also effective at reducing resident-reported mouse sightings, though the result was not statistically significant, perhaps owing to the small number of buildings in our study and the comparatively low prevalence of mice. These findings are noteworthy for several reasons. First, the IPM intervention reduced both pest populations and allergens relative to traditional pest control. Though kitchen cleaning may have had a direct impact on allergen reductions in kitchens, the fact that allergens were significantly reduced in bedrooms of IPM apartments while those in control apartments were unchanged further demonstrates important benefits from pest interventions in limited areas.

Second, the IPM intervention was delivered with minimal resident education. Most other published studies of IPM that have reported significant impact on pest and allergen levels have involved multiple home visits over 1-2 years to teach residents how to maintain IPM and allergen control (Brenner et al. 2003; Krieger et al. 2005; McConnell et al. 2005; Morgan et al. 2004). Although these approaches appear to be effective at empowering residents to improve their home environment, they are also costly to implement and unlikely to be sustainable by a large public housing authority as a component of routine pest control operations. In contrast, this IPM intervention -- completed in a single visit averaging 8-12 person-hours without separate visits to educate residents -- may be more replicable. It is difficult to directly compare our impact on pests to other studies due to different monitoring and statistical approaches. In terms of counts of cockroaches, Brenner et al.'s study in New York City found a 50% reduction at six

months in cockroach populations in their intervention group and no change in its control group. In contrast, our weekly kitchen cockroach levels dropped by 75% at three months, and 88% at six, with increases in control apartments over the same time periods.

Third, this IPM intervention was successful in decreasing residents' use of, and potential exposure to, pesticides by reducing the application of spray pesticides by commercial applicators and by reducing the perceived need for the use of aerosol sprays and total release foggers by residents themselves. A noteworthy finding is that traditional pest control had no independent impact over time on objectively determined cockroach levels, and minimal impact on resident sightings, suggesting that the use of pesticides alone is both ineffective and an unnecessary introduction of pesticides into the environment, even without an alternative pest control approach to replace it.

There were several limitations of this study. The generalizability of the findings may be limited by the fact that two conditions were considered in the selection of housing developments; location in neighborhoods with higher rates of hospitalization for childhood asthma and not having been scheduled for major capital improvements in the following two years, suggesting greater structural integrity than some other developments. The study did not randomize buildings or apartments to treatment and control status, but rather, assigned treatment status to buildings that were selected to be as similar as possible on potential confounders. /. Several sources of potential bias exist. This study compared the impacts of IPM to quarterly pesticide applications. Normally, a significant proportion of residents refuse or do not make their homes available for these scheduled visits. Given the nature of this study, it is likely NYCHA reached a greater proportion of control apartments than would otherwise be expected. Also, because buildings were selected for IPM or control status within the same housing development, there was

potential for experimental contamination, especially with respect to tenant advice about maintaining pest free homes and reducing the use of pesticides. Each of these concerns likely biases the results toward the null, potentially leading to an underestimate of true impact. We were unable to fully adjust for time of the year of building recruitment, since our adjusted models would only permit inclusion of a dichotomous variable for heating season, which had no impact on results. The impact of recruitment season should be evaluated in future studies of IPM effectiveness.

In conclusion, this study shows that a modest single visit IPM intervention in public housing is more effective at reducing cockroach populations and allergen levels than traditional scheduled pesticide application alone. In the period of time since the completion of this study, NYCHA has implemented several key changes to its pest control protocol. NYCHA has trained its entire workforce of approximately 75 pest control professionals on IPM strategies. It has maintained the IPM unit of nine personnel created for this endeavor, which now carries out identical IPM interventions in severely infested apartments, and in apartments during occupant turnover. NYCHA has suspended the routine use of pyrethroid sprays in all but basement areas not accessible to residents, and now applies and distributes cockroach baits during its apartment visits. In addition, NYCHA has abandoned scheduled calendar visits in favor of visits that account for levels of severity and resident concerns. Where feasible, NYCHA now orders new kitchen cabinets pre-caulked and sealed, and its contract specifications for kitchen rehabilitation includes provisions for pest exclusion. The success of the study suggests that this intervention is a model that can be readily replicated by public housing authorities.

## References

- Brenner BL, Markowitz S, Rivera M, Romero H, Weeks M, Sanchez E, Deych E, et al. 2003. Integrated pest management in an urban community: a successful partnership for prevention. *Environ Health Perspect* 111:1649-1653.
- California EPA OoEHHA. Chemicals Known to the State to Cause Cancer or Reproductive Toxicity. 4-30-2005.  
Ref Type: Pamphlet
- Chew GL, Carlton EJ, Kass D, Hernandez M, Clarke B, Tiven J, et al., 2006. Determinants of cockroach and mouse exposure and associations with asthma in families and elderly individuals living in New York City public housing. *Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol* 97:502-513.
- Chew GL, Perzanowski MS, Canfield SM, Goldstein IF, Mellins RB, Hoepner LA, et al. 2008. Cockroach allergen levels and associations with cockroach-specific IgE. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 121:240-245.
- Condon C, Hynes HP, Brooks DR, Rivard D., McCarthy J. 2007. The Integrated Pest Management Educator pilot project in Boston public housing: results and recommendations. *Local Environment* 12:223-238.
- Gruchalla RS, Pongracic J, Plaut M, Evans R, III, Visness CM, Walter M, et al. 2005. Inner City Asthma Study: relationships among sensitivity, allergen exposure, and asthma morbidity. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 115:478-485.
- Huss K, Adkinson NF, Jr., Eggleston PA, Dawson C, Van Natta ML, Hamilton RG. 2001. House dust mite and cockroach exposure are strong risk factors for positive allergy skin test responses in the Childhood Asthma Management Program. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 107:48-54.
- Kass DE, McKelvey W, Van Wye G, Kerker B, Mostashari F, Eisenhower D, et al. Pests Can be Controlled ... Safely. [4(3)], 1-4. 2005. New York, NY, NYC Department of Health and Mental Hygiene. NYC Vital Signs.  
Ref Type: Serial (Book, Monograph)
- Kass DE, Outwater T. The Lehman Village Houses Pest Control Program: Demonstration of Integrated Pest Management in New York City Public Housing. Contract Number X982128010, 1-22. 2-6-2003. New York, NY, NYC Department of Health and Mental Hygiene.  
Ref Type: Report
- Klennert MD, Liu AH, Pearson MR, Ellison MC, Budhiraja N, Robinson JL. 2005. Short-term impact of a randomized multifaceted intervention for wheezing infants in low-income families. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med* 159:75-82.
- Krieger JW, Takaro TK, Song L, Weaver M. 2005. The Seattle-King County Healthy Homes Project: a randomized, controlled trial of a community health worker intervention to decrease exposure to indoor asthma triggers. *Am J Public Health* 95:652-659.

Matsui EC, Wood RA, Rand C, Kanchanaraksa S, Swartz L, Eggleston PA. 2004. Mouse allergen exposure and mouse skin test sensitivity in suburban, middle-class children with asthma. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 113:910-915.

McConnell R, Milam J, Richardson J, Galvan J, Jones C, Thorne PS, et al. 2005. Educational intervention to control cockroach allergen exposure in the homes of hispanic children in Los Angeles: results of the La Casa study. *Clin Exp Allergy* 35:426-433.

Miller DM, Meek F. 2004. Cost and efficacy comparison of integrated pest management strategies with monthly spray insecticide applications for German cockroach (Dictyoptera: Blattellidae) control in public housing. *J Econ Entomol* 97:559-569.

Morgan WJ, Crain EF, Gruchalla RS, O'Connor GT, Kattan M, Evans R, III, et al. 2004. Results of a home-based environmental intervention among urban children with asthma. *N Engl J Med* 351:1068-1080.

National Pesticide Information Center. 2009a. Hydramethylnon Technical Fact Sheet. Available: <http://npic.orst.edu/factsheets/hydratech.pdf> [accessed 1 March 2009].

----- 2009b. Fipronil Technical Fact Sheet. Available: <http://npic.orst.edu/factsheets/fiptech.pdf> [accessed 1 March 2009].

Nelson HS. 2000. The importance of allergens in the development of asthma and the persistence of symptoms. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 105:S628-S632.

Peters JL, Levy JI, Muilenberg ML, Coull BA, Spengler JD. 2007. Efficacy of integrated pest management in reducing cockroach allergen concentrations in urban public housing. *J Asthma* 44:455-460.

Phipatanakul W, Eggleston PA, Wright EC, Wood RA. 2000. Mouse allergen. II. The relationship of mouse allergen exposure to mouse sensitization and asthma morbidity in inner-city children with asthma. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 106:1075-1080.

Rosenstreich DL, Eggleston P, Kattan M, Baker D, Slavin RG, Gergen P, et al. 1997. The role of cockroach allergy and exposure to cockroach allergen in causing morbidity among inner-city children with asthma. *N Engl J Med* 336:1356-1363.

Stevenson L, Garg R, Leighton J. 2000. Asthma hospitalization in New York City 1988-1997. *J Urban Health* 77:137-139.

U.S. EPA. List of Chemicals Evaluated for Carcinogenic Potential. 7-19-2004. Available <http://www.epa.gov/opp00001/carlist>.

Table 1. Characteristics of public housing apartments followed for 3 and 6 months.

	No. of Apartments (%)		
	All (n=280)	Intervention (n=169)	Control (n=111)
Apartment location			
East Harlem	148 (52.9)	100 (59.2)	48 (43.2)
Brooklyn	132 (47.1)	69 (40.8)	63 (56.8)
Building Status			
Family	193 (68.9)	112 (66.3)	81 (73.0)
Senior	87 (31.1)	57 (33.7)	30 (27.0)
Number of residents in the apartment			
One	143 (51.1)	87 (51.5)	56 (50.5)
Two	58 (20.7)	35 (20.7)	23 (20.7)
Three	25 (8.9)	12 (7.1)	13 (11.7)
Four	25 (8.9)	15 (8.9)	10 (9.0)
Five or more	29 (10.4)	20 (11.8)	9 (8.1)
Apartment is home to children under age 7	42 (15.0)	23 (13.6)	19 (17.1)
Number of floors in the building			
Three	62 (22.1)	49 (29.9)	13 (11.7)
Six to Eight	113 (40.4)	63 (37.3)	50 (45.1)
Eleven	48 (17.1)	0 (0.0)	48 (43.2)
Twenty	57 (20.4)	57 (33.7)	0 (0.0)
Number of rooms in apartment			
Two	48 (17.1)	32 (18.9)	16 (14.4)
Three	95 (33.9)	57 (33.7)	38 (34.2)
Four	76 (27.1)	43 (25.4)	33 (29.7)
Five or more	61 (21.8)	37 (21.9)	24 (21.6)

Table 2. Pest sightings, objective pest monitoring results, and pesticide use at baseline.

	Number of Apartments (%)		
	All (n=280)	Intervention (n=169)	Control (n=111)
Resident reported daily cockroach sightings			
Never/less than once a day	55 (19.7)	30 (17.9)	25 (22.5)
1 to 9 a day	109 (39.1)	66 (39.3)	43 (38.7)
10 to 19 a day	40 (14.3)	24 (14.3)	16 (14.4)
20 or more a day	75 (26.9)	48 (28.6)	27 (24.3)
Cockroaches trapped weekly in the apartment			
0	67 (23.9)	38 (22.5)	29 (26.1)
1 to 10	85 (30.4)	51 (30.2)	34 (30.6)
11-50	62 (22.1)	41 (24.3)	21 (18.9)
51-100	31 (11.1)	15 (8.9)	16 (14.4)
Greater than 100	35 (15.5)	24 (14.2)	11 (9.9)
Mouse sightings in the past 3 months			
Never	146 (52.5)	95 (56.9)	51 (45.9)
Less than once a week	58 (20.9)	29 (17.4)	29 (26.1)
1 to 6 times a week	29 (10.4)	16 (9.6)	13 (11.7)
At least once a day	45 (16.2)	27 (16.2)	18 (16.2)
Baits positive for mice in the apartment	36 (19.7)	22 (20.7)	14 (18.2)
Use lower-toxicity pesticides			
Containerized baits	211 (75.4)	128 (75.7)	83 (74.8)
Boric Acid	93 (33.2)	58 (34.3)	35 (31.5)
Gel baits	123 (43.9)	69 (40.8)	54 (48.7)
Sticky traps	98 (35.0)	69 (40.8)	29 (26.1)
Use higher-toxicity pesticides			
Bombs/Foggers	25 (8.9)	15 (8.9)	10 (9.0)
Chalk	17 (6.1)	14 (8.3)	3 (2.7)
Sprays	162 (57.9)	104 (61.5)	58 (52.3)
Tempo®	31 (11.1)	24 (14.2)	7 (6.3)

Table 3. Effectiveness of IPM intervention after 3 and 6 months follow-up on cockroaches (trapped and sighted)

	Baseline	3 months follow-up		6 months follow-up	
	Median (range)	Median (range)	Adjusted <sup>a</sup> IPM:Control Count Ratio (95% CI)	Median <sub>a</sub> (range)	Adjusted <sup>a</sup> IPM:Control Count Ratio (95% CI)
<b>Weekly Counts of Cockroaches</b>					
<b>Trapped in Kitchen<sup>b</sup></b>					
IPM	8 (0-373)	2 (0-212)	0.57 (0.33, 1.00)	1 (0-161)	0.86 (0.56, 1.33)
Control	3 (0-450)	7 (0-357)	1.00 (reference)	5 (0-330)	1.00 (reference)
<b>Sighted in Apartment</b>					
IPM	53 (0-140+)	25 (0-140+)	0.44 (0.30, 0.64)	7 (0-140+)	0.55 (0.29, 1.05)
Control	53 (0-140+)	53 (0-140+)	1.00 (reference)	25 (0-140+)	1.00 (reference)

a. Adjusted for baseline cockroach counts and senior building status; trapped cockroach counts also adjusted for number of trap-days.

b. Trapped cockroach counts are standardized to 5 traps placed for 7 days; sighted cockroach counts are assigned the midpoint of numeric category values.

Table 4. Success of IPM in reducing, or maintaining zero, cockroach and mice populations.

	<u>Success at 3 months<sup>a</sup></u>			<u>Success at 6 Months<sup>a</sup></u>		
	IPM apartments Number (%)	Control apartments Number (%)	Odds Ratio IPM:Control (95% CI)	IPM apartments Number (%)	Control apartments Number (%)	Odds Ratio IPM:Control (95% CI)
<u>Count of Cockcoaches Trapped</u>						
Model 1: 25% reduction or remaining zero	121 (77)	56 (54)	3.1 (1.2, 7.8)	113 (76)	62 (58)	2.1 (1.0, 4.5)
Model 2: 50% reduction or Remaining zero	108 (68)	50 (48)	2.7 (1.0, 7.8)	101 (68)	57 (54)	1.7 (0.7, 3.9)
<u>Sighted Cockroaches</u>						
Model 3: Drop of > 1 category or remaining zero	97 (62)	32 (31)	3.6 (1.8, 7.5)	97 (66)	44 (42)	2.5 (0.7, 9.2)
Model 4: Drop of > 2 categories or remaining zero	57 (36)	16 (15)	3.1 (1.6, 5.8)	65 (44)	18 (17)	3.0 (0.7, 1.2)
<u>Mice activity</u>						
Model 5: No mouse activity	141 (90)	90 (88)	1.2 (0.4, 3.5)	130 (88)	92 (87)	1.0 (0.2, 4.9)
<u>Sighted mice</u>						
Model 6: Drop of > 3 categories or remaining zero	119 (76)	61 (59)	3.6 (0.9, 14.7)	109 (74)	55 (52)	3.7 (0.6, 22.1)

a. Cockroach and mouse success models are adjusted for baseline cockroach counts and senior building status, except for Model 3, which could not be fit with senior building status.

Table 5. Ratio of allergen levels in IPM to control apartments at 3 and 6 months follow-up<sup>a</sup>

Outcome	Ratio IPM:Control	95% CI
Cockroach allergen Bla g 2 (units/g)		
Bedroom: 3 month follow up	0.6	0.3, 1.3
Bedroom: 6 month follow up	0.4	0.2, 0.8
Kitchen: 3 months follow up	0.4	0.2, 0.8
Kitchen: 6 month follow up	0.3	0.1, 0.9
Mouse allergen MUP (µg/g)		
Bedroom: 3 month follow up	0.9	0.6, 1.3
Bedroom: 6 month follow up	0.8	0.6, 1.1
Kitchen: 3 month follow up	0.7	0.4, 1.5
Kitchen: 6 month follow up	0.7	0.4, 1.4

a. Multiple regression model for predicting allergen concentration at follow up evaluations adjusted for baseline allergen levels, and senior building status.

Abbreviations:

Bla g 2: *Blattella germanica* 2

MUP: mouse urinary protein

g: gram

µg: microgram


Table 6. Impact of IPM after 3 and 6 months on residents' personal use of pesticides and perceptions of building maintenance.

	Baseline Percent	3 months Percent	6 months Percent
<hr/>			
Households reporting			
Use of Tempo® or chalk			
IPM	18.1	1.9	2.0
Control	8.1	8.7	4.8
Use of aerosol pesticides			
IPM	62.7	38.6	36.5
Control	53.2	53.9	49.5
<hr/>			
Households rating			
Cockroach control as poor			
IPM	52.5	21.8	26.4
Control	44.4	40.6	44.2
Mice control as poor			
IPM	36.7	26.5	21.6
Control	37.1	31.0	36.2
<hr/>			


### Figure Legend

Figures 1A and 1B:

Bla g 2 allergen concentrations (U/g) in kitchens (Figure 1A) and bedroom (Figure 1B) of IPM and comparison apartments at baseline, 3-month and 6-month time points (box and whiskers represent median, 25th-75th , and 10th-90th percentiles).



Bla g 2 allergen concentrations (U/g) in kitchens (Figure 1A) and bedroom (Figure 1B) of IPM and comparison apartments at baseline, 3-month and 6-month time points (box and whiskers represent median, 25th-75th , and 10th-90th percentiles).  
215x279mm (600 x 600 DPI)



215x279mm (600 x 600 DPI)