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

Chapter 2: The Context

- Box 2-1: Scope of the OTA Assessment
- Box 2-2: What Is Integrated Pest Management?
- Box 2-3: Alar: A Case Study on the Influence of Public Opinion
- Box 2-4: Congress Anticipates Future Pest Control Needs in the 1990 Farm Bill
- Box 2-5: Technologies Not Covered in This Assessment Also Receiving Increased Attention
- Table 2-1: Roles of Federal Agencies Related to Biologically Based Pest Control and Location of Discussion in This Report
- Table 2-2: User Expenditures for Pesticides in the U.S. by Sector, 1993
- Table 2-3: Use of Integrated Pest Management on U.S. Crops
- Table 2-4: Critical Cases of Multiple Insecticide Resistance in the U.S. Today
- Figure 2-1: Growth in U.S. Conventional Pesticide Use, 1964 to 1993
- Figure 2-2: Approaches to Pest Control in Practice Today

Chapter 3: The Technologies

Box 3-1: Outcomes of Biologically Based Pest Control

- Box 3-2: How Changes in Available Pesticides Affect Adoption of BBTs
- Box 3-3: How Conservationists are Turning to Biological Control to Help Save Biodiversity
- Box 3-4: The Areawide Pest Management Concept
- Box 3-5: The Message from Experts Remains the Same, but Progress in Bringing BBTs into Use Has Been Slow
- Table 3-1: Available Data on the Use of BBTs in the U.S.
- Table 3-2: Priority Research Needs Identified by OTA's Contractors
- Figure 3-1: Intervention is Not Always Neccessary to Prevent Unwanted Pest Damage
- Figure 3-2: Adoption of Biointensive IPM by Major Food Companies
- Figure 3-3: Key Stages of BBT Research, Development, and Implementation

Chapter 4: Risks and Regulations

- Box 4-1: Controlling Public Health Scourges with BBTs
- Box 4-2: Regulation of BBTs by Hawaii and Other States
- Box 4-3: Oversight of Vertebrates as Biological Control Agents

Box 4-4: The Proposed APHIS Regulation for the Introduction of Nonindigenous Organisms

Box 4-5: Pest Control Acts

- Box 4-6: Categories of Pest Organisms
- Box 4-7: Technical Advisory Group on the Introduction of Biological Control Agents of Weeds
- Box 4.8 Chronology of the Praxis Company's Experience with FDA
- Box 4-9: Other Regulatory Systems
- Table 4-1: Examples of Potential Risks from BBTs
- Table 4-2: Categories Regulated by EPA

Chapter 5: From Research to Implementation

- Box 5-1: USDA's Integrated Pest Management Initiative
- Box 5-2: Case Studies of USDA Pest Control Programs Involving Biologically Based Technologies
- Box 5-3: California Taking an Active Role in Changing Pest Management Practices
- Box 5-4: Campbell Soup Company
- Box 5-5: Connection between Research and Implementation in Australia
- Table 5-1: Funding for Research on BBTs
- Table 5-2: Funding of BBT-Based Pest Control Programs
- Table 5-3: Technologies Used in Pest Management Programs of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (USDA)

- Figure 5-1: General Schematic of the Decision Processes by which the Agricultural Research Service and State Agricultural Experiment Stations Award Research Funds
- Figure 5-2: Biological Control Expenditures and Programs in State Departments of Agriculture
- Figure 5-3: Distribution of Federal BBT Research According to Pest Type (1994)

Chapter 6: Commercial Considerations

- Box 6-1: Biologically Based Products for Pest Control
- Box 6-2: How Ciba-Geigy Markets a Microbial Pesticide
- Table 6-1: Estimated Market Value of Biologically Based Pest Control Products (millions of dollars annually: 1990, 1991, or 1992)
- Table 6-2: Projection: How Improved Production and Handling Technologies Would Incrementally Increase the Scale and Decrease the Costs of *Trichogramma* Production
- Table 6-3: Examples of Biologically Based Products Marketed by Major Agrichemical Companies or Their Partners
- Table 6-4: Comparison of Biologically BasedProducts and Conventional Pesticides
- Table 6-5: Examples of Factors PotentiallyAffecting the Future of the BBT Industry
- Figure 6-1: Comparison of BBT and Conventional Pesticide Sales According to Type of Pest